

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

June 18, 2025, 4:33PM



Public Safety Cluster 0:14

Good morning, everyone.

Welcome to the public safety Cluster Agenda review meeting for June 18th.

First Fund meeting order and a self instruction for each office 1st district.

Good morning, everybody. And the business supervisor.

So this is Justin's deputy and I have a colleague, Danielle, that here with me.

Hi everyone.

Daniela Urbina. I helped cover housing, homelessness and immigration for the supervisor.

Thank you very much.

Second issue, morning everyone.

Dante Franklin, just deputy first supervisor.

So can I have my colleagues here?

Did I wrong seeing it just a second melody?

Assistant justice deputy.

Thank you for district morning, everyone.

Stephen Edwards and senior justice deputy for Supervisor Barbath and I believe I have provided online Nick and.

Thank you very much.

Sorry.

I'm sorry.

This is this is Chloe Chinni, Ray's supervisor on justice mental health deputy and Alex Enterprise, associate justice mental health.

And Kyla will be joining us shortly.

Thank you. And the chair?

Good morning, Senator Croxin for supervisory Catherine Barker.

And we have colleagues.

Hi everyone.

My name is Leslie Camino.

I'm the assistant deputy for Antwa Valley Field Justice and immigration.

Hello everyone.

Ariana Gutierrez, USC fellow with the office.

Great. Thank you very much.

Just a note, this meeting is being transcribed since our motion is on the agenda.

First, we'll go to informational items.

There are no informational items this week, so next we'll move to board motions and board motion 1st district.

I have to then. Thank you, Annabel. Thank you, everyone.

I know this is a homelessness related motion, but it impacts a lot of the public safety departments.

So that's why we're listening to it here at this cluster. So for background.

Back in 2021, supervisors Quuel and supervisors Barger past emotion.

Essentially banning homeless encampments in our very high fire hazard severity zones for obvious reasons, I think 2021 was a particularly.

Fire prone year with a lot of fires and some of our unincorporated areas that.

Where there were a lot of homeless encampments. So that motion specifically was targeting the unincorporated area.

And resulted in us having dedicated outreach teams, dedicated host teams that would go to the unincorporated areas that were designated as very high fire hazard severity zones and you know, try to get folks housed, right.

Let them know that homeless encampments were not allowed in this area because of the obvious risks to their own safety, but also the safety of first responders. Residents who may live in the area if there is a big fire, etcetera, etcetera.

And that and that has been.

Great to have those targeted host outreach teams that have been supporting getting folks out of those unincorporated very high fire hazards severity zones.

I think things have obviously changed a lot since 2021.

We just had two very devastating fires that Eaton Fire and the Palisades fire, and in addition, the state released new maps designating new areas of the county as very high fire hazard severity zones. I think across.

Southern California. So not just.

La County the increase in what was designated as a very high fire severity zone was up by 26% and that includes a lot of areas that are right next to residential areas.

So for example, in the first district, there is a portion of Whittier Narrows that was not previously in the very high fire hazard severity zones that is now in that red zone.

That is right up against our unincorporated S San Gabriel.

Neighborhood and community.

So it abuts a very.

Area so the the motion is asking for a couple of things.

Obviously the the the ban on encampments and unincorporated.

There's like very high fire hazards, very zones still exist, but we saw a need to kind of review those maps again. Look at the new areas that have been designated and essentially come back with a plan to enhance resources to ensure that we're clearing those areas more quickly.

And a part of that is obviously we don't have jurisdiction over parts that Caltrans manages or parts that the Army Corps may manage, but a lot of times those are the same areas that even though they're not unincorporated, very high fire hazard severity zones, they are against some.

Of our communities. And so while we may not want to, we're not going to take the lead on those. We also want to see how we can better support those partners because a lot of times they'll come back to us and say.

Well, we can't clear out the zone until we have the outreach and the.

You know the the best to coordinate to get folks out of here.

So that's idea #1.

Look at the new maps kind of map out like where.

Where are the very high fire and severity zones, but also designating and making it very clear like this is Caltrans, this is Army Corps. This is all the different jurisdictional jurisdictions that have jurisdiction over these lands. And then also look at our existing resources from host and public.

Works and Parks and Recreation identify what new resources.

May be needed to ensure that those very high fire hazard severity zones in unincorporated areas are clear of encampments, but also considering how we can better support those very high fire severity zones that are not unincorporated but certainly would have a major impact on our communities if they.

Were to have a fire, and then there's obviously report back both 30 days for the maps and the 90 days after that so that we can.

Identify the strategy.

So that's it.

I know.

I think we have representatives from fire and host and hi.

Probably on the line or maybe in person, so I don't know if anyone else wants to add anything.

Well, I like to sleep. I'm either.

Either like Mike.

I just have one question in terms of the timeline, just wants to know a couple things, how it was informed, if it's enough time and how it, how it it aligns with when buyers most likely occur?

Yeah, I wouldn't.

The report fax.

I wouldn't say necessarily align with how fires occur per southeast.

I think I'm trying to give enough time for the departments to to do these assessments. The 30 day report back from.

Fire sounds pretty doable 'cause I think they were already starting to do some of this. Mapping out where the zones are and and I think they were gonna actually present to the board pretty soon.

On these maps and and where all these very high-powered severity zones are.

So it's timely from there and then, yeah, so the the idea was that we'd get that 30 day report back and then within 90 days, taking into account that we have a 30 day report back from a fire, that's when the other entities like host and hi and.

Lhhsa and parks and public works can can have a report back.

So. So no, it doesn't necessarily align with fire season because we're in the.

In the middle of it right now, but hopefully this will get us ready for.

The next fire season, which as you know is also apparently year round now.

So yeah.

My question is why don't not wait until the maps are actually approved by the board which is coming in the next month?

Because I don't know if there's gonna be any potential changes or not, but that hearing hasn't happened yet.

Yeah, I mean I I think I see it as coinciding with it, right.

I think once those maps are, if you know it's a 30 day report back, but I think that falls into the alignment with when those maps will come back to the board.

So I think it's just sort of enhancing what I think their their.

They're already doing the work, so I don't.

I guess I don't necessarily see a need to wait per SE 'cause they're already doing the work and that we wanna get these analysis done sooner rather than later.

Is there any concern that in my stretch resources already that already sustained into you know doing this work from fire and from the Lasd site?

Yeah. I mean, I think that's why this is a report back to identify what the resources are that are needed.

I know right now it's a difficult budget year, obviously. And so it's it's, it's hard to say like how to how much more resources we're going to be able to put into something like this.

But I think without having the assessment of what resources are needed.

Then we can't look to the future to say, OK, we need this many more host teams to be able to do this or we need to enhance this and this for public works.

So it's all report back does not necessarily a directive to to redirect resources. But there is I think that the intent is to be able to understand what we would need to better address resources that are needed for the to keep those those those clear.

Yeah. And I.

Think.

I think there's still moratorium on extension of special teams, so I think that's where my concern lies.

Yeah, we're gonna. If there is gonna have to be a call for additional resources. The department is on a position to provide that.

Yeah, we understand.

And it doesn't always have to be LASD hosting.

Like right now, it's LASA, but I think obviously there will be a new department that I assume is gonna be taking over those lots of teams like the the host teams are not just share it. The host teams are also the LASA counterpart to host and so.

You know, if we aren't able to expand.

Lasd maybe there's an opportunity to expand the the loss of component of host, I have that more targeted outreach. So I hear you.

I mean, resources are strained, but I still think that this is a, at least for for the supervisor and for other districts that I think have a lot of these very hard fires severity zones, I think is a priority to just see like what can we do to.

To try to address it better.

I'm curious.

Just curious if we have kind of data on how successful we are at housing folks who

are moved out of these five priority zones versus just kind of shuffling them into a different area and then remaining on house.

I don't know if hi or.

Host are on that can answer that question.

I do not currently recommend her D drink is awful.

GD **Geff Deedrick** 10:49

Good morning.

I do have the numbers of of the 1000 folks that we did find doing our operations over 307 were placed in temporary housing.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 11:03

Thank you.

And then the other and just for my knowledge just kind of envision how how this works, what can, can you share kind of the process that the host team takes to help support people with moving out of these high fires severity zones, especially the folks who are not?

307 that are that are placed in housing.

Is it just like a one day sweep?

Is there any sort of supportive process to? Yeah.

To help them have a meal.

GD **Geff Deedrick** 11:35

Right now, that's a great question and and no, we don't do any sweeps.

The the host team model is built on report building and so once we do find folks in these pretty significant, you know, challenging terrain areas, it's just building reports building that collaborative bridge to the services that are with us. And and remember when host goes out not only.

Is it?

Is it lasso host that's with us?

Often times we have the Department of Mental Health.

Public health.

We basically use all the keys that the county has.

For all the homeless resources and our job is to provide safety and security.

So folks can engage with the outreach providers and connect them with those

services and and that's where we point to the success of. There's never been an arrest, no uses of force.

It's truly to be that bridge for that person to take the services and encourage them, that where they're at in the time or in that moment in time, is not a place they can be.

So it's not a A use of force situation, it's more of a.

Guiding them to be with the people that can help them and explain to them the dangers to the community and to themselves about being out there.

Quite often we've come across people who've been in some kind of medical distress and they're out there with no type of help.

So it's repeated engagement and it's also so it's education awareness and then being that bridge to those services.

PC Public Safety Cluster 12:58

Zero. Yeah, and and I'll add as and thank you, Captain Dedrick, for for that. I also want to add just as a kind of a follow up to Sandra's question and also maybe yours a little bit, Chloe, but I think my hope also with this report back.

Is that we can think you know, one of the things that we're thinking about and with your narrows is like, how can we use existing resources like a pathway home or something to address the encampment that we're seeing there?

And so I hope that there maybe could be.

Recommendations that come out of this.

Report that can help us identify ways that we can be more successful.

I mean, 300 folks, placing temporary housing is incredible.

But you know, there's that leaves some folks that aren't housed and I think that there are ways that we can that we can make that connection a little bit stronger.

I also you know a lot of folks that come to these areas I think are folks that have been shuffled around from other areas already, right?

And it's kind of why they end up.

Like in places that are more remote because.

They're feeling like they just haven't moved from other places, and so I think it is our responsibility to try to help get these folks housed, cause some of them. I mean, I know Captain Deedrick you probably have stories like folks who've been unhoused in, like these areas for.

Ten years who suddenly are like, Oh my gosh, someone's offering housing.

Amazing I can.

I can move in.

So you know, again, it's a report back.

So we'll have to identify funding and ways to expand all of our resources, but I think it's important to think through.

How we can better serve these?

GD **Geff Deedrick** 14:33

And Danielle, if I may, one of the things that and I agree with everything you said earlier and I think this motion opens the the window of opportunity for innovation is in lieu of the resources currently used.

What else could we do and and what could we do to be more efficient and so working with our county partners, especially LA County Fire, Lassa parks and public works, on this, I think we may be able to come up with some ideas on this motion. That that might be innovative.

That might help us.

And then also being cognizant of in the motion, I recognize that it talked about fire. Embers do not understand jurisdictional boundaries. And as we've seen, fire somewhere else could affect us well due to the county being ahead of this when it came to the host training, there's been.

Over 500 police officers from the independent police departments that have trained in the host model and so as we come together to address these that might touch other jurisdiction, those relationships are already in place.

Based on the host money for the Independent PD.

So I think it positions us well for an innovative response regarding this motion.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 15:47

Comments. Questions.

OK. If not, are there any public comment on this item?

Please raise your hand or speak up on teams.

Great. See you then move to the next motion from SD4. Implementing report reminded and gratification services for addressing contract review.

Thank you.

Yeah. So this is a follow up motion to motion that was previously approved by the board earlier in April of this year.

And the goal of that motion was to increase opportunities for justice involved youth to receive court reminders and other court related services.

So as a reminder, this is really important. A number of youth because a number of youth are incarcerated.

Atlas Kadrinas because of Benjamin.

Meaning they are incarcerated because they miss court or didn't follow through with their court orders.

And so we believe that any opportunity to enhance services. So I'm sure that they are able to attend court and comply with court order services at court ordered.

Court orders they will be less likely to be detained.

That was the three house and we're obviously trying to reduce the population that was drinas.

So we received a report back from that previous motion that outlined a number of steps.

That the departments can take to move forward with accomplishing this goal.

So this motion is distracting them to kind of move forward with those next steps and specifically address which is the the lead in cooperation with probation, Dyd County Council public defender and alternate public defender to do a number of things attracts them to develop a screening questionnaire.

For people who call in to the Justice Connect Support Center.

Which is J Cods calling center who want to receive services for you to develop a process for them to be able to do that it directs them to explore the possibility of expanding the use of text message court reminders for you through that Justice Connect, Support Center and.

Through the public defender and alternate public defender case management systems.

They direct them to explore contracting with a transportation service provider and making sure that the justice connects Support Center is set up.

Per youth PREFERRALS, and to make sure there's a process for informed consent and parental consent specifically. And then it directs them to integrate dyd's providers into the Justice Connect Support Center system.

So justice involved youth can be referred to services in their communities while they're going through the court process.

The motion also directs provision to continue meeting with the LA Circuit Court, which they have done previously, to explore the possibility of using the courts.

Hearing reminder service which is a text and e-mail service for justice involved youth and finally it directs all these departments with Jay Cotton, probation and lead.

To as well as the CEO to report back in 45 days and then sixty days thereafter with updates and funding considerations until the directives are completed.

So this is another report back, but expecting kind of progression in these goals. And then just a couple quick notes.

Colleagues, for some changes, we're gonna make some motion.

I just need to departments.

We are making it so that the public defender and alternate public defender are collaborators, so instead of them being.

In consultation with public defenders office, we're just gonna include them as one of the departments listed in collaboration with Jacob.

And.

The the third directive, which says to partner with the youth center provider.

We're just gonna change it to, say, explore partnering with the youth center.

Provider job provides transportation services so that it's not directed to move forward with the contracting process yet.

So I think that's all I'm gonna say. We have Gina here from Jcod and other folks might be here or online, and I don't know if you want to say anything, Gina, or if not, we can just have a question.

Happy to answer any questions. We've already working collaborative collaboratively with all of the partners that have been listed in.

And then.

That are listed in your slate of today.

So how'd you answer any questions?

Any other comments online for chance?

No other questions from just.

In.

All right, stop. Go ahead.

Quick question for director. One, what do you and maybe this is a Gina question?

What? What do you anticipate the timeline being to?

Add these additional aspects of the screening questionnaire.

It seems like it may be like an easy.

So I in developing the original questions for the adult population, we work with partners to come up with a question what they look like.

Of course we want.

We want you guys here for this process to make sure that they're sensitive right to the population that we may be talking to and that they will physically address.

I think what's necessary right to get them connected in transportation or public services, that's kind of the screening questions that.

I think we are currently being used to get adult connected to services when they call the address of Connect support center.

They'll want it to be a collaborative process.

I I think it contains you know from depending on you know if everyone's in agreement, it could be a short period of time.

But if there's some back and forth, you know, once to give people the space, and I think it would also be helpful to run whatever we're coming up with, at least by our justice involved individual panel and to get some feedback right from you who you know might.

Have some feedback on like the types of questions.

Being asked. So I want to be intentional about the process right in developing what makes sense.

So I think a couple months.

Ago.

But any none. Are there any public comments on this item?

For those on lights.

Your dad or raise your hand on things.

Megan, you have one minute.

I'll start your time when you start sleeping and leave yourself.

M **Megan** 22:17

Good morning.

My name is Megan.

I'm a community engagement intern with law Defensa. I want to speak to the alarming coordination between the Sheriff's Department and ice, the Los Angeles community is under so much stress and seeing LASD support ice raids, blocking protests and helping target immigrant families is pretty unacceptable. Second, I want. To highlight the the need to restore funding for the public defender's office, cutting their budget while increasing funding for law enforcement sends the wrong message. Finally, I urge I urge you to take a hard look at the Probation department's budget.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 22:49
Screen.

M **Megan** 22:51
They've cost Los Angeles County billions in settlements from abuse cases, yet they continue to hold onto funding for vacant positions.
That money should go where it's actually needed, like Youth Services, housing and care based program.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 23:08
Omega this is not the time for public comments, sorry.
We can come back for public comment at different times.
We were talking about this motion specifically.
So are there any public comment for this motion specifically?
All right, Sean.
And we move to the next one. The next item is from SD5. The first motion is support for SB571 and AB468 strengthening protections against reading.
I'm gonna turn it over to my colleague who's online, ation.

VN **Vartanian, Natalie** 23:42
Thank you, Sandra. Good morning.
So this motion is support for Senate Bill 571 and AB 468. Both of these bills are related to strengthening penalties for looting crimes.
So this is something that we have definitely seen an increase in, particularly in the Altadena area, as folks are.
Working to rebuild and recover from the devastating wildfires.
So the the two bills are similar.
SV571.
Does increase certain crimes related to looting like burglary and Grand Theft to felony charges? If it's occurred during the? If it's occurred during a declared emergency or 180 days after they're, it does also include new penalties for impersonating emergency personnel, which we did see occur.
In Altadena as well.
And then AB 468.

Expands the definition of looting to also include trespassing and theft from vehicles in the emergencies of zones, and similarly to the previous bill. It includes sentence enhancements for impersonation of emergency personnel. Both of these bills have passed the 1st House, and they do head to the committees in.

The 2nd house.

And I believe Adam from CEO, there is on as well to answer any questions.

Thank you.

PC Public Safety Cluster 25:20

Any questions?

Justice deputies.

I have some questions.

I don't know, so I guess.

I had a couple of questions to sort of wanted to make sure I understand the context of the current state of the law correctly, because my understanding is that these crimes are already crimes, and if I remember right, right after the fires, District Attorney Hoffman did like a.

Big Press conference where he, you know, announced that they had found.

Three people alluding, and he indicated that the charges those folks were facing were pretty significant.

I think there were more than five years.

I think one of them might have been like a strike three. So it was like a very lengthy potential prison sentence.

So it I just want to kind of understand what the real impact of this will likely be.

Are we taking sentences from, you know, one to two years and then making them like 5 to 10 years? And to the extent we know and I don't know if this is a?

A question supervisor, varga's office or for CEO layer.

But do we know what the potential impact on county jail operations and county budgets will be?

Because my understanding is that each time we increase.

The criminal consequence of like, something so taking something from a misdemeanor to a felony or making available a sentencing enhancement that's not already available separate from whether or not it's a good idea. There's a budgetary consequence in terms of increasing length of stay.

In the county jail, as the person fights their case, increasing the cost of the public

defender.

Alternate public defender and presumably also the District Attorney to to see that case through.

So I just kind of want to have a better understanding of like the big picture for like how we expect those changes to impact account.

And I think I don't know if there's somebody who's in a Da's office level may be able to answer some of those questions. But I think from our perspective, there was a huge accountability issue that occurred and especially our fire area.

Right. Like we had people who were told to evacuate in a moment's notice, who left a lot of things behind, some of them who lost their homes, some of them whose homes were still standing but were unable to come back for weeks.

And during that time, there was people who fled to the community and continued to victimize people who had lost everything. So for us, it becomes a trust issue too.

It's about ensuring that when we are telling people to evacuate that.

They are trusting that their homes will be safe.

And like I said, unfortunately in this case that didn't happen and it didn't happen in high volume and it is continuing to happen because we're starting to see, you know we we did see in the last few months an increase in crime in Altadena. And we have a.

Lot of residents who have reached that to us, who continue to reach out to us about public safety in the Community because they don't.

They're already survivors and they just don't want to continue to be like you said, re victimized under these circumstances, so.

Part of it is to.

One accountability, but second also to hopefully deter the activity and behavior during an emergency PREPA order like this one.

We we know that fires are a real issue in our city and our county.

There's gonna be other incidents that are happening. Happen again. Like we wanna make sure that when we're telling the public to leave and to leave on a moment's notice that their belongings will be safe once they return. So.

That's the perspective where we're coming from on the crime scene.

I don't know if there's somebody from, like, the Dea's office who might be able to might be able to.

Answer some of those more questions.

One bda's office lightspeed online.

Are you going to be a doctor for CEO there?

Unless they're able to.

We're here, but we are from admin side so I I wouldn't have this.

Responsibility to your questions. If you can take the questions back and.

Adam for team.

OK.

Great. Adam, would you like to go ahead and?

AS

Adam Smith 29:27

Thank you.

Morning deputies Adam Smith and CEO Lar.

I just wanted to speak on the sentencing enhancements.

You know, as Natalie spoke about, these bills have a lot of crossover, AB468 and SB571, but generally.

Where?

Penalties for burglary or theft are typically around, you know, 12 months or so.

Generally, these bills enhance those.

Those penalties in evacuation zone or emergency declaration zone for to about 16 months to three years, depending on the severity, subject to.

You know, pending the court's discretion.

PC

Public Safety Cluster 30:15

So Adam.

Do you or does CEO have any projections on the financial impact of what that would cost? And and for me and I'm just just wanting to make sure I understand because you know with justice budgets because we have budget here today, I'm always kind of stuck on this.

Idea that like we pay times 5 basically so like we're increasing the separate from like the policy question like whether it's a good idea we're we would be increasing the we would expect cost to increase from.

Decide the prosecuting case in different ways.

Gonna take longer from the public defender and alternate public defender who's doing the same thing, and then the person's also staying in our county jail.

So we'd expect lasds to service the NAND or whatever to go up as well.

Do you all have a sense of what that cost looks like for us?

AS Adam Smith 31:03

Personally, Seal Air does not at this time, but we're happy to get that information or report back.

PC Public Safety Cluster 31:10

Thank you.

Yeah, I'd appreciate whatever you've got.

I have.

I have a question and just as I'm looking at the letter from bear as well, I've had some concerns or questions about the if this is moving a moving us away a bit from a care first approach to this issue that it was respond to the folks that.

Can do such things out of pure necessity or to meet needs that they have like are we?

Who are we centering in this approach?

And how does it advance this care? First model, it goes like that ties kind of shifting a bit with this and with the financial impact, which it sounds like, well, no more a bit later.

It seems like it it's being misprioritized today in terms of how it that financial impact could be an Ave. to further support folks that are mostly harmed by.

This and as you mentioned, I know I'm taking a bunch of questions in this but.

With events that are going to be continuing to occur.

Buyers disasters. Things like happened in the bit of the unknown.

How does this also put folks at risk that we've seen historically being put at risk in terms of how looting is looked at differently with different probability with different people?

And one of the questions also with this is the definition of the evacuation zone and is this bill also looking at evacuation warnings?

Success was well seen before.

Folks are evacuated. Is also impacted areas where it's just the warning 1st and then does that open up for some bias or to occur in terms of who's being prosecuted?

I mean, I feel like.

Like I said, in terms of like a cost perspective, like there already is a cost because we have people that have been arrested for this activity, right?

Like we have people who, you know, went into communities that were evacuation

zones. We had people who impersonated first responders to go into communities, people who were not from the community that impacted. Like I said, people who had already been impacted by a fire and then couldn't have.

Access to their properties.

So from that perspective, that's where we're coming from.

We want to ensure that there is a level of trust when there is an emergency declaration so that people don't continue to be re victimized in a situation where they're already struggling, right?

There's there already being impacted like I said, and we wouldn't be doing this if we weren't hearing this from our community.

Who wants to feel safe?

Who wants to go?

Who want to go back?

Some who have nothing to go back to because their houses were burned and their the fear of what happens when you know.

Construction happens is is my property going to be safe?

That's the perspective that we're coming from, if I may. I think the idea here is.

Just general protection of the most vulnerable. Obviously, this population here already lost everything they have.

Rebuilding is going to be the top priority here and I'm sure many of you have also seen some of the Articles of Eden the the victims of the Eden Fire lives in these homes in these multi generational homes. There's a ton of black and brown lives and you.

Know that are equally as struggling.

So I think the idea here is really just protecting the most vulnerable.

And I think in that view it is in line with the care. First, I understand that it is increasing penalties and this is a hard a hard one here. But I think the general idea is we hope that it would deter so that way these opportunistic crimes, Don.

Take place to begin with.

Just the final question on that is we drift in this area of being concerned about increased crime happening or increase of crimes in might often look at increasing penalties as the solution to tier crime.

Is there backing or evidence that suggests that that does work?

Or is because I need to set it's a whole, but I think for someone that's gonna increase punishment on people like we should tell them most studies actually show the

opposite, that they don't really need to spend.

They don't have to decrease crime rates or the crime already exists, so people aren't prosecuting for them, like Steven said.

So I'm not sure that what the bill's trying to do is actually looking to work. This mostly show the opposite so.

I would echo the question.

But he had about is there any sense that you have children of appointments?

That's a slightly different question.

Did.

I don't know.

Does anyone know if the author or the authors have looked at other ways to provide support to communities who are experiencing the aftermath of a fire that are separate from criminal penalties, like whether there could be an investment in supportive services that are more prominent?

We based in the communities, so that doesn't necessarily have to be law enforcement, but just someone being physically present more to deter looting.

Rather than increasing criminal penalties after a theft of a burglary has happened like like, is there a what do we know if there was an expiration of like what?

Preventative measures or?

Sort of.

What's the? What's the way to say it non?

Sort of.

Sort of law enforcement type security, right?

Like the kind of just the idea of having a presence there, whether it's a supportive service, whether it's, you know, anybody basically like the the sort of.

See something say something.

Communities does not only live in law enforcement, it could live elsewhere as well.

So like, was there any effort to find like whether there were other services that could be present and physically present in these communities more often as a way to deter?

Folks who shouldn't be there first.

Folks who shouldn't be taking advantage of of residents as opposed to the law enforcement sort of technique, which is typically a response to a wrong.

Do you know I I actually don't remember.

VN **Vartanian, Natalie** 37:23

So if.

If I'm understanding the question correctly, are you referring to like a neighborhood watch type of system security?

Is that along the lines of what you're going for?

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 37:35

I mean.

I I'm not.

I'm not a post that sort of thing.

I don't love neighborhood watch thing.

I mean, we saw with George Zimmerman how that kind of thing goes, but I I think in my head it doesn't have to be that it could be.

It could be anything, right?

It could be social workers that are just there to support the community and are just responding earlier and physically present in the environment to come say hey, wait a minute. Like we're gonna we have eyes on things.

In my head, that's sort of a more preventative approach that is not necessarily tied to.

Increasing criminal penalties way and I'm I'm not.

I just don't know.

I.

I don't remember from the my reading of the bill whether the authors had actually explored, like whether there were other ways to do this.

I mean, I think.

VN **Vartanian, Natalie** 38:19

Understanding. Yeah. Go go ahead, Sandra.

I was just gonna say my understanding of the bill, these two particular pieces of legislation, I don't believe that it was explored.

And Adam, maybe you could chime in if I'm wrong.

I know that you know the at the county level in our local jurisdiction.

Sandra can probably speak on this that we've been trying to do some increased

patrols and whatnot, but I don't believe that that was particularly mentioned in this legislation.

PC Public Safety Cluster 38:53

Thank you.

Yeah. I mean, I think what I was gonna say is I think there has been an effort from the community itself to.

Increase security, that is non law enforcement.

I mean that is definitely something that is still very active.

So we have folks that, you know, wanna hire their own security.

Companies to protect their properties, but not everybody has a luxury of of being able to afford it.

VN Vartanian, Natalie 39:16

Mm hmm.

PC Public Safety Cluster 39:17

So they're looking to us to provide that level of security for them.

And then during an evacuation zone, I mean, nobody is allowed in those areas and we found because of the dynamic and geography of paladina looks and is a lot of entry points that even when checkpoints, people still manage to get in and that was the concern of the.

Community and for weeks we heard they wanted the checkpoints back.

They wanted the National Guard back.

They want extra patrols.

They want a lot of things.

Because they don't feel safe and I think we also remember that when we do have an active emergency like this one.

We have people that scattered.

Not everybody comes back out that, you know, we have people who are, you know, in other states who are in other counties who are not as accessible to their properties.

So they want to be reassured that their properties are being kept safe because they're not able to be there to have eyes.

Yeah, I think that that makes sense.

Sandra and I, I just want to highlight what my colleagues were saying about whether or not this will actually solve that problem, right.

I I'm not.

You know, I've. I've also heard those studies aneval that increasing penalties is not an effective assurance for crime.

So I don't know if there's alternatives, including security.

I I really like Steven's idea as well.

Enhancing support in those communities, which I think would be more effective and would also be more aligned with their care first vision.

I have a a kind of practical legal question about the 8468 which?

Fixing the definition of leading to increase trespassing and theft from vehicles and then evacuation zone.

And so I'm. I'm just wondering, it sounds to me that.

I.

I'm just curious if that means if you steal anything from a car in an evacuation zone that that would lead to a felony conviction regardless of the amount or the context or circumstances. I'm just.

I'm not sure if you know that answer. If there's someone on my answer it and I guess like what is the current law?

When it comes to looting, it doesn't include car thefts at all.

Or is it like increasing?

Yeah, I I just hope there's a way to clarify that.

I'm gonna see you.

VN Vartanian, Natalie 41:35

On 468, I believe this one had more of a tiered system based on the severity of the crime, but Adam, can you speak on those technical technicalities?

AS Adam Smith 41:50

Certainly the the bill itself does allow.

The court some discretion.

In.

Charging and providing penalties.

So just because someone.

Burglarized a car within an evacuation zone. Doesn't necessarily automatically.

Equal the the penalties in the bill I do want to state though that.

Because AB 468 and SB571 are so similar.

And they're both in the opposite houses there when they come together for concurrence, they could be merged, and that these bills are most likely subject to some element of change.

So it's still an evolving situation, but.

There is some discretion by the courts.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 42:49

I'm also just wondering if we can get I think.

Steven asked some some good questions in his initial questioning, and I'm wondering if we can. I guess I want to formally ask for some follow up on that if possible, and if not Steven, I'm happy to share with 30 those specific questions if that's OK. Helpful. Yes, 'cause.

Mine notes are always a mess.

Thank you.

Just for the note veridis and a written comment and those are on your desk.

You know, they're if they're already just there, deputies that want copy have it on my my desk here. OK, we move to public comment.

Are there any public comment for this specific item, Melinda?

I'll start your time when you start speaking.

Wanna meet yourself, Belinda?

Linda.

MK **Milinda Kakani** 43:48

Can you hear me?

Can you hear me? OK, great.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 43:50

Yeah.

MK **Milinda Kakani** 43:53

I just wanted to express my strong disgust for these bills and the idea that the Board of Supervisors would potentially support these bills.

What you're basically asking for is the criminalization of communities. And I think

based on the questions and the response, I hope from SD1 and SD2 and SD3.
That it would be clear that this is not the answer.
People are asking for support. They're not asking for more cops.
People are asking for.
Subsidies. They're asking for less.
Red tape.
They're not asking for increased sentences. They're not asking for increased punishments like this is the furthest thing from the answer to what people are asking for.
It's misguided. It's offensive.
It's racist and it's gross.
And so my ask would be that the board not support these bills and in fact support.
And then in fact submit letters of opposition as opposed to A5 signature letter of support.
Thank you.

PC Public Safety Cluster 44:59

Colin, next, you have one minute.
Please start when you I'll start your time.
We start speaking.
Helen, please unmute yourself.
Owen.

HE helen eigenberg 45:10

I'm here.
Hi, good morning.
Helen Eigenberg, resident of SD3.
I just want to echo what Millie just said to everyone.
It's appalling that we're even talking about these two bills and I want to thank SG-12 and three for your questions, which really speak to why we should not even be discussing these bills this morning.
And I just know that especially with 468 it is.
So it's written in such a problematic way.
And we know that any enforcement is unlikely to unjustly and disproportionately.
Target people of color please do not support either of these bills. Thank you.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 45:45

Thank you very much.

Next we have editing, editing. We start speaking.

AC **Andony Corleto** 45:52

Yes. Can you hear me?

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 45:53

Yes, go ahead.

AC **Andony Corleto** 45:54

Yes, my name is Anthony Corletto.

I'm an SD2 resident and a program associate. The various food and justice. While we do understand that the importance of supporting fire survivors, SB571 and four AB 468, prioritize a misguided approach, these bills offer a costly and punitive legal response instead of.

Meeting the real needs of impacted communities.

Extensive research has show that these bills will not deter crime, but they may, however, worsen the racial disparity and invite racial profiling.

And false looting accusations, as we have already seen happen in Ukraine after the January fires.

The SC Justice Group surveyed the Eden Canyon fire survivors in Altadena regarding their needs and not a single person mentioned looting or theft.

Instead, they named Tommy Cash assistance reconstruction and improved emergency preparedness as their key needs. Further, as we continue to bear the impacts of aggressive federal immigration enforcement, these increased penalties can likely.

Cause devastating consequences for immigrant Angelinos.

Including family separation and deportation.

These bills threaten our most vulnerable under the guise of safety.

I urge you to please not support SB571 and AB468.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 47:03

And if you have any.

OK.

Next person we have, Lena.

Lena, will you go ahead?

I'll start your time.

Please unmute yourself.

Go ahead.

And can't hear you.

Come back to Leon Meagan.

Do you have a comment on this item specifically?

Megan.

MC **Megan Castillo** 47:39
Hi there my Co.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 47:39
We'll start.

MC **Megan Castillo** 47:41
I'm with the reimagine LA coalition and law defence, and I'm speaking in strong opposition of SB571 and 8468.
These bills exploit a tragedy and push an unnecessary criminal legal response. Instead of addressing what Angela knows urgently need community members have reported being racially profiled and falsely accused of looting during the recent fires. And even as Anthony shared, you know SC Justice Group did a survey and. No one expressed concern about that.
Instead, they asked for housing, food, clean water, cash aid and faster evacuations. And these bills are dangerously broad, right? Applying to any theft and during any state of emergency, which in LA County could mean indefinite enhanced penalties for crimes unrelated to disasters. That to me, is not safety.
It's an overreach that risk worsening racial disparities.
And these bills punish people who are struggling to survive.
After disaster, so instead of helping them, some individuals still metal and copperation, not creed.
They've lost their homes access.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 48:47

Do you know? Are you friends?

MC **Megan Castillo** 48:50

What they need is cash assistance.

Please support our communities do.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 48:57

You know, Are you ready to speak these?

I mean yourself going to start your time.

Go ahead.

I'm sorry we don't hear anything.

Perhaps you can submit a written comment. I can't hear you.

Sorry, I'm gonna have to move.

Alright, that being said, then we move to next item. Next item is from SD5.

Yes, supporting SP379 and SP380 protecting communities since they're fully violent.

That's a number.

I'm so supervisor's bringing this motion forward to support Tuesday bills, SB379 and SB380 by Senator Brian Jones, which responds to the ongoing public safety concerns.

Around the release of sexually violent predators or absolute peace into residential communities like those in the Antwerp Valley.

For years, the Antelope Valley has been disproportionately impacted by SVP placements, despite its remote location, limited infrastructure and already stretched law enforcement capacity. These placements have occurred with little community input, delayed response access and minimal oversight from the state.

SV379, known as the Safe Dock, would strengthen oversight by requiring the Department of State Hospitals to prioritize public safety before any placement is approved.

It also prohibits the state's contractor from securing a lease on a placement site before Department of State Hospitals formally approves it, ensuring local conditions and risks are fully evaluated before the contract is signed.

Meanwhile, SV380 takes the longer term approach by requiring the state to study the feasibility of establishing dedicated transitional housing facilities for sups under conditional releases.

The idea is to explore safer, more controlled alternatives to scattered site. Placements that currently place a heavy burden on small, under resourced communities.

There is an overall fear in the community and skepticism.

From the community, if Svp's are really cured of their verified mental disorder and it's potentially disrupting any any neighborhood they're put in.

This motion simply directs the county to formalize support between both bills as part of a broader effort to ensure as weekly SVP placements.

Are handled with public safety, fairness and community impact.

And I think we have Palmdale station captain on my questions.

Yes, please.

Yeah, that's great. I have a couple.

So the first thing is wondering just how how public safety is being defined by the author.

And then second to that.

The public safety having the capacity to do what?

As in water, kind of what does it require?

It's it's my understanding that public safety and legislation is not defined.

But maybe CEO layer can speak to it and then come deal. Station captain can probably answer the public safety concerns.

Years ago.

AS Adam Smith 52:30

Hello again.

I'm sorry, I'd have to get back to the deputies on questions pertaining to both of these bills.

PC Public Safety Cluster 52:47

Just the.

I could.

I could probably explain a little bit more. The public safety piece just from being there and talking to the community.

So in past for for example, the pillow case replace that was placed this year, we had a community town hall meeting, something at the end of last year and there were a lot of concerns because I mean, when you think of the placement in the roles that you.

Think of maybe this is a home and it's miles and miles away from everyone, and that's not the reality there.

The reality there is that there are neighbors.

There is minimal landline connection.

The roads aren't really navigable.

In the last time that pillowcase ***** was placed it, I think it had over 180 calls for service. And just to put it in context, that placement site is maybe I want to say maybe 30 minutes from the nearest station in Palmdale, and there's only two.

Resident deputies that cover that area.

Yeah.

So, and I think at if I can remember correctly, the day we were at that town hall with or the community meeting explaining this, the resident deputy was responding to, I believe, a murder or something very severe and same deal with other resident deputies for in that area.

But I'm sure we could probably get you more information.

Can I follow up on the so I think a concern for for us with this specific Bill 379?

We're asking state hospitals to define what public safety is or look at like a broader picture of what public safety looks like.

And I don't know if it sounds to me like there isn't like a set definition.

And our view of what public safety may be may not align with what they're thinking.

And the other piece.

Is that they?

Umm. Once they've made that that determination on what they believe public safety would be, they get to then share that with the court and then the court makes a decision based off of that, right.

So if you're if if somebody's making a decision or or determination on how they're defining what is a public safety, I guess rest that again may not be aligned with care 1st may not.

It may be aligned with their own bias.

Now they're being able to bring that to court and say this is what?

That is, I think that's problematic.

To say the least, I I do appreciate, and I think it's the other bill.

This is 379, the analysis being done and would like to understand more, maybe from the author or.

Both of the bills.

What that risk assessment will look like, how they're aligning that to?

I guess.

Suitable risk assessment and I guess what does that risk assessment look like will be something that we'd like to see or or.

Read over.

Look over.

So I think it might be helpful to talk about process because currently like one, there is a placement like that's when you have input from the community, right?

Like we get notified once there, there is an A location already identified.

We don't have any say before that.

So I think that is a concern that our communities are expressed.

It's once I notice is issued to law enforcement, to the D as office that there is going to be a placement that addresses already been done and there is an input from the community who's going to be impacted by having svps live in their community to have a.

Say in the process before that.

So I think that's been a challenge.

Is that time and time again we're seeing the animal Valley being selected because of the remoteness of the community.

And it has become and feels unfair to the community.

Who basically says we have no choice. We have to, you know, accept them in the Community because either they have ties to LA County or an outside judge has decided that there are enough ties that they have to be placed in our county.

So nowhere else is there an SVP place, except we're currently in the off.

Here are you.

Appreciate that.

Still, I think what that risk assessment looks like, and maybe it includes that like, have you looked at all the different you know, locations, what all those different pieces?

I don't think that speaks to this. And then we're making.

By supporting this, we're essentially making it a blanketed way of how we're moving forward without having the ability to.

And maybe this is a conversation with the author, but like, determine what?

Again, public safety looks like how we're declining what public safety is and also what we're what's the best standard used for, like a risk assessment when it comes to.

This specific population so.

Concern don't say anything.

I think you got it.

The concern that what we'd have with those, especially as it already seems, I'd imagine it's placement is challenging already with the existing considering schools and parks and and then I also would be concerned about that this has something additional barriers that it places on people that already are.

Have issues with jobs.

And housing already.

Any other questions, comments.

 **+18*****31** 58:30

Is Captain Barton from Palmdale station.

I was finally unable to unmute. If you have any other questions, Miss Croxton covered the majority of the public safety stuff.

I was gonna comment on the other part I would add is that obviously there is no routes to some of these folks within our community.

One of the things we've been stressing the most is community policing and community input, and that honestly ends up leading to a lot of distrust from the public to us and we're end up having kind of a conflict with the Community when they're out there protesting these folks.

There. And that's what one of the biggest resource burdens.

Recently. Thank you.

 **Public Safety Cluster** 59:05

Thank you very much. Any other comments?

He applied, removed the public comment public comments.

We have Mary jure Perry with very fine.

We start speaking, please to meet yourself.

 **Mary Jeters - No SVPs in the AV** 59:20

Hi I'm a residence of the Antelope Valley and I've been advocating in our area for quite some time.

These two bills were proposed with the idea of.

Making public safety a condition or a consideration in these placements, because right now it isn't.

And the judge has even said in court that they're not allowed to consider that, which is kind of ridiculous.

But anyway, these bills are not controversial.

They passed through the entire.

State Senate unanimously, both of them, and the SB379 passed through the Assembly Public Safety Committee yesterday also, and it looks like they're on the way to go to go through.

I can't personally define public safety, but basically our residents are just terrified. It's upending lives.

It is.

There are only three of them here currently, but in the entirety of LA County having all three.

Three Svp's within a 20 mile radius of each other.

Just as blatantly unfair.

And we would really appreciate support. Thank you.

PC Public Safety Cluster 1:00:26

Very much.

All right. Are there any other public comments?

Linda, I'll start your time when you start speaking.

MK Milinda Kakani 1:00:38

Thanks. Three folks upending lives.

Feels like maybe we could do more by providing additional supports to those young to those folks.

I'm sorry.

So they don't re offend and it also it's this feels so vague and everything is about like overreach and like control and surveillance and how many dollars can we contribute to that?

I just.

I don't understand why we can't prioritize caring for folks like part of the reason.

That we're here is that we've forgotten that we belong to each other. And I'm not saying that those folks have not done terrible, horrible, egregious things. But this idea that we just want to push folks out as far out beyond the margins as possible.

And frankly, if it's already passed out of the Senate with full support, it's already

passed out of the Public Safety Committee.

And if it's headed to a floor vote before the Assembly?

I'm fairly certain this will pass out anyway, so I don't get why LA has to also then submit a letter.

It just feels like an unnecessary add to something that's gonna make its way through and that probably.



Public Safety Cluster 1:01:48

Thank you.

All right.

Any other public comments?

School.

OK.

Alright. With that, we move on to the next section of the Board of the Cluster Agenda is the presentations. First presentation we have.

It is from the public Safety Department final budget final changes budget.

Start with Ryan.

Please.

All right.

Good morning, deputies.

It's Brian Hoffman here with the public safety team to provide our budget briefing for final changes.

Final changes in the second.

Three budget phases in the county wide budget process.

Just a few notes before we get started.

You'll notice that the NCC programmatic adjustments for public safety are quite slight and final changes due to county's fiscal situation.

You will not see any curtailments.

And final changes as those are scheduled to be implemented in supplemental changes. And last but not least, we'll skip over any centralized adjustments otherwise referred to as finance targets as those adjustments apply to most, if not all of our public safety departments.

So with that being said, I'll go ahead and get started with Brian Bell representing the district's.

Brian Bell with the District Attorney.

All right, for adjustment 1-2 and three, those are all finance targets.

Investment 4 restores the funding deleted and recommended budget.

For one, head Deputy District Attorney, employee relations and overtime, this is fully offset by the deletion of one deputy District Attorney, 32 Deputy District Attorney Twos.

One legal office support assistant one and one intermediate typhus clerk.

We have any questions?

That's all we have for District Attorney.

We'll move on to the fire.

Good morning, everyone.

What's the motive for fire department before we begin?

I just wanted to remind everyone that fire is a special district and they are independent from the General Fund. General Fund general looks like allocation appropriation minus revenue equals NCC for the fire department.

They have financing, uses and financing sources which?

Have total have to match each other.

So moving on to #1 is a finance target.

Number two is 127 thousand for lifeguard services.

Number offset with Jonathan contributions. #3 is a grant for 34.4 million and that's mostly federal grants.

#4 is a one time carryover of 7.8 million and that is for unspent prior year funding.

#5 is a little over 8,000,000 for other revenues, mostly for the in the state.

#5 is an addition of 12 positions for 1.8 million, and that includes other for dispatch the dispatchable.

Moving on to the next page, #7, there's an increase of two positions for the forestry unit.

And that's because of the increase in defensible space.

#8 is a increase of a 965,000 for the epic La build out.

#9 is an increase of 26 positions for a little less than 5 million.

And let's just stop the three one stops in Malibu, Calabasas and Altadena.

#10 is an increase of 291,000 for the board approved Reclasses.

#11 is an increase of 5.3 million and that's for one time revenue from Measure H and Southern California Edison.

#12 is an increase of 500,000 for DSOs. We'd like to call Dso's department operating expenses.

#13 as a decrease of almost \$3,000,000 from property tax estimated by the assessors and #14, is a decrease of 193 thousand.

In a perfect continuous and #15 is a decrease of \$4 million.

For funding committee reserves, are there any questions for the fire department?

Yeah. The one shop, shop stuff is that are these temporary positions one time funding?

Is it for a year it's on.

It's gonna be ongoing and fire expects to absorb them to the attrition ongoing until everything's been built.

Of what?

Probably the department anticipates a long term need for these positions, even though on the surface it seems like it could be a short term ask.

The positions are expected to provide services indefinitely.

If there was any other questions, I'll be moving on.

I'll be moving on to fire.

Lifeguard #1 is a finance target and #2 is an increase of large thousand for lifeguard services.

Any questions for fire leckburn?

Thank you.

Next up is like to introduce Brian Bell comma Brian Bell with medical Examiner Adjustment 1 deletes, 1 administrative services manager three position.

That was temporarily added to facilitate an employee transfer to assist with Probation's reorganization.

Under other changes we have adjustment.

One is a finance target and then adjustment 2 exchanges the ongoing revenue approved during the recommended budget phase to eliminate transportation.

And storage fees for one time revenue. And that's all we have for medical examiners.

Do you have any questions?

Yeah. So practically that last one that you said, what does that mean?

That means that we are making it ongoing to eliminate the transportation, so on recommended budgetary approved we approve ongoing revenue for the transportation and budget fees.

We took that back and we're just swapped it out with one time revenue and we're gonna fund that every year with one time revenue. And so our budget situation gets a little bit better.

OK.

So these are still being eliminated, correct?

We're using one time revenue, correct, OK.

Any other questions?

Are you confident that we will always have one time revenue to do that or is it like next year's budget we would expect to see some sort of plan to move it into a multi.

So we ask every year on the budget and we'll go ahead and.

Assess it at that time and see how and see how we can fund it.

There's there's no guarantees in budget, but generally speaking, one time funding one time, revenue is more readily available than ongoing NCC or ongoing revenue, so.

We'll evaluate in 2627 to see where we're at.

Want to ask a question, but I'm a budget person so most likely I I think I understand what's happening right.

We're saying, like, we want to fund this, we're going to use one time funding to do it, but we're also expecting it to continue every year.

That seems sort of correct.

Well, this is all part of the overall strategy to address labor and AB 218.

So the board permanently eliminated these CS.

So we allocated ongoing revenue for that.

Permanent deletion and recommended, but due to the county's fiscal situation, one time revenue is being provided as a stop gap. In 2627, we'll evaluate ongoing revenue again, potentially one time revenue to continue the elimination.

Got it.

But I I hear you and that does make sense.

Sort of, but I just if our situation were to change.

Wouldn't the board have to vote to start doing the fees again since the board already voted to not do the fees?

Am I getting that wrong?

Like, I'm not sure.

Oh, you mean a one time revenue was not?

Yeah, like it's not sufficient one year.

Like if the board already made AI think it was a motion.

Right, right.

Like it's so the board. Are you made by a motion decision to fund it?

Right. So the one time money wasn't sufficient.

We would.

The board would have to do something to start charging people again for that those fees.

I think we have to discuss the logistics, but I would recommend let's see where we're at in 2627 in that address if necessary.

OK.

All right.

Thank you. OK.

Any other questions for medical examiner? If not, we will move on to probation.

Hewitt and Stephanie. Good morning, deputies.

My name is Stephanie Zarella.

Probation item number one is a finance target.

Item number two is 7 additional positions to support the operations and internal accounting functions for JJRBG justice Realignment block grant.

And #3 is an internal adjustment to align the departments application.

Opening, I guess for any questions.

Why do we need 7 positions to support JJ RVD? That's on a new plot grant, yeah.

Hi Robert, I'm getting.

5 excuse me, five of those positions. Management of the programs at Barry J, Knight R Juvenile Hall. That includes both ensuring the program providers show up, make sure his curriculum is according to the program plan.

Make sure that rosters are maintained and that the.

Program occurs through allotted amount of time.

It's also for the planning for all that programming and basically ensuring integrity to the model, whatever the model program might be.

So that's those positions.

There's two more positions are for fiscal positions to manage the money. Currently, the year end balance of the GRPG is expected to be about 1500 and four \$106 million of one time money and the new allocation to estate for the coming.

Fiscal year is 55,000,000, so add that together that's.

\$61 million.

We're asking for two people to manage that right now. We have no one and we're struggling with all the other revenues that we have to manage in the department.

So we manage at the fiscal end all the claiming that comes through to draw against

the Special Revenue Fund.

So all the departments that feed off of the Special Revenue Fund, we process all of that.

We also provide all the fiscal information CC when they meet both for jgcpa and jgrvg.

This action is specific to JGR BG.

And these are not sworn positions.

No program analysts for the J and their accounting positions for fiscal.

Can I ask?

The five program related positions. I thought the board had pushed for Dyd to take on more of a role in programming and if that's the case, why would we provide for permanent programming positions and probation for these funds?

Couldn't dyd do these programs?

Do you?

Are they already task?

Yeah. Dyd hires people to provide programming.

Certainly that's a large part of the sytf service, but services provided to sytf you and I used to be acronyms. Let me know.

But we do monitor the programs that.

Their contractors provide. It's in our house, so to speak.

It's in very J and Kilpatrick, so we make sure those programs occur, that there is a model that supports the overarching program and goals for the youth, whether that be vocational services, education, straight educational services, all kinds of other things that they might do. So we're Mon.

Everybody, whether it's provided to dyd contractor or provided to a contractor, the probation change.

I guess the question is though, if Duid is taking on the primary role of managing that programming framework. Does probation need 5 positions for these two facilities to do the? What is basically an administrative function of making sure you know making sure the program shows up making sure.

That the curriculum is whatever that seems like a big lift when it also seems like gyd will also do that, right.

Because they're not, they're not.

They would be not doing their job if they also.

Making sure the program showed up.

Make sure the curriculum was appropriate, etc.

So it seems like a weird.

That's why I'm trying to figure out, are we getting that balance right?

Where those steps we're doing everything from making sure there's a room available, the supplies or equipment are available. the IT network is available.

The the budget is available that they show up on time.

They maintain roster because complaints from oversight groups is. For example, we show up and you've got to schedule the programs throughout the week.

We walk into the room and there's no program happening.

Or the vendor shows up and and is there for 15 minutes and leaves.

It's supposed to be there for 55 minutes, so we're the ones that are on site and making sure all that happens. But it's not just what's happening in the hall, it's all the planning and scheduling that goes into that. The backup, all of those programs and it.

Not just the programs that Dyd was, it's what provides. It's what we provide through too. If there's therapy sessions that are supposed to occur, we're there to make sure they occur.

We're there to make sure there's rosters.

We're make sure all that happens in a timely manner.

Any service for any kid we're there to make sure they get recreation on time.

The recreation period is supposed to be 3 to 4:00 or something.

It's required by the SEC that they get one hour of large muscle activity every day.

Whether permitted, we make sure that happens. So we make sure the calendar that's posted for every program actually happens.

Dyd doesn't do that immediately.

Again, it's our house.

We have to make sure it happens because ultimately we're accountable to the SCC and the DOJ to make sure all the stuff happens.

I hear you, but I I'm still trying to make sure that 'cause my my understanding is that you put on some of the common complaints from oversight posts, right?

I think that's right. I guess what I'm trying to unpack is exactly how which staff end up in probation and which staff end up in duid.

Balance is actually right, because I think the board has weighed in more than once to encourage did to take on more of a role in some of this space.

And so I want to make sure that we're budgeting.

I'm inconsistent with my last questions about whatever, but making sure that the budget staffing, especially the staffing, is ongoing, that we're hitting that balance, right and we're not putting more of it in one place rather than another, or like unintentionally duplicating where those staff positions are and I I.

I hear what you're saying and I'm just trying to make sure I understand exactly how that like, give me some confidence to make sure I'm getting that right. So I'm sorry. The the high level and the detail level.

High level, we're accountable, not dyd.

Dyd is certainly provides the contracts for the services in the facility.

But ultimately, the SEC and the DOJ and the POC and all OIG, they don't look to dyd to find out why a program did or did not happen.

They look to us well lately, but dyd so in the case of a dyd program, so not a probation or DMA for somebody else, but for a dyd specific.

Program dyd is accountable 'cause. They're supposed to manage that contract.

So if the program provider for DOA program doesn't show up, dyd should be saying hey this person reached the terms of their agreement and they didn't do XYZ or whatever, right?

So I don't see the dyd named anywhere in any bscc or DOJ inspection report.

It's us.

That's that to me. Drives home the point.

Or not faulting dyd anyway.

They're providing services.

That's great.

And that's appreciated.

We've also, for example, got credible messengers.

Somebody's got to hold them accountable. That's us.

We've got Sapsi who holds them accountable.

That's us mental health.

Well but, but I guess so.

This is kind of like why I am and I don't be stuck on it and I promise I will.

I won't go further, but part of the reason I'm asking this question in this context you because you have a tremendous amount of expertise. We're gonna be sapped when you retire.

I'm just and and also cause the budget people are here, right?

So like making sure that balance is right, because for each of those folks like if dmh is

managing somebody's contract, I really think dmh should be saying, hey, this person didn't show up, right?

That's their contract that they should be policing, and same trooper dyd, and for some of the other folks as well.

So I guess my I I'm hearing you say you think this is this is the right balance, but I guess I'm maybe this is for the budget folks like are we confident that that's right that for each of those things we're not duplicating some because.

DMA supposed to be managing whatever programs they have.

DUI DS supposed to be doing their part.

So each one of those roles, it shouldn't be that there's two departments doing the same function and making sure the contractor provider shows up.

It should be one department.

I'm not so sure. I care who it is as long as that's actually happened, right?

You're supposed to be here at 3:00.

We're here at 3:00.

We don't.

We don't have to answer that question.

We want we should not answer it twice, so it, I mean, are we confident that that's accurate in how the staffing for this is budgeted, I guess?

Yeah. Well, we all know these are 24/7 facilities.

I'm not saying there are vendor provider programs happening during sleeping hours.

Sure, sure.

But for the other hours of the day, it's better provided it's county partner provided it's Lau.

Whoever provided a Community College provided, and it's us provided, so we're providing therapies, for example, for kids. So group therapy, that sort of thing.

We need to be there to make sure so it's all of those sorts of things seven days a week, and that includes the things we don't always think about, like getting kids to school on time.

That's the one that's always crucial to get knocked for.

Getting cancelled appointments on time for medical care on site or getting them picked up by transportation onsite on time.

Getting kids again out for recreation on time and then they get the full portion of that recreation and those vendor provider services, some of which which we contract for some of which by the contracts for I don't see any duplication there.

Certainly every contract in the county is for services is supposed to have a program manager who oversees these sorts of things. All of our contracts have a name in them who is a program manager.

You can look it up.

But somebody has to be on site regularly.

You know what Bill's saying? Don't expect what you don't inspect. We inspect to make sure, and we make sure there's documentation. Because when DOJ or Bsc come in, they wanna see the documentation.

Prove to me this program occurred.

Prove to me what kid was in the room.

When it happened and proved to me it lasted the whole length that it was scheduled for.

Those are all things you've been cited for by Bsc and DOJ, and getting kids to medical appointment and getting kids to school on time. And why is the kid? Why is the school not on time?

Do probation. Deliver the kids late or did la go not have a teacher to accept the kids when probation brought the kids so that argument occurs, lateco and probation are supposed to keep tabs on each other in terms of education, showing up on time.

What does their record?

Say, and what does our record say every day?

Don't wait a month from now and find out what happened on the 3rd of the month, because by then everyone's forgotten.

So it's all these sorts of things that we're holding people accountable for whether provided or provided by us or a county partner.

Steven, you may follow up in writing to confirm that the alignment is appropriate. OK.

Thank you. OK.

I appreciate it.

Thank you very much. Thank you, Robert.

I have a question.

I'm sorry.

For this same piece, and I'll leave you.

Stevens line of questioning alone. I think we got deep into that.

So for the seven additional positions, I believe like way back when you all I believe first came to us, there was a number of positions that were decreased due to like the

3%.

I think curtailments aren't looking.

And then I think it was like 188 and then there was a question around like how many vacancies the department had and that number was like 1400 ISH.

Is there so this will be 7 positions in addition to the current vacancies that they have. That is correct.

Are there any vacancies within and it may not be 14 now, maybe less, whatever that may be in the current vacancies that could be reclassified to these positions as opposed to adding on top of those.

Already vacant positions.

And I know some of them are like like swarm positions and not necessarily like civilian. But are there any and has that like analysis or assessment been done?

The basic numbers you quoted, I don't know exact number from big positions, but certainly are there.

There's 1000 or more they can position. We are taking a huge hit in curtailments.

That's where the curtailments are coming from. From those vacancies, and I can give you a long lecture on the structural budget deficit and probation and the S&S areas. So we use salary savings to pay for S&S shortfalls that are caused by the increasing inflation rate on commodities we buy and our services we get from other departments.

We do not get increases year over year, year in our SNS to pay for that probation is not unique. And I said this to the board during the work budget hearings.

Probation is not unique in this.

There's other departments that are dependent upon the general fund that are little by little actually quickly losing their ability to purchase the products and services that we need, whether it's to keep the lights on or buy pencils and computers. We do not have enough SNS, so salary saving.

Based proportion of that. That's not the way budgeting is supposed to be done. If you read a textbook.

But that's the reality for a general fund department in the county.

We're the bottom feeders in terms of funding departments that bill.

Others are the top feeder, so to speak, and those that are funded by outside agencies such as Dpss and mental health. They get revenue, come to somebody else.

We don't as far as reclasting positions all the positions we're asking for here are all paid for with JJ Rvg fund.

Again, there's \$161 million as of July 1st coming up.

That will be available in Jdrbt and I think this year we're going to spend 25 or 30 million.

So that balance keeps growing.

This is specifically and only for JG, RBG for Sytf youth, whether they're kpatrick or Barry J.

So it's not funded with County General fund dollars.

We can reclass positions that functionally, of course we can do that, but those positions are necessary to provide the staffing needs for juvenile halls and field.

They're not vacant by choice.

They're vacant because we can't hire fast enough.

The attrition rate is exceeding that. So we want to build those eventually to provide for those staffing ratios.

So those deployed staff can go back to their other assignments.

So those positions are certainly needed, particularly in light of the curtailments that are coming up on the supplemental budget, which is, I don't know, the exact number, but it's hundreds of positions. Information got it. OK, thank you.

My question still stands though, is there? Has that been?

How's that asset I hear from the probation side?

I'm talking specifically CEO budget piece like has that been looked at?

It hasn't because these positions are revenue offset. OK, but it is something that we can look into to think about, OK.

Thank you.

The issue of NCC shortfall the budget deficit.

Again, not not unique to probation, I brought it up with the CEO budget briefing and I brought it up at the board brief.

Probably unpopular when I say it, but it's true.

It has been true for years and never been shy about saying.

And I said it to the pocia, their members are listing online as private people. But I said it to them as well.

Yeah, I appreciate that and I appreciate.

How your how it's being shared. I I just think as we're looking at department and I'm probably be the same way, even though the Sheriff's Department's not subject to curtailment, probably feel the same way, but.

If we're sitting on vacancies, there's a lot of different departments that have

vacancies and that are their vacancies are being taken through the curtailment practice and I think.

We should be thinking creatively about some of these departments and where we can offset for other things as well.

I mean, we haven't got there yet, but I'm looking at public defender.

I think it was like 32 deletions or positions. I think that's problematic.

I won't skip, but you know, as we're looking through like the budget and I know you all have a hard job of trying to figure out with this amount of money how we can make things happen and shifting.

But where there's opportunities where I hear, you know, there's vacancies in the desire to fill those positions. And I believe the last time we talked about vacancies and the ability to fill the positions, some of them have been sitting for like 2 plus years is not 3 plus.

Years. So it's like, how realistic are we going to be in?

In those positions at this point in time and at this juncture.

And and making determinations based off of all of that, another effort that we're making in consultation with the department is taking a look at those vacancies.

Taking a look at their SMS and just permanently right sizing, what we want to do it in a in a thoughtful man.

It can be done overnight, but as their structural deficit is something that we are actively analyzing, OK, thank you.

I think you have it.

Are there any other questions? I just want to echo what Natalie was saying.

Not all vacancies are the same.

It I think the probation.

I think probation has 1000 vacancies that have been vacant like over five years, right? Something crazy.

That or the average length of vacancy was like 3 years. This thing is a couple years.

It's a few years, right? And I think the PDI had asked for during the budget cluster.

I had asked for the average vacancy length of those vacancies and those are usually typically vacant like a year or less, right? So.

Not the same so.

So talents are gonna affect different departments different so.

Yeah, and it concerns me.

And and can I ask about the salary savings piece? Because we're told that not all

departments are able to use salary savings to offset?

Their challenges is there.

A.

A sort of guide or rule that we as board deputies should keep in mind when departments come to us and say, like, hey, CEO told me I can't use my salary savings wise. Southern deputy is there some sort of guide you can help us non budget people I think.

Me.

Speak to every department. We'd have to consider each department's circumstances individually, but if there's any within public safety that you'd like to discuss, you know, we can speak to them directly right now or follow up with the appropriate analyst managers.

I think they'll hold that question over for the next.

But yes, thank you. OK.

Thank you. If there's no more questions, I will hand it over to the Sheriff team.

Hey, good morning, Michael, Shane and patrol team for the.

So #1, this is a finance target.

And then #2, this is ongoing NCC reductions.

So this adjustment deletes the 9 mental health and Wellness positions that were provided during recommended budget.

And also to leads ongoing funding that was provided for La Rick's device licensing. Costs.

And then #3 this adds one time funding for just 17 buses and this is going to be 11 buses funded with one time NCC that was previously set aside in PFVIEW for DOJ consent Decree Compliance. And then the remaining six classes are funded using one time 80.

109 funding that was recommended.

For approval by the public safety.

I'm sorry. It's OK. Yes.

Do you have any questions on grocery desks?

Yeah, the Rick's removal.

Is this the same thing as the medical examiner, where you're gonna be using one time, or are we not paying now for the license fees for Rick's?

So no, go ahead, Mark. As of the budget as presented.

Now that deletes all of the funding that was previously added for Le Rick, so the

department does not have funding for Le Rick's as of this as of this case.

OK, you can move on with your next adjustment #4.

This reflects funding for phase three of a five year plan to for complete network infrastructure upgrades.

This is essential for DOJ clients and compliance with various settlement agreements.

#5 this is a 0 net county cost adjustment that reflects various contract changes.

Number six, this is also zero in that county.

Cost adjustment.

This reflects an additional 4 positions and a deletion of six positions to fund the positions for administrative oversight of consenting Creek compliance, and it also includes.

Various realignment of appropriation.

And then number 7 and #8 are target changes for measure.

Do you have any questions for Sharon?

The customer base 3 for the Custom network upgrade, which is this money from the PFU as well.

So go one time funding the 7.566 million is from the IT Infrastructure Fund and then the 241 ongoing is NCC.

OK.

So the Tech Infrastructure fund had been previously set aside for this or no.

I believe yes it was.

Any additional questions for chair?

OK.

I'll wait to hear it with 8109 morning depth.

Feast to hills out for AB19.

So for final exchanges, I want to remind that this is a special case because normally no AB1 online adjustment work considering binary changes. However, during the last year 2425 supplemental change, our office satisfied one time 23.4 million for PSRT 2 sub.

Recommendations in current fiscal year so Psrt des submitted in two phases.

Phase one for million would incorporate during the year the one process.

So our focus point is the phase two which leaving the remaining available budgets at 11.4 million.

So however psrt's, the mayor total of 16 recommendations among the total is 30.5 million, exceeding the available budget by 19.1 million.

So our office approach is on the second page of the document. If you can see on the top.

Because the limited funding availability we each of the 16 recommendation into four groups, so with Group One being the Nexus to AB 19 mandate of housing the N3 populations and Group 2 is legal mandate or statutory requirement and Group 3 is broad priorities so starting with.

Request #1 the 5.3 million is for share to replacing its six aging clusters.

So this is the Group One request and recommend for approval.

Request #2 is this 343,000 for the ICA trade, the Mental Health Service Unit to replacing its aging desktop and the laptops.

I mean desktop and the monitors.

So we're recommending to amend this suppress to 380,000 due to the limited funding availability.

So this is also a Group One request.

Request #2 is for 4.2 million for the PDS resentencing project.

This is the time limit program.

For the next two years, they will support the PD to finish the remaining 500 cases file received the previous three years after the end of the 2627. The program will sound set.

So this is also a group 2 request we are recommending to approve the last one on page is the request #4 the 625,000 for the Department of Mentoring and Military Mentoring.

Justice involvement Train Service Enhancement initiative.

So this is also a Group 3 request I2 above priorities.

So we are recommending to approve so on the next page request #5 is the 1,000,000 to extending the operating hours from 8 to 14 hours a day at the job King Center at the Crocker Harm Reduction health hub.

So this will allow the additional service provider to provide a service on site.

So this is also request.

We are recommending to approval then the remaining from 6 to 16.

We are not recomme.

Nding does become available in the supplemental budget.

We will reconsider this request as a property.

See if I can add.

Sure. There's \$19 million of requests that are unfunded due to the submissions

exceeding available funding levels.

We've informed Psrt that in supplemental changes, the next budget phase is going to be approximately \$4.5 million of new one time funding available.

We are going to begin discussions with Psrt actually this afternoon, potentially allocating funding to some of the programs that were not funded at this time. As part of this \$23 million set aside.

Good.

Sorry, is the expectation that Psrt will basically rerank their recommendations based on the fourish 4 point fiveish available? That kind of the idea they had previously they had.

Yeah. So Psrt did not prioritize their requests, but we'll be coming to them with various suggestions tiers in which they can repackage the unfunded requests for supplemental changes to.

Facilitate their funding.

But that even being said, there will still be unfunded requests that exceed the available funding level.

So the last page is just a reschedule of the order phase one phase two request.

So it's just a reference for next year.

So yeah, that concludes the AB 109. If you have any question I can answer.

Thank you.

I would clarify and question for the recommended approval ones. Or are these I'm? I'm hearing it's recommended by CEO to and not the PSA PSR chief.

Psrt recommended all 16 requests to CEO for funding consideration based on available funding levels.

We're only able to recommend approval to your board of five requests, OK?

And then for for URLs recommended approval for the five requests. How? How was that determined?

Well, again, going back to, we created four different groups in which we could categorize those requests.

Group One Nexus to M3 population.

Group 2 Nexus to legislative changes Group 3, Nexus to board motions.

Any additional questions for AB109 or public safety?

All right.

Thank you so much for your time.

Are there any other comments for this item or raise your hand?

OK. Melinda, what's your party time?

MK Milinda Kakani 1:38:33

My comment pertain specifically to the probation request for seven additional positions. I believe Mr. Smite said something about it's our house. We're responsible to make sure that things happen. Perhaps probation should prioritize holding probation accountable before they invest in additional positions to hold other folks accountable, especially as.

ST2 mentioned the fact that they have 1400 vacant positions.

Additionally, I just want to lift up the.

Report most recently where probation stated it would be developing 3 electronic systems. The Youth Activity Tracking System, the institutional programs and calendar application, and the Youth Services system.

So why don't you focus on launching those?

Perhaps that will support and making sure that what's supposed to happen actually happens, and these seven additional positions can go somewhere else while they're actually result in something that benefits the community.

Thank you.

PC Public Safety Cluster 1:39:29

You very much.

Next we have vet you go.

I'll start your time when you start speaking.

I Ivette (they/them) 1:39:34

Hi Ivetta Leigh for Lito here with lot of fence and a Commissioner on the psrt I want to take a moment to really raise the issue of opportunity costs every time there's a vacant position at the county or unspent dollars of any kind. That's an opportunity cost to.

Our communities and right now we are facing record levels of houselessness record levels of unemployment.

Our communities are suffering.

Bring and are being displaced and it really is astonishing when we look at the probation budget for AB109 of the five hundred, 515 million in AB109 funding that

probation received for salaries and wages, they're on track to only spend. 462,000,000 of the 88 million that probation received in block grant funds from the state.

They hadn't even spent 80 million of that.

In the last year, this is opportunity cost for our communities, for our young people. I recommend that the board sweep those dollars and invest them into Carefirst needs.

PC Public Safety Cluster 1:40:38

Thank you very much.

Aaron, I'll start your time when you start speaking.

Please send me to Karen.

KT karen they/she 1:40:49

Hi. This is Karen Garcia with the reimagine LA Coalition lafenza and a lifelong resident of SD2. I think it's reprehensible that probation is already costing us \$4 billion in abuse settlements to resolve 6800 claims of childhood abuse, and they're still asking for additional funding.

These there's so many positions that have gone unfilled for years within the probation department, and they're wasting millions that could fund community based services.

Thank you to SU-2 for asking the necessary questions.

The public defender's budget is getting cut, but probation is still requesting more funding when it's this department that's costing the county and really us as residents billions of dollars.

And regarding the shares budget, the CEO same thing has recommended conserving the 3000 vacant positions within their already inflated budget.

Meanwhile, sheriffs are colluding with ice as they kidnap our community members and helping brutalize angelino's, exercising their First Amendment rights.

We ask that you rescind at least 10% of funding for LASD vacant positions and allocate these funds for urgent care and defense needs, particularly for public defenders.

PC Public Safety Cluster 1:41:55

Thank you very much.

Next we'll have Lena.

It's very time we start speaking.

Hopefully your speakers working microphone's speaking, go ahead.

LM **Lena Mallett** 1:42:08

Thank you, Reno.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 1:42:08

Do you know?

LM **Lena Mallett** 1:42:09

Yeah. Leena Mallet with the Children's Defense Fund want to echo the comments made before me.

It's disgraceful that we're still seeing increases in the county's most significant liability departments, departments that gun down our community members while they're in mental health crisis who pepper spray peaceful protesters, children, elders and families with tear gas, flash bang grenades, and less than lethal ammunitions while exerc.

Their First Amendment rights.

To collaborate with and protect ICE agents who are really just tools of federal fascism.

Who are terrorizing our communities, departments who operate youth, caging facilities, and legal defiance of Allstate orders departments with officers convicted of bringing drugs into facilities resulting in overdoses.

Monthly of orchestrating youth beatdowns of committing heinous violence in all forms against children.

What more is required for real cultural shift and investment in care?

1st, we demand transparency over wasted county resources from Lasd's collusion with ICE.

We demand the reversal of LASD and PROBATION'S budget increases.

The restoration of the 3% cut to public defenders and safety net departments.

Reallocation of funds from 1400 vacant positions.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 1:43:19

OK.

Last thing we have Holland, Holland's or started time we started speaking.

HE **helen eigenberg** 1:43:24

Good morning.

It's Helen Eigenberg and I just want to echo what everyone has said in regards to probation.

Milli and Lena, they spoke about this stuff much more eloquently than I do. I just find it appalling with the crisis that is happening in our probation right now and you're coming to us to ask for more money.

For more oversight, you refer to our House.

This is our county.

These are our kids.

This has got to stop.

This is just nonsense and I just want to throw out to everybody.

I don't know if any of you have watched John Oliver's recent report.

On youth justice in the United States, we are in poor company. La County is mentioned in his amazing piece that he did last Sunday night and we are really in poor company with other states that we would normally look at and be ashamed to be aligned with them.

So let's take a look at ourselves.

We got to stop this.

Thank you.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 1:44:14

Thank you very much Baron.

You have one minute.

I'll start your time when you start speaking.

Please mute.

BC **Byron | TransLatin@ Coalition** 1:44:20

Good morning.

Good morning.

This is Byron Jose with the Transatina coalition here to ensure that we are following a Carefirst model and we're truly investing and making sure that our our priorities and

our budget reflect what the Community are asking for, specifically our youth. And we're not just continuing to build our.

Partial system specific Operation department. Thank you.

PC Public Safety Cluster 1:44:41

Alright, thank you very much.

Any other comments?

Any other move to the next item of items?

The Community Care and Justice Department 3 nights.

Yes.

2.

Good morning, deputies.

Quian king with the CEO of Community Care and justice unit, like the Public Safety Foster before us, we will be presenting the final changes recommendations for our 8 CCTA departments.

You'll notice in the packets today that you only see 5 departments.

That's because three departments routes, grand jury and independent Defense Counsel Office did not have any changes in space.

So we'll only.

5 departments that do have changes, we will follow the same protocol that the safety cluster did and we will not reach you on the finance targets.

As with public safety, we do not have any additional curtailments for our departments this phase, but you'll notice that two departments alternate public defender and public defender had placeholder curtailments in the recommended budget, so the scholars went out of those departments.

In recommended in April and we have since worked with the departments to put together revised curtailment plans and you'll see those plans in the document today. And so with that, we will start off with a list and alternate.

Good morning, everyone.

For alternate public defender, we have 3 adjustments.

Number one reflects a net county cost realignment to the services and supplies placeholder completed in recommended budget.

To now reflect the dilution of nine vacant positions.

Adjustment #2 reflects an adjustment to remove funding set to expire at the end of fiscal year 2425 for the guiding RE entry of Women program.

Adjustment #3 is a finance target.

Just real quick, just because this came up in the last discussion about the average length of time, the vacancies in the are open and like how that factored in. And then also the salary savings question like whether they've been allowed to use salary savings to offset some of.

The so for the average time of vacancies, we'll need to get back to you on that, Kyle. I'm working on the request, so we'll have it all put together for you all.

For salary savings, it's it's a risky approach and we have been advised to not take that at this time.

These the reason we needed to take these curtailments with workforce long term or, you know, semi permanent liabilities.

Salary savings is a good technique if it's like a temporary adjustment. For example, a temporary loss in revenue that we anticipate may come back in one year or two years.

Salary savings could support that, but for a long term approach it's best to not take that as very risky.

You know, we would hold vacancies open.

They could get filled, as you know.

There's also labor considerations, right?

And this new bill that is asking to report each year on vacancy, federal open and so we need to balance all those considerations.

When taking this into account so.

We were advised from our office that salary savings would not be available approach at this time for the liabilities that we are managing.

So thank you.

That was very helpful in understanding why.

What the salary savings thing is and why it's not favored.

But can you talk me through a little bit about what my understanding is with PD and APD in particular?

We have a constitutional legal obligation to pay for their services.

Is and right now we don't have a framework for offsetting those services.

Register my theories out there, but broadly speaking, we don't have time technique available to us to offset those services.

Full, constitutionally obligated to provide them. And if we don't? So like we cut our PD department, we cut our APD department totally like we took them away.

The county would still have an obligation of pay for the legal defense services and it would likely cost us more because it would be private practice lawyers picking up a contract with the county. Whatever that framework looks like.

So with the PD and APD, I feel like they're not similarly situated to some of the other departments that have maybe whatever.

Basically, we say if we are curtailing their.

We end up we the county, end up paying for that someone else down the line, either through increasing demand if Co, but if Co itself is a sort of limited framework and then if that's overwhelmed, we just end up looking for private employers to pick up that D.

Work.

So I in my head.

I'm lawyer, but I never actually had to budget for a law firm.

But like in my head, we gained something by having salaried lawyers do the work that we don't gain when we have hourly lawyers out there in the Community doing the exact same work.

So I guess I'm gonna understand probably what the population is there, because I'm concerned, especially as we know with our current DA with some of the changes we've seen in state law, we expect our demand for legal services and the technical. Difficulties of the legal work provided for those services to increase, right?

So how are we in addressing that when we're looking at these curtailments?

Because it's sort of to me, it feels like our demand for legal services is going up. Our demand for higher quality and sort of more.

Intensive for lack of a better word, Google Services is up like we just were talking about sentencing enhancements, right?

Those are a big deal in terms of like how a criminal case works. Are we figuring out how to offset that when we're looking at these curtailments?

Because I'm concerned that if we just, you know, we cut these positions, they still wouldn't even work.

Ed and HP can't do within the county. Just pays out of pocket somewhere else.

I mean, we can't be sure that that's somewhere else is cheaper for us.

Right. Absolutely. A couple of things.

So in recommended budget, you know in every budget phase when departments request positions, they will ask if for particularly for apartment we ask for no caseload information.

Like for paralegals, paralegal to attorney ratio or to case ratio, right to get the best picture we can see as of recommended. We did see some slight increases in caseload workload.

But a couple of challenges in being able to see the full picture in order to help us make these determinations.

So the first one is is currently public.

Defender is leading with ram their workload study.

It's in process right now.

We're waiting to see what is going to come out of this.

By August, maybe one month.

So the preliminary report is expected in July 2025 for the public defender. The final report will be expected in March 2026.

We are interested in seeing what's going to come out of that because that not that it's going to allow us to say, OK, green light, we're going to prove everything now, but it will help to inform us in our decision making.

APD is currently enhancing their CCMS to provide better reporting data as well.

And so we hope to see that in the next by the end of this calendar year.

Earnings next year to get better data to show us the full picture of what's happening.

So yes, we agree that we anticipate for a variety of reasons, Prop 36, the Da's policies, that things are going to increase. We don't have the full solid picture of data yet to show that to us.

We've seen minimal increases as of recommended, but we don't have the full picture. Sure. Yeah.

And so we hope that that's coming and that will help inform these decisions for the curtailments.

Unfortunately, we there's a lot of considerations that go into cutting the vacancies, right?

Not only did we consider the impact to their attorneys, but they have available, but then also to their services and supplies, right. And their rent expenses.

They need space.

They need to provide space to attorneys near courthouses.

We don't want to cut those.

They need adequate services as price supplies.

Appropriation and budget for their ISAF services to support their infrastructure, their CCMS so they can continue their operations. So weighing all of those things led us to

the curtailment scenario that we came to now.

And see, even if I could add, I think your your comments are spot on, right?

Pd and echo all operate, you know together as a cohesive unit system for the county. To the extent that PD attorneys aren't able to accept cases.

I'm not saying that's the case today.

Then those will go to APD and to the extent that APD couldn't then be port would assign.

And so either way, the the work needs to get done and I think for all departments. Curtailments are challenging.

For departments like these, where it's a constitutional mandate, but the level of service is not necessarily known or mandated, it is even more challenging. And I think for for CEO, I think the task going forward with this budget phase and the next because more curtailments will be IMP.

In supplemental changes, it's going to be.

Incumbent on us to continue to continue to monitor.

Sure, the workload and the actual impact to operations for both alternate public defender and public defender as we move forward.

That's all very fair.

I mean I I guess I'll just, I'll just flag that when we have when we the county have experienced significant challenges in our public defenders office and framework, we have ended up on the hook for some massive liabilities.

We don't wanna be in that position.

We also don't want to be in the position of paying more for legal services in the normal course of things that we have to.

And then I recognize, like there's a huge benefit from having the workforce studies and the improved CCM data and stuff. I mean, there's no doubt that's super helpful. But also would not.

If, like next year, we passed our mark and we're letting things slip and then we find out we can't easily go back and we will have spent a whole bunch of money we didn't have to spend.

So I it's a, it makes me nervous.

Because I'm I know enough about legal billing to know that like it could get very expensive for us very quickly and we're still on a look for it.

I don't have a way out of that, whereas I think for some other folks.

They seem to have to be able to move all puzzle pieces around a little more clearly in

a way that I'm not so sure makes sense for somebody like public finance outfit public defender.

And it it needs to set, it needs to be heard.

So I appreciate the conversation and I won't.

I won't repeat it during the public defender piece.

How about that?

And what are the? What are the APB 9 positions?

But they are 6 vacant admin positions.

Would you like the detail of the sets your admin or not?

Attorneys, admin and it.

Yes. And then there are three line staff positions, one investigator, two and two DAP D2.

Any other questions, if not all of answer, qz.

OK.

PD has four adjustments.

Adjustment #1 reflects the net county cost realignment to the services and supplies placeholder completed and recommended budget to now reflect the deletion of 32 vacant positions.

Adjustment #2 reflects one time revenue adjustments to add 12 new positions and cost of living adjustments for three existing positions fully offset by revenue or intra fund transfer.

And to delete 12 positions due to the expiration.

Of measure H funding, resulting in a net zero position change.

Adjustment #3 reflects ongoing revenue adjustments to add 15 new positions and a cost of living adjustment for one existing position fully offset by revenue or intr fund transfer.

And adjustment #4 is a finance target.

Are any of these new positions like you have to social workers or DPD force for the previous board motion?

They are not DPD fours, but there are 11 DPD threes and eight psychiatric social workers.

Which one is that? I'm going to? Revenue source.

Are they both?

I'm sorry, sorry.

The 8 psych social workers I'm trying to is it.

Lawyer. Lawyer. OK.

That's what you're asking for, is it?

Is it under #2 or #3?

Yes. Is it two or three, OK.

So they're broken up.

Yeah. So let me just double check something real quick.

Yeah. OK. So.

Two of them.

Are from JJ Rvg under one time.

An additional three are funded by AB 109.

And.

60 No, I'm sorry 3.

Are from JJC P a ongoing?

What is the breakdown of the 32 payments?

Those are all DPD.

Two vacant DPD.

Two questions, all 32, and you're gonna get back to us with the average time.

We'll do that for both PD and APT.

I'm sorry. Do you have a question about it?

32 positions that would be needed.

Maybe this might need more for the PDS 'cause. I know they were.

Usually they save his positions for like park clerks or something like that, but I was just wondering what's the impact of the deletion of those 32 positions will be on.

Thank you. Goodbye bye.

Yeah, that is the impact.

It's to their pipeline programs for law clerks. These are the positions that they will vacant for that pipeline program.

So does that mean that they will no longer be able to have that it is significantly minimized as a result?

No 'cause, they normally hold 50, OK.

This is 32 of them.

So then kind of goes back to Stephen's question about like future cost and then it was high. I as a law student was trying to be an for the public defenders office and wanted to stay on and but they weren't offering any positions at that time, so.

When I heard that they're doing that now, that's great because a lot of people asking

me what's going into the profession without having to worry about how to pay their bills, whether we're waiting to pass the bar so.

Correct. No, we completely understand how detrimental this is.

You know, PD and APD are heavily MCC funded departments.

So the percentage of NCC that needs to be pro tailed is high.

And so that's why we had to, you know, really dip into these type of areas to make the cuts without again weighing, you know, the impact of other areas and not wanting to cut other things as well.

But there's fifty, so now there's gonna be 32 calendars.

There's a 218.

Thank you.

No other questions on public defenders on alternatives.

It looks like you're just seeing something.

Say she walked up like when Robert stood up. I'm pretty sure.

I just wanted to provide.

Thank you deputies for inviting me up.

I just wanted to provide some programmatic clarity since those are the questions you all seem to have about the curtailment impacts.

Well, number one, I wanted to say as to the new positions we're getting, these are all out of non NCC funding.

So they're all programmatically specific. Most of the social worker positions are for our Youth Services division or juvenile division.

The work is specific as to the kids, and that is through the two walk ranges and we're getting the acronyms.

There is AB109 funding for social workers as well.

That's also very programmatically specific as to our post conviction work.

So none of the social workers will actually.

Be dealing with the adult programs.

We didn't get any funding.

We haven't gotten any funding for the adult programs impacting jail closure and.

As to the curtailments Elisa's, correct.

This this rounds curtailments are impacting our DP2 positions. Those are really our only vacancies and just so you know, you asked the question about.

Length that they are vacant.

These are specifically programmatically designed to support our pipeline program

for new lawyers.

So we can bring in law clerks second year law clerks senior.

So the minute they pass the bar.

They can be sworn in and they are ready to represent clients on day one of being DP1.

We anticipate that as of December 1st with the curtailments we're getting, we won't have vacancies to hire new lawyers with about 60 lawyers at trading each year.

We will very quickly be unable to backfill our positions.

In addition to that, occasionally when we don't bring in as many senior law clerks or they don't all pass the bar and we have vacancies, we sit our 120 day contract attorneys who are recently retired public defenders on those vacant items so that we can backfill SH.

Term attrition in our branches.

In other words, if somebody is out on long term leave with their cases and their clients.

Need service.

We'll have an experienced lawyer who's available.

To help with that, those contracts expire June 30th and where we are right now is in the untenable position of figuring out whether we're going to maintain our operations in the branches or whether we're going to have people just even a scant few to hire come December, so.

That's how curtailments are hitting the public defender's office.

Happy to answer any questions.

I just wanna bring up.

I don't even sure you guys are, but the cfc budget that was presented to us for the reallocation of the one time funds when it was presented to us in cluster, it included money for GPD, for any psychiatric social workers to go to the public defender's office.

That has since been removed.

But the board letter that's going to the board next week Tuesday, Tuesday, yeah, is no longer has that money for the public Purpose Office and.

I'm personally very upset about that, but I don't know if I saw that.

Thank you for bringing that up. That was a that was a an unpleasant surprise.

Obviously I'll say one last thing about the salary savings, Steven, since you asked about that.

Our salary savings are are actually pretty.

Dependable because they are part of this pipeline program.

So because we under bill, those DPD 2 vacancies with law clerks for a period of time with DPD ones for the for the first year.

That they're actually sworn in and representing clients on cases, we always have very reliable salary savings year after year.

We have a history of that and so we had submitted that to CEO as a potential for the curtailment exercise because we understand the county is in dire straits vegetarily, particularly with NCC, we just think we can do our part with salary savings without having to impact Oper.

I did want to also mention that the IT is not as linear when public defender is at capacity to handle cases. APD does not pick up those cases.

They are a conflict agency specifically, so they don't pick up cases where Pd's don't have capacity to take them. Those all go to Idco and Inco.

You know, has a very they they are much smaller.

Organization in terms of being able to take on the number of cases that would have to be taken on if public defender stops being able to hire in December of 2025.

Do you have any questions?

I will turn it over to my colleague Vincent Emerson for Cscn.

Thank you, Lisa. For 2526, final changes, the CfcI budget, one adjustment that impacts several programs with the adjustment itself is a net zero impact and that's because the funding is already budgeted in the CFCI budget for the festival is just reallocating funding within the C.

Budget.

Adjustment for final changes to community safety implementation team program recommendations.

The adjustment reflects net zero impacts the cfcI year one spending plan closed.

Men's Central Jail project funding, including a reduction to ODR SP3P4 gel and population vets program from 28.9 million to 20.6 million to align the.

Program's budget, with the anticipated spending needs in fiscal year 25.6.

5 million for Dphs Community treatment program.

Ram 4.5 MP Jay got specialized treatment for optimized programming interim housing program 4.8 million for jaycots interim housing beds and 2.4 million for odors.

Fraternal health program.

The adjustment also reflects 1.6 million in new ongoing funding for the public defender's division. Court staffing for six new position to support the other population efforts.

The new position will augment and serve a similar purpose as the PD positions that were approved.

Under the P3T4G other population plan and they will support and facilitate the expansion of Odr in two additional courthouses as the Airport Branch, courthouse and the Criminal Justice Center Courthouse to refer PD clients to secure mental health facilities that previously mentioned the funding for.

The cease and programs and physicians has already budgeted in the CFT collected, so there's a net zero impact.

To the overall CF budget.

Questions.

There are no questions.

I will turn it over to my colleague David Beas for any. We're all just running out of steam.

I didn't public defender part really.

Yeah, I should have done my life.

I'm in a whole other place. I'm sorry.

No question, but I'll send over my colleague David Gia's birthday kind of committee.

Good morning everyone.

I'll go ahead and get started with Department of Development.

They only have one change and it was a finance target for salary and employee benefits.

And then I'll move on to the Justice Care and Opportunities department.

They have three changes.

The first change is a finance target for salaries, employee benefits.

The second change reflects an adjustment to intra fund transfers to property line with the fiscal year 2526 funding levels.

This adjustment property lines properly aligns the CFCI administrator budget, the adopted budget.

Adjustment #3 reflects a board approved position reclassification for 35 positions from the health program analyst classifications to the justice program classifications.

This is a lateral note, no cost to reclass.

And that concludes Gyd and J cog. Any questions?

And that is it for ccjang. We will follow up with the vacancy by aging data for APD and PD, and we'll send it out to Dougherty and report it to the committee and the board letter for final changes.

Budget is before the board on Monday morning.

It's a special meeting Monday morning at 9:30 for final changes. Thank you.

Thank you.

Thank you. Board approved. Are there any public comments for this item?

Anything that. Oh, I'm sorry.

Yay, you want to speak.

Every time we use.

I **Ivette (they/them)** 2:11:45

Hello everyone.

Hello everyone.

Eva aliferlido here.

I just want to take a moment to speak to the importance of public defense in this moment.

Our county is under ice occupation.

We need more public defenders and social workers, not fewer, especially when our public defense infrastructure has been underfunded year after year, despite saving LA county taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars through resentencing and social work programs.

Understanding that the vast majority of migrant people facing deportation.

In Los Angeles are funneled through our criminal legal system.

We know that strong public defense infrastructure at the local level will help guard against family separation and the denial of due process down the line. So I request that you reverse any cuts to the public defenders, alternate public defenders offices and supplement with vacant positions in LASD and.

Probation, even at modest 10% cut of Las DS3000.

Vacant positions will free up over \$50 million that can be used to support.

Limit other departments that are on the front lines, defending our communities and providing services. Thank you.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 2:12:54

Thank you.

Thank you very much.

Next, Byron, I'll start your time and start speaking.

BC Byron | TransLatin@ Coalition 2:13:00

Byron Jose with the translator coalition and Reimagine LA we do know the cost of cutting dispositions and having public defenders or APD representation for our county residents.

We can see that through the Men's center trail, even if we change the culture team and their name, we can see it in the liability payouts, right?

That we continue to receive due to the state sanctioned violence that.

Our community continue to face at the hands of the sheriff.

So we don't need to speculate what that cost will be.

So how do we continue to to reframe and to actually push forward a budget and properly fund our care for our communities?

Thank you.

PC Public Safety Cluster 2:13:43

You very much Megan.

I'll start your time and start speaking.

Please send me Megan.

Megan emu.

All right. We'll move on to Karen.

Eric, I'll start your time.

You start speaking, please unmute. Go ahead.

KT karen they/she 2:14:01

Hi, this is Karen member of Reimagine LA and Lafenza and lifelong resident of SD2, our public defender and alternate public defender. Offices remain underfunded year after year despite saving the county and state hundreds of millions of dollars through resentencing and social programs in a county under ice.

Occupation. Currently we need public defenders and social workers, not fewer.

Understanding that the vast majority of migrant people facing deportation in LA are funneled through our criminal legal.

System. We know that strong public defense infrastructure at the local level will help guard against family separation in the denial of due process down the line.

So we ask that we that you reverse cuts to the pdap and safety net services by offsetting with withheld LASD funds and vacant probation line items.

PC Public Safety Cluster 2:14:51

Thank you very much, Megan.

Can you meet yourself or start your time when you start speaking, Megan?

M Megan 2:14:58

Hi, my name is Megan.

I'm with the reimagined LA Coalition and La Defensa, and I strongly urge you all to consider resourcing and supporting the public defenders and alternate public defenders offices. They remain under funded year after year, despite saving the county and state hundreds of millions of dollars through resentencing and social. Work programs and in any county under ICE occupation, we need more public defenders and social workers, not fewer.

So I just strongly again urge you.

All to reverse cuts to the PD, the APD and restore the safety net services by offsetting with withheld LASD funds and vacant position line items.

Thank you.

PC Public Safety Cluster 2:15:39

Thank you very much.

Any other public comments?

All right, seeing none, we conclude this item 4B. Next we have 4.

C.

4C approval incidental non expenses for this year, 25.6 and 26.7.

Morning again.

Talk about budget if you like.

I'm here about the incidental and non incidental letter that does come before your board, and I'll explain what those are.

We come before you every two years asking for a two year renewal on this.

So that's why we're here again.

Install expenses are expenses for food, beverages and sundry items, and I'll define that in a second for a county business, events directed towards functions for employees, non incidental expenses are very similar.

It's food, beverages, and sundry items for non employees.

So that could be, for example, for community based organizations for parents or for youth at events, that sort of thing.

And I'll give you a few examples, examples of incidental expenses probation week where we celebrate the probation week. I think that's the third week in July coming up here soon. Various staff recognitions, such as Training Academy graduations.

By the way, we do not use this for example for birthdays and things like that.

Christmas celebrations, that sort of stuff. It has to be at business purpose.

Some managers meetings and that includes not only probation managers, but.

County partners as well.

So when we meet with health or mental health or something and you don't want people to leave but you wanna continue the conversation, then you can provide your coffee and bagel and your pastries or whatever it is for folks in these meetings.

Noninstal expenses are for again community for youth, for parents and so on.

Examples of that are tomorrow Juneteenth recognition.

Today there are two community resource meetings going on.

I think one's a sentinela and one. Excuse me. One's in Van Nuys.

Graduations. There's one June 26th at Mary J, so I hope you all can go to that for kids graduating.

Good for them drum core performances.

I went to one a couple months ago at Barry J. It was great and various living unit recognitions and sometimes for special events for kids such as Super Bowl or World Series where they don't eat the kitchen food, they want something more aligned with the sports events. So.

Maybe they get hot dogs and nachos and things like that.

So non incidental, non ex incidental employees.

Why do we call out something called sundry?

Items sundry items like I think I made-up the phrase actually a couple years ago.

That is for plates, cups, napkins, tablecloths, things like that.

The reason we specifically call it out in here is because the CEO asked us to if it wasn't in prior letters, although it said Sunray didn't define. Why? Because the enabling board policy and county fiscal manual do not specifically call out the ability to provide those sorts of.

Things, but it makes sense because you can't eat the food without a bowl or a plate.

Or you can't drink the beverages without a cup.

So we specifically said it here to ensure the board is aware that that is something else.

We'll be spending things on.

Then how much is this going to cost already?

The board policy provides for all departments for instant expense funding, the amount of that is depending on the size of the department. There's three different tiers of sizes, probation being the large department.

So probation gets \$57,000 per year for this. What we're asking for is additional 50,000. So that would be \$107,000.

Per year and for the non incidental it's 200,000.

Again, this pays for those sorts of events.

We don't spend it all.

It goes back to the general fund.

And next year you get a new budget. Same thing.

So someone will be back here in two years to provide this sort of presentation two years from now.

How does this actually work?

Practically, we have a form that you fill out.

So one page form that has to be signed, one of those signatures is me and I think the chief deputy signs and the chief signs for pre approval.

Of each of these incidents, so camps and halls are the primary users of these funds, and they submit events in advance, for example, or Juneteenth tomorrow, to provide for some sort of celebration of the Juneteenth event, or for graduations or those sorts of things.

What am I looking for when I review these for pre approval?

What are you buying?

How much are you buying and does it make sense?

What doesn't make sense?

Do not buy gifts.

Do not buy gift cards.

Do not. Do not buy prizes.

You can't buy trophies for that.

That has to go purchase order at the plan. Advance what is the cost per kid cost per participant. So if expect to have 30 people there and the cost is \$30, we'll give it to dollar a person.

That makes sense if you can have 30 people there and it's \$3000, that's \$100 a person that does not make sense.

So we're looking for the reason list of what they're buying and what it is they're buying to support the event that's coming up.

Again, I hope you all can make the graduation next week, June 26th at Barry JA. Great event.

Lots of parents, lots of kids.

I think it's one of the largest graduations we ever had. What I heard is 55 kids, so that'll be great.

I think it's at 1:00 in the afternoon, but if you want to know, let me know and I'll get you the information. Other than that, that's it for me.

I'm happy to take any questions you might have about this or about budget issues.

There are no questions.

We'll move to public comment.

Are there any public comment on this item?

OK, seeing that we moved to general public comments. Are there any general public comments?

Good. Seeing none, we adjourn this meeting. Thank you very much.

Thank you.

□ **Dardy Chen** stopped transcription