

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

Transcript

November 19, 2025

□

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 8:02

All right.

Morning everyone.

Welcome to the November night 19th public season.

You mean following the meeting order and the first thing to do is our self introductions from the board offices first District morning.

My name's Tammy McLean.

I'm the senior budget deputy for Supervisor Solis in place for Annabelle Martinez.

Thank you very much.

2nd district.

Good morning, everyone. There's a lot of us here.

Supervisor Mitchell, senior justice deputy Natalia Romo.

I have Melody O'philly, who's our assistant justice deputy, and then online we have Jonathan Yang, who's our legal affairs senior deputy.

Thank you very much.

Good morning, everyone.

Stephen ever seen Justice deputy Supervisor Robach and with James my colleague Nicoleville. Good morning.

Thank you very much for this opportunity.

Good morning.

I'm Kyla Ali here in person with us and then Chloe is online. OK, thank you.

And before I go to the chair, I want to recognize that this is her, possibly her last. Person it will be.

She'll be gone next week.

She's like the first district of December, but thank you very much.

It's been a wonderful year working with you.

All right. So we'll move on straight to the agenda. The first item is the information

items.

There are no informational items this week and next we go to port motions.

I want to let everyone know this meeting today is transcribed.

First one is from the third district performing the county's commitment to transparency in media selection.

Good morning, everyone.

This motion.

Today we're presenting a motion about improving transparency around settlement agreements between the county and department executives.

The motion presented asks for reports back from the Austin County Council, the Executive Office and the auditor controller, so you can understand the process for entering into and reporting these types of settlements with county leaders.

Recently, as many of you know, the County Executive into a settlement agreement with with an executive for about \$2,000,000.

And it triggered some reports that captured some previous settlements with high level county leaders.

So we think these settlements highlight an opportunity to improve the county's processes and transparency around them.

Hope you join me in supporting the motion.

Happy day.

Take any questions.

Thank you. Questions.

OK.

I have one, OK.

Good. I know this is probably already just shared specific to.

Or was brought to light regarding the more, more recent settlement.

Are there any additional ones from my executive that we're unaware of in the past?

So I I only am aware of the ones that were included in media reports.

So there were some indicating that previous exec, Chief Executive Officer and some.

That included previous executives and County Council. I'm not aware, though, of the details of any others.

I can't rule out though.

Steph Online, are there any staff online that have questions?

Please speak up or raise your hand on teams.

No.

Regional public comment on this one, yes.

Are there any public comments for this item in person or online?

You speak up for laser hand.

OK.

Thank you, chair Garvey.

Yes, our legal affairs deputy has a question, but he said he came here on, oh, sure, checked earlier.

Folks online.

Can someone on mute?

Make sure if you can hear me.

Anna, are you in mute?

 **Cheney-Rice, Chloe** 11:49

We can.

We can hear you dirty. This is Chloe.

 **Public Safety Cluster** 11:52

OK.

Thank you for the question.

 **+12*****91** 11:57

Hello.

 **Public Safety Cluster** 11:58

Well, yes.

 **+12*****91** 11:59

Oh, hi.

Sorry, sorry about that.

Hi my name is.

This is for for the first item, right?

 **Public Safety Cluster** 12:05

Yes, SD3's motion.

Only the 1st motion.

 **+12*****91** 12:08

Yeah. Hi.

 **Public Safety Cluster** 12:11

Wait, this is only for the.

 **+12*****91** 12:11

Only the 1st question OK.

I'm sorry I'm a little since I can't see it.

 **Public Safety Cluster** 12:15

Move to out.

 **+12*****91** 12:17

I'm only in the in the first semester, OK.

So yeah, SP3 OK.

Great. Sorry about that, one second.

 **Public Safety Cluster** 12:23

Hold on one second.

What? On one second, I'm gonna have Jonathan or Debbie go first, and then we'll go to public comment. Sorry about that.

 **+12*****91** 12:26

So hi my go ahead.


OK.

 **Public Safety Cluster** 12:35

Jonathan, thank you.

 **Yang, Jonathan** 12:36

Hey sorry guys, I was having audio issues so I didn't realize you all had started.

 **+12*****91** 12:36
No, you're good.

 **Yang, Jonathan** 12:41
Just clarifying.

I apologize if I mean I missed Steven, if you did a whole brief presentation on it, so you may have answered this.

With the statutory definition of county executives, I'm just curious, like how far down does that go?

Obviously it's department heads, but like, what's the universe?

Just ballpark because it's a pretty broad specially that C category.

So, like science department heads, Health and chief and I guess one level down, chief deputy is how far down does it go?

 **Public Safety Cluster** 13:07

So yeah, that's that's a good question, Jonathan.

Thank you for that.

My understanding is that it doesn't go down very low at all.

I think it's chief deputy is in maybe one more level. So it's it's pretty narrow, but I think County Council could certainly give us give the board more information about that as they do the report backs.

 **Yang, Jonathan** 13:25

OK. And then the other one was on sequencing.

Just understand between 2:00 and 3:00. So 2, right?

We're gonna get the language.

We're gonna get the draft language in 60 days, but three, we already are telling Coco to start putting in settlement agreements that we're gonna be disclosing it publicly, but we won't know.

We won't get the board, may not yet have seen the language.

By which that disclosure would take place. I I mean, you know, it's only for like the 60 maybe?

A bit longer day window so well, there are probably settlement agreements that fall in this definition that may happen, but do you do you see what I'm saying?

Like we're telling them in three, starting from the day this passes, you gotta put it in the agreement that it's gonna be disclosed publicly.

But we, as the board won't get no, because Coco won't have returned the draft language yet.

How that's gonna be disclosed?

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 14:22

So I'm open to clarifying that, but I don't think that's how it will work.

That's why we included the pursuant to the language identified in two.

So I think we were thinking that three would follow to kind of like your contemplating the question, if that's not sufficient, let me know and I'll think if there's an easy tweak we can make to it, I'm I'm OK with clarifying that.

YJ **Yang, Jonathan** 14:33

OK.

OK.

OK.

No, I just want to understand the the the intent, but I see that like I OK I can.

I see that all right.

Alright, that was it for me. Thanks.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 14:53

Thank you, Helen.

Are you with the board office, Helen?

I heard. No, no. OK, we're coming.

All right. So we're gonna move to close to public com, OK.

HE **helen eigenberg** 15:00

Here I'm here.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 15:04

We're actually a person in the head.

We the first person that was that raised your hand earlier.

HE **helen eigenberg** 15:11

No, I was not.

That was someone else.

PC Public Safety Cluster 15:13

OK.

So we're going to go with 0891, the telephone number 0891, and now you have one minute. Once you start speaking.

0891, you're muted, so go ahead.

+12***91** 15:25

OK. Hi. Hi. My name is Jessica Martinez.

PC Public Safety Cluster 15:26

Bye.

+12***91** 15:28

I'm with Kofi.

I'm one of the Co chairs of immigrants, our Los Angeles Coalition's.

I'm here representing the coalition.

We're in support of the ordin.

PC Public Safety Cluster 15:38

Oh, this is the wrong.

+12***91** 15:38

We're in support of the motion. Oh, OK.

PC Public Safety Cluster 15:40

I'm sorry that is OK. So.

+12***91** 15:43

OK.

It's the wrong item, so it's not a seat.

I'm sorry.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 15:47

I am all right. Helen, are you talking about?

+12***91** 15:47

I apologize for that.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 15:51

Are you here to comment on the 1st motion from SD3?

HE **helen eigenberg** 15:53

I am.

+12***91** 15:53

Yeah, ST3.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 15:56

OK.

Go ahead, Ellen.

HE **helen eigenberg** 15:59

Hi, this is Helen eigenberg.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 16:00

What?

HE **helen eigenberg** 16:01

I'm a constituent in Saint 3 and I'm calling in support of this motion.

I have to say it was really jumping to read about this lawsuit and the payout with tax dollars in the LA Times. We need to know about these things and I don't know the legalities of when it can be, but I really support this motion and I appreci.

Supervisor Horvath and her team putting this forward. Thank you.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 16:21

Thank you very much.

Are there any other public comments from this specific item?

Casey, nonprofit chair and we'll move on to the next next motion.

Move forward, ready for the next the next motion from SP4 is establishing Career Center program at the Century Regional Detention Center.

Thanks colleagues.

So this motion today asks the Department of Economic Opportunity, also known department, to establish a Career Center program at CRDF or the Century Regional detention facility.

I also want to note we are going to be adding JCOD as a collaborator after cluster and then for some background in 2019 the board passed a motion that established A2 year pilot program at CRDF and at the time DEO, which was known as the DEP. Of workforce development, aging community services was the lead on that pilot after the pilot ended, there was an evaluation done and there was lesson learned on how to improve the program. And shortly after the public safety realignment team or the KSR team recommended funding.

For deo.

In them, out of \$608,000, a one time startup funding and 1.2 million ongoing funding specifically for establishing a Career Center at CRDF.

This recommendation was adopted by the board and allocated in fiscal year 2324.

However, since allocated DEO has not claimed the ongoing funding or there has not been an established Career Center program at CRDF, so this motion is asking DEO and LESD to work together with.

Jacod also to get the Career Center programs back for the incarcerated individuals at CRDF report back in writing in 60 days on the progress of implementing these services and again in one year with updates and outcomes.

It also asked for the departments to work with a gender Responsive Advisory Committee or the to come up with some key performance indicators on what success looks like for these programs.

And then it asks for the program to be evaluated in two years, with feedback from various stakeholders to see how the program can be improved.

Both lest and on the motion. And then Melissa Kelly is here from Lesd and Kate Mccanty is here from DEO to answer any questions. And then Adam's here from J. Co.

Le.

Questions. I have questions.

Do you know why Geo didn't launch the program a couple years ago?

I don't know if Kate will now if you guys want to come, maybe up here.

Mackenzie, from DEOI, joined the team in January, so I wasn't around during the first portion of the pilot.

I do think a lot of we spent a lot of time in over the past three months kind of looking at what the challenges were with the previous pilot.

There were a couple of studies done, so we've taken some time to work with the Sheriff's Department to come up with a new program plan.

That we we believe will have better results.

So that's been kind of part of the reason for.

The delay in in getting the program off the ground again, but we do have an agreed upon plan now to serve the goals to serve about 100 women.

We some of the changes we're making are to focus on women we know will have a release date within 90 days and to provide more intensive case management and job readiness supports while they're still incarcerated and focus on having a strong.

You know, hand off into the community.

Eat you are are provided that will have in the community who will continue to work with the women and connect them to job training and employment services.

You know, we'll be the lead in incentives for the women to continue to receive services once they're released from from custody. And my name's Melissa Kelly.

I'm with the Sheriff's Department and I can provide a little bit more context on some of the delays. The board motions that help establish the Career Center at CRDF or prior to COVID.

But we actually launched during COVID and there's been some significant demographic shifts as well as changes in the infrastructure of what's available in the community, including J COD, which we're.

We're excited actually.

That would be an identified partner moving forward to provide more holistic and wrap around services.

So there just happens some structural delays with just changes in terms of the infrastructure as well as when we started lead acts was a completely different department and in the new department as well. And my unit also came online during that time.

So this Career Center has bounced around, but I can tell you first hand from speaking with the women helping implement it.

And everyone at CRDF that they have looked forward for this program coming back. And we've had a lot of success in terms of people that have gone through not coming back into the system and recidivating and the handful that have come back through, they have noted that there were.

Great opportunities. When they did leave the program in terms of being successful. And so we're excited that we're able to move the program forward in a more permanent structure versus being a pilot program.

You know, 8109 dollars are very precious dollars, in fact, of every dollar that the county has precious dollars.

So it's always a little bit concerning when we see that there's been under expenditures or the program isn't moving, even the board is already approved it. But so it's \$1.2 million of ongoing AB109 funding and that is your budget annually, right you.

Within that budget, right?

Yeah, for DEO.

So for the last couple years for school years, that means there's been an underexpenenture.

So there's been surplus.

Where is that surplus going to go?

Is it going to this program?

So it's actually the way ABA 109 funding works is that it's not really necessarily a surplus. It's just kind of like stays there and if it's being claimed, then it's claimed. But if it's not, then it just stays at the 1.2. So there hasn.

Been like an additional surplus, if that makes sense.

OK.

There's not more than 1.2 in allocation.

It probably goes back to the one time 81 goes into the one time pod and it's not like thank you.

And just to add, we do have a plan. We're gonna be doing a competitive procurement for a provider to operate the program.

So we will be.

We're gonna scope of work.

We're gonna, you know, hopefully have that out the door in the next couple of months and the goal is to have a new provider in place before the end of this fiscal year.

Thank you.

It's more about the program and maybe the operational side of it, not necessarily the motion.

I don't know if you know where you all can help.

Criteria for women who are incarcerated to be a part of the program.

I've heard in the past about programming in our jails and how there's some inefficient. We've seen it in the Oigs report.

About who has access to those programs, who's chosen to be a part of those programs?

So we can share a little bit about how women incarcerated women would be, you know, I know it's a select spot.

So like how they would be chosen, what that would look like and how that's a part of this program.

Or anything.

I can start.

So as far as our our plan for the program, we we did wanna focus on women who we knew were going to be released within the next 90 days because we think it's the most critical critical for them to get the support right and to prepare for the.

Release. So we wanna work with the Sheriff's Department to identify those women and and we wanna also make sure that services to women who may have mental health needs as well.

So making sure we're coordinating with LSD and DMH.

But we're still working out kind of.

You know, we're we're not trying to create restrictive eligibility criteria.

We wanna make it to make it open to as many women in jail as possible, and those were the selection criteria in the previous pilot was just looking at people that were being released within 90 days and making sure that they were being prepared and when we would.

Look for eligibility and selection.

We would actually just pull a list of every single person that was in the jail.

And filter.

When they had a release date and there actually wasn't enough women that, that qualified that had sent in states that we knew when they were actually going to be leaving.

And so all of the people that were eligible purely based off of their release date, we

would go and recruit them and ask if they wanted to participate because programming is voluntary. We can't mandate anyone to participate in programs. And then just to make sure that we were.

Being judicious with our county resources when they were open spaces, which there were because we didn't actually have people during that time and again we were piloting at the height of COVID. So there were a lot of releases, the population was a lot smaller at the time about.

40% smaller than it is right now.

We would add people in that did, however, about half the people that went through the Career Center ended up going to prison and people that were serving long periods of time.

So that's one of the things that.

We really wanna focus on people that are going to be released so that we know that the funds are being utilized in a way that is most judicious in terms of who's able to participate and if we have more people than are able to fit in a Co.

We can definitely put a waiting list together, but we have not.

We didn't experience that during the pilot, so that's something that as we move forward, we'll have to look and see how large the waiting list may be or if there's not a waiting list and plugging people in, that may not be within that eligibility, but making sure.

That the cohorts are full. OK.

That's helpful.

Thank you so much.

Mm-hmm. I just wanna add Kate and Melissa have been amazing, but, you know, to Tammy's point, we did this motion because we were frustrated that this has been in the works for many years and it hasn't happened. And so we wanna throw the board's weight behind.

This right, the Void Board's support behind this to help all the collaboration happen that needs to happen to get this moving forward.

So thank you both for being advocates for this program.

But it's waited too long to get up and running, and so that's why we're doing a motion today.

Public comments, all right.

Are there any public comment on this item?

Please speak up or raise your hand if you.

OK.

See you back.

We'll go move on to the next one. The next motion from Court District implementing a county ordinance.

Law enforcement officers from concealing their identities in LA County unincorporated areas.

Yeah. Thank you, darnie.

I'll be presenting so this motion today is a follow up to one that the board approved back in July that directed County Council to draft an ordinance that would prohibit law enforcement from concealing their identities when conducting law enforcement business in unincorporated LA County.

So this motion today introduces that ordinance that has been drafted by County Council for approval and approving the motion will count as the first reading of the ordinance.

And then there will be a second reading one week later.

So the ordinance is attached to the motion.

Hopefully everyone saw it.

The ordinance does two things.

First, it prohibits all law enforcement, including state, local and federal, from wearing masks or personal disguises while interacting with the public. In the course of their duties in unincorporated LA County.

And second, it requires that all law enforcement, once again, local, state and federal, requires that they wear visible identification and agency affiliation while interacting with the public in the course of their duties in unincorporated LA County, the ordinance includes in it a number of pre approved exceptions to.

These requirements. The exceptions include things like medical masks needed to prevent disease transmission, breathing apparatuses, motorcycle helmets when someone's riding a motorcycle, SWAT teams.

And active undercover operations.

Amongst others, this motion will set a clear expectation, ingrained in our official county code, that all law enforcement show their identities and the agencies that they work for.

The ordinance lays out various reasons for this requirement. In the first page of the ordinance.

When law enforcement hides their identities, they cause distress, fear and

intimidation.

They cause an inability to read facial expressions which can unnecessarily escalate interactions, and they cause an increased risk for false impersonators and kidnappers. All of this undermines public trust and feeds chaos.

Unfortunately, we have seen too well the terrifying impacts of masked law enforcement in the federal ice raids that have been taking place across LA County and the country when plainclothes officers have kidnapped and drawn their guns at residents at all times of the day.

So this ordinance today will go before the board on December 2nd for the first reading and then December 9th for the second reading. And then it will go in effect 30 days after that second reading.

From January.

And I open it up to questions.

Question.

I do have a question.

What? What is the the penalty for a violation of the ordinance?

So the ordinance would count as a infraction, I believe.

So there's a section that says penalty.

Section 13.01060 on page five of the ordinance says it's punishable as it's infraction or misdemeanor.

And who would be issuing this?

Would be.

Law enforcement.

So if a sheriff's deputy violates the ordinance, then it would be up to the state agency to issue a penalty, yes.

Right. Is that the?

Like if the sheriff's deputy breaks the law in any other instance, it would still be that law enforcement entity issuing punishment.

They would.

Somebody would be called, yes.

And what about for state and federal agencies?

So we can't. We can't speculate what will happen, I imagine.

Well, let me speculate what we'll.

I believe that.

Let's say there is an ice raid that is happening in sheriff's deputies come upon it.

And trying to question ICE agents, I imagine the ICE agents are not going to be cooperative.

Mm-hmm. And then supervisors are going to get involved.

And what happens from there?

I do not know and I do want to say Sandra, and to everyone, right, enforcement will need to be figured out when it comes to something above local, right?

However, there is currently a state law in existence that does the same thing.

That makes it an infraction or misdemeanor.

Yes, to violate state law.

We would be enforcing agency of that state law, so enforcement has to be figured out anyway.

This doesn't add any additional burden of figuring out the enforcement, however, we're able.

No state law applies to local law.

I'm talking about the issue of enforcing against a federal right that needs to be figured out with the state law. It would also need to be figured out with this ordinance, since we have to figure it out anyway for the state law.

This ordinance doesn't do anything additional.

Doesn't the department already have any policies that like like address like the identification component?

Yeah. Is this in addition to clarifying?

They do as far as having visible name tags, yeah, badge numbers.

That's that's well enshrined in in statutes. And how is this different then it's just adding a penalty component or it was changing?

I can answer that right.

So the Sheriff's Department and all local law enforcement have their internal policies and their internal policies.

Require identification. That's why when we talk to anyone, we say the first thing you do. If the cop knocks on your door is ask for identification, right?

That, though, would be a violation of a policy if someone violates it, they would be punished within their department.

This would now make it a violation of an county coordinator which make, which makes it an infraction or a misdemeanor, as opposed to just being a violation of internal departmental policy.

So it won't change law enforcement's policies.

But it will change that if someone violates it, it now does count as an infraction or a misdemeanor, as opposed to just a violation of the penalty but not the policy itself.

OK, correct. Correct.

Right, it's all here this week online.

Leslie, do you have a question for comment?

Unmute.

GL **Gamino, Leslie** 32:38

Yes, so curious.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 32:40

Go.

GL **Gamino, Leslie** 32:41

Curious because I know that this came out from some of the two Senate bills that came earlier this year and were passed in September.

And it seemed that they're being, you know, challenged as we expected.

But what happens if they're struck down? Would it?

Would this ordinance just apply to county law enforcement?

Just curious.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 33:05

So so this ordinance is separate from the state law and it by itself.

So regardless of what happens to the state, law or ordinance would be in place, but you know, it could. Our ordinance could be challenged.

And as Supervisor Han, my boss said publicly at the last time, you know, we'll see.

We'll see you in court if it's challenged.

So we believe that there's a lot of things happening at the federal level that are unconstitutional.

That we believe this protects actually the constitutional rights of our residents.

In LA County, and so if it needs to be battled out in court, it will be. But we believe going forward with this ordinance anyway, regardless of state law and any challenge is important.

GL **Gamino, Leslie** 33:52

Curious to hear Council also on this if the challenging of those of those legislation would have.

Any effect on this ordinance?

PC Public Safety Cluster 34:04

Yeah, we stand by the statement.

It's accurate.

GL Gamino, Leslie 34:07

Thank you.

PC Public Safety Cluster 34:14

Any other questions, comments.

OK, comment for this item. Do you speak up or raise your hand on teams if you're online?

OK.

Jessica Martinez. We'll start you at one minute when you start speaking, please, Amir.

Jessica Martinez BMU and start speaking or started talking in one minute.

JM Jessica Martinez 34:36

Yeah, sorry about that. OK.

This is the right motion.

I I got it now one second.

I have so many tabs open. OK hi, I'm with kofem.

My name is Jessica Martinez.

I'm one of the Co chairs of immigrants RLA, and I'm here representing the coalition.

We're in support of this ordinance prohibiting law enforcement officers from concealing their identities and requiring visible identification when interacting with the public.

This because this measure is rooted in the simple.

The sexual truth.

Transparency builds trust and keeps our community safe. When an officer's face is hidden, community members experience fear and certainty and intimidation. As we all heard when the during the presentation. Just as importantly, when officers are not readily identifiable, the public becomes more vulnerable to the impersonation a.

Problem that we saw amplified during.
Well, right now during the immigration raids and this has enabled.
Best harassment. Kidnapping, I would say.
And violent crap and violent crimes across the the county.
So this ordinance is it strikes the right balance.
It preserves the necessary exceptions that that were named like SWOT operations,
hazardous environments, and other situations. But outside of those limited
circumstances.
Our residents deserve deserve that. That's it.
OK.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 36:05

Yes, comments raise your hand on themes, Colin.

JM **Jessica Martinez** 36:06

Yeah, they just deserve 2.
Feel safe. Thanks.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 36:13

I'll start you one minute. When you start speaking.

HE **helen eigenberg** 36:16

Hi, Helen eigenberg. Constituent of SDE 3.
Thank you Supervisor Han, for this motion.
We absolutely need it.
What's happening in this country and in our state is unexcusable, and it always feels
like unincorporated areas are the last to be protected anyway.
So let's do this.
So thank you for this motion.
I appreciate it.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 36:38

All right.
Thank you very much.
Are there any other public comments for this item? Please speak up.

We'll raise your hand on teams.

Alright, seeing none, we move to the last motion. The last motion to get it from the 4th district, speeding up and expanding family reunification programming at the century Regional detention facility. Thanks dari.

Thanks. So this motion requests that the Sheriff's Department report back with the plan to revitalize the old courtroom.

That is located at CRDF.

So for some background, the state used to operate a courtroom, which is at CRDF. But since the pandemic.

The courtroom has been inoperable and ownership was transferred to the county back in 2018.

The Sheriff's Department applied for and received a grant from the Department of Justice to revitalize the courtroom and transform it into a space where incarcerated mothers could have in person family visits with their children in a non carceral setting.

Those are the grant funding was spent to purchase supplies, equipment needed for the revitalization such as furniture, cameras, decorations, training.

And more.

So the Sheriff's Department should move forward with revitalizing this courtroom, especially since family reunification efforts are critical.

It can help incarcerated women continue their relationships with their children.

The bonding empowering and reuniting families or bear program run by the Sheriff's Department has recently restarted.

And they're currently operating in a small room, which means there's a very limited amount of mothers who are able to participate. And also this room is actually outside of Lacs security area. So that means only certain level of security.

Clearance for women are allowed to participate, so revitalizing this courtroom for the Behr program would allow for more women to participate. Since it's within the family facility security area. And it's a much larger space as well.

Additionally, the department has the supplies and they've already purchased that they've already purchased with the grant funding that can be used.

So this motion asks Lesd to collaborate with CEO Real estate since they managed the building to report back in 45 days and every sixty days until the completion of this project on the status of moving forward.

With the revitalization, including what potential cost would be associated and a

timeline to move forward, and then Melissa Kelly is here again from LASD to answer any questions.

Kind of about the last one. We just noticed that there was kind of a delay on moving this project forward.

So we really want to throw the board's weight behind this to get this project moving because this is important.

So we'll, I don't know if you wanna come up to answer any questions that my colleagues may have, but.

We have provisions.

I just wanna come in agreement.

Is the courtroom used for any other stuff regularly?

I know that.

County councils for time uses it for witness prepar.

Ation, but I don't know of any other uses.

And is it more than one courtroom or it's just one or it's just one room?

We're we're only interested in using one.

There are multiple courtrooms.

There's two downstairs.

My understanding is there's one upstairs and they are not used formally for anything in terms of use.

Sometimes it's rented out. One of them is rented out for filming and you know people informally use it for meeting space.

But in a few years I've been with the department.

I've never seen it officially used for anything other than maybe one or two days of training or filming, and there are three corners I understand.

There's three.

I know there's definitely definitely 2 on the bottom floor I have.

I have not ventured up on the 2nd floor to actually look at that, but my understanding is that there's three.

Any questions?

Will you stay there? Sorry.

I know this looks a.

Renovations to the potential courtroom and what the cost would look like, and really digging deeper into that, do you all anticipate that being utilized with existing funding or is this going to be asked during a budget cycle?

Is there funds already allocated for renovation projects in that space to share a little bit about that?

There are not currently funds allocated. That was part of the money that had to go back were.

We're gonna be used for the revitalization of the space.

As a whole, it is.

It's fairly usable as it is.

The biggest components are changing the locks on the doors just to improve the security 'cause right now it's, you know, panic hardware.

It's used for a public space, but we want to use the majority of the bones in the building because it are it's good infrastructure.

It was previously courtroom.

There's already mechanisms in place to make sure there's safety and security, and so we've already purchased a bunch of supplies and equipment that literally just need to be hung up and things being painted.

And so while we do anticipate A1 time cost for a few things that need to be changed ongoing, the real expense is the like the rental lease payment, which we believe is approximately 50 to \$60,000 a year just to physically like rent out space.

Thank you.

No, I mean, I'm just thinking 'cause like you don't have to say that.

Because it's an unused space, right?

And I hear that this is only part of the space, so it just rings this bell of like I've been working for the county since 2018.

It has always been an unused space.

Oh, I would.

I would take the 2nd courtroom as well. If someone wants to throw it my direction like I'm more than happy to.

So I guess that's, I mean the theme of two of our motions today is that there's some things that have been in the works for a while, right? And haven't really.

Gotten off the ground so we're trying to throw some support and and and push behind them.

Cool, yeah.

And we we, I well, I'll speak for myself. I'm absolutely appreciative of of.

Supervisor Hans office and her staff being able to support the expansion of services for women at CRDF. The space was originally developed as a maximum security

space for men and as we know, even though it's a modern facility, it really doesn't have space for rehabilitation and these are.

Two programs that help move forward.

Some opportunities and we're appreciative of the support in our office as well as the rest of the board.

Anything else?

Thank you. Melissa. Do you have any public comment to this item?

Please speak up or raise your hand on teams if you're online.

OK.

See, now we've moved to the presentation part of this meeting or letters from CEO who approve of the care first Community investment, one time funding recommendations.

Wanted to introduce us.

Alright morning, deputies.

Jack Artunian, the budget manager for the community here and justice team, incoming budget manager.

Outgoing budget manager.

Yuan King is here to help me out here.

Thanks for the opportunity to present the board letter.

Today, we're bringing forward the CEO's recommended year five CFC I spending plan, which totals 240, five \$28 million.

One time funding our goal throughout the process has been to honor the committee's recommendations and uphold the board board adopted CFCI process and ensure that all programs are legally sound, operationally, operationally viable and ready for implementation.

The CEO's plan includes every program.

The CFC Advisory Committee recommended in its final October 16th submission, we work carefully to preserve the committee's intent.

The few adjustments made were limited and necessary.

To ensure legal compliance, operational feasibility and alignment with board identified priorities. As you know, the committee submitted initial recommendations in July, but those lacks sufficient detail to determine funding amounts or award decisions. We issued a memo on September 19th requesting additional detail, while the refined recommendations arrived in.

On October 16th, Cos office still has a complete significant due diligence going

forward. We believe the process would benefit from earlier legal and operational vetting.

Before the committee takes final vote, which would reduce the need for technical adjustments at the end of this cycle.

Jumping right into what the recommendations entail, the the most notable one that you probably may have questions on is the recommended 10%.

Set aside, which equates to about \$24.6 million.

This is to address urgent immediate county wide needs, including food and security resulting from the neverending federal government shutdown.

And the critical demand for rent relief directed by this board to set aside of the 24.6 million will support \$14.6 million for emergency rent relief, aligning with the committee's priority on housing stability and the balance of 10 million will go towards.

Food insecurity, with flexibility to redirect the rent relief should the board choose to go to set aside, is well below the historical underspend in cfc programs.

So we anticipate minimal impact on programming any program that demonstrates the need and strong implementation can be made whole in future cycles using routine one time one time funds.

This is just a temporary and manageable adjustment, not a structural reduction.

The CE OS intent was not to deviate from the committee's recommendations.

The aim is to maintain a full set of recommendations, while reserving small portions for.

Immediate board identified crises.

The 10% adjustment allows us to do both, preserve the full list of programs and respond responsibly to urgent needs.

Our approach was an attempt to balance fairness and moving forward, all recommendations consistent with the committee's process.

Food and security is rising county wide as a result of the shutdown, food banks experiencing increasing demands. The 10 million allocation allows the county to act quickly.

At the same time, the board has directed us to identify emergency rent relief funding.

These CBA is already preregistering tenants and landlords with programs launching in December next month.

The 14.6 million allocation will help stabilize families, prevent eviction and advance

the community's emphasis on housing stability.

Jumping onto the other changes, there were two legal changes that were required.

One of them was the recommended program title change from general training and employment.

Services for black workers that needed a change to comply with legal requirements to preserve intent while maintaining compliance, we recommended renaming it general training employment services for historically underserved communities, and then the committee recommended \$1.2 million for Office of Cannabis Management, social Equity Program Council.

Determined that cannabis focused programming is not consistent with federal law. We recommended renaming it to small business social equity.

Program which expands focus to small businesses.

Small businesses disproportionately impacted by the justice system.

And then lastly, the two other changes were changes to program administrators for the employment program serving American native and indigenous workers. The committee recommended administration by Lanai Lane has since confirmed it does not have a passing to manage the program directly.

We recommend administration by the TPA, with Lanai serving as a subject matter expert.

And then lastly, for the holistic early assessment and linkage program, the heel program.

The committee recommended administration by the Community safety implementation team HEAL was created and currently is currently administered by the public defender to ensure clinical interactions are protected by attorney-client privileges moving the program.

Risks duplicating efforts and compromising continuity. We recommend he'll remain with public defender.

Going on to deployment strategy consistent with the committee's directions.

89.5 million will be deployed through a third party administrator to support access for small team based organizations.

The remaining 156.3 million will be administered by county departments, which will pass most funds through community providers.

We're not recommending additional administrative funding. Jacob will continue operating within his existing 1% allocation.

The C OS office remains fully aligned with the board, established CFI process. Every committee recommendations include included the only deviations are the four described today, which were the two legal title changes to administrative adjustments, and then the 10% set aside to address board priorities.

These adjustments ensure compliance feasibility and the timely deployment of resources to the Community we collectively serve.

So with the adoption of the spending plan, the county will deploy.

4528 million in one time Csci investments strengthen community based systems and address urgent needs while maintaining faithful remaining faithful to the committee's recommendations and the intent of Measure J.

We're happy to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

Question I just have a quick sorry just and I apologize in here, didn't read it.

Frank, Frank, the 10 the 10% set aside is different from what the committee recommended, he said.

That is correct.

So does that decrease the total pot that's being allocated to the committee's recommendations?

So what that does is it takes the 10% off the top for all the programs.

Yes, yes.

And then OK, yes, so it's 10% was taken off every allocation from each program, correct. OK.

Has this for that have been shared already with the Commission and if not, one will be shared.

It was shared with the committee's leadership on.

We briefed the leadership on Friday.

We're also going to be going through the committee meeting tomorrow to debrief them tomorrow as well.

And then for #3, this is a lot of delegated authority.

I mean, it's just basically like blanket delegated authority, which is not common for almost all of the Members that we see.

Is that the same recommendation that was in the earlier CEO board letters, or is this new?

It's it's consistent with prior practice, I think.

There was some inconsistency in the year, one year two and year three board liners.

There was some assumption that the delegated authority from year one

automatically applied to year two and automatically applied to year 3.

And So what we did starting with year four was we.

Basically restated.

All of the delegated authorities that happened in prior spending plans, and so it's consistent with prior board letters, but it looks like more because we are affirmatively restating the delegated authority because there was some confusion over whether or not, say, when departments are administering year two could.

The year 1 delegate authority still apply, or did it not apply? And so per per our work with Council, we were restating on the same authority that.

That had been granted in the past.

So county councils, the recommendation, OK.

Thank you.

I don't have questions. I'm very clear on what's happening.

I I do want to say, you know, thank you to jaycod for a lot of the coordination that happened with CFCR Advisors committee and really trying to bring transparency and their voices into this space. I mean, of course not happy about the 10% taken off the top.

However, understanding that there are a lot of programs that have a lot of need.

I think.

At least right now for for our office, it's really making sure that we're not spending more time going back and forth and that we're getting the actual money out because this money is as of right now, not being out in community and sitting, which was the whole purpose.

Trying to right size the the unspent funds that were there and I'd hope, and I appreciate actually I read it in here.

About the expectation of accounting department to spend down these dollars.

Once they receive them and and picking programs that are kind of already baked up and need expansion are ready to go.

So that these dollars don't turn around and we have this under high understanding each year.

So appreciate the work that you guys have done on this.

To date. So thank you.

I have a quick question umm on the cannabis equity.

Umm, appreciate the explanation I.

I believe the intent is to stay the same.

With albeit the name changing, but do you know if?

And you might know the answer to this, but how other jurisdictions have been able to create these funds?

Because I know they exist.

Or do you? Do you also think that you know the name change could impact the incentive?

I don't think.

I mean, I can't speak to what other jurisdictions do because I'm not a cannabis specialist, but the issue that we ran into with csci in particular is that the csci board policy has a unaffirmative clause that says when we administer and allocate csci funding, it has to be.

Compliant with both state and federal law.

I see.

Umm, the measure J itself.

Umm has an introduction that says that the board will allocate all measure J funding in compliance with all laws.

And so I think because of those two affirmative statements that are embedded in both the board policy and the Charter language, umm, we had to do kind of a more rigorous screen to be sure that when the board discharges, right, its duties under the Charter measure.

It's fully compliant.

With the letter of the measure, and because that measure itself affirmatively said, we have to comply with all law the the federal restriction kicked in, for instance. Thank you.

Yes.

But I would just.

I just wanted to echo Natalia about we know that this took a lot of work.

We know this is not easy.

There's a lot of players at the table.

We weren't necessarily happy with all the ways that that it all work out and panned out, but we recognize and appreciate the work that's going into this.

So thank you very much. Thank you.

We appreciate your support in allowing us to kind of do this in the truncated time frame as well because, you know, we had to present this last week to be able to put it on the December 9th agenda, and I appreciate you allowing us to do that.

Present today to still vote in December 9. So.

Just get the money out.

Hearing no other questions, public comments. All right before we start public comments, I just wanted to note on behalf of 18, 19 public comment that was submitted for written, OK, are there any public comments for this item?

Please speak up or raise your hand on teams.

Once or twice.

All right. If there are no public comments, we will move to the general public comment of this meeting.

Brian. Jose, do you have a comment for the item 4A?

BJ **Byron Jose** 56:49

Yeah, yeah.

PC **Public Safety Cluster** 56:50

All right.

Why don't you go ahead?

I'll start your when you start speaking.

BJ **Byron Jose** 56:54

Yes, hot there too.

On quote Measure J on the Charter as if him and his and County Council would have done their job to ever include it.

Actually update message a language csda board policy is what we can quote this 10% is new.

I've never heard of this, so it is very disingenuous for CEOs to say that they're upholding and willing to work with the committee when they're making decisions, letting them know on Friday evening and then now they're going to go tomorrow after the fact.

Yes, the board is gonna continue to look at, I messaged J or CSCI funds as your little Piggy Bank to just go and take and take and take.

But that is not what message it was for. And while we know some offices are out there way out the door, they don't care to do anything about this. We need to.

We need to see Q and King and John wherever the action CEO to be at the tomorrow's gsci meeting and face the public and face the community because you

continue to show up time and time again and say different things and do different things as if the rules.

Don't apply to you.

PC

Public Safety Cluster 57:54

Thank you very much.

All right. We move the next comment public comment. Katrina, if you mute, we'll start a minute.

KM

Katerina Mesesan 58:03

Good morning.

My name is Katherine and I'm with the Los Angeles Regional Food Bank Nutrition services team.

I'm speaking in opposition to the proposed removal of 1,000,000 from the calfresh healthy living and the 20% reduction to all cfc awards on agenda item 4A. Los Angeles County is in a state of emergency around food insecurity, our food pantries, community partners and the food.

Bank are experiencing unprecedented demand. Cutting these funds now will cause immediate and widespread harm.

The cowardly living at the CFCA dollars directly.

Support nutrition, education, food access and long term health for the communities.

I urge the county to restore the full 10 million because emergency challenges should be addressed with emergencies as a native funds, not by taking from programs that are built by health stability and Community Trust. Thank you.

PC

Public Safety Cluster 58:49

Very much darde.

Can I ask a question to our folks about that comment?

She's referenced cutting 1.2 million of food insecurity.

But we're giving 10 million extra of food and security for on what was correct approved by the committee, right? Correct.

So there's a net positive of \$8.8 million for food food insecurity.

9 positive 9 million.

Yeah, there's. So there's a net positive extra 9 million going towards food insecurity than what was approved by the CSCI committee.

Correct. OK.

Thank you. For the record everyone listening. OK, alright.

Are there any other public comments for this item?

Alright, seeing none, we move to the general public.

Comments. Are there any general comments today's meeting?

Please speak up. Raise your hands. I'll raise your hand on team.

OK, seeing that we adjourn this meeting, we move to closed session.

Thank you very much.

Jardine can you send Chloe's in like I will.

Thank you once again.

□ **Dardy Chen** stopped transcription