

Homeless Policy Deputies Meeting (4th Thursdays of the Mo.)-20260122_212154UTC-Meeting Recording

January 22, 2026, 9:21PM

2h 39m 57s

My name is Daniela I'm Lisa's office. Yes, before I welcome my colleagues to introduce themselves, but also like to introduce my colleague Emily.

Go ahead and introduce yourself.

Hi, I'm Emily grind.

I just started as a fellow and office mentee. Thank you.

And then I'll hand it over to you.

Hi, Evie Perkins.

I work for supervisor Lindsay Horvath, but for just regular county supervisors.

John McGiffin, housing and homelessness liaison.

3rd Supervisorial District Anisa Lopez, Supervisor Mitchell's office at 2nd District,

Pamela Leo, also second district housing and planning, Wendy Gomez.

Also, second District community development.

So, like housing supply.

Tyler, supervisor of Arter's office covering health and homelessness, and we have another individual here from SC 5 as well.

Hello Ariana Gutierrez.

Covering helplessness.

Oh yes.

Hello everyone.

Ivan Sulek, homeless housing deputy for supervisor Janice Hans.

Welcome and pleasure to be here.

OK.

So let's get started with our first item, annual evaluation agenda.

And we have Jasper Cooper, director of Data analytics and evaluation with the LA County Department of both representing housing taking away.

Thank you.

All right. Do we have slides up as well?

Please thank you for having me back and having us back to report on our progress in developing the 1st annual Evaluation Agenda for the Los Angeles Department of Homeless Services and Housing HSH.

So I'm Jasper Cooper. As mentioned, I'm the director of Data Analytics and

evaluation. HSH and I've been working on this with a team in the new department. So next slide, we'll begin by covering why we're here today and recalling the background.

On measure A's evaluation requirements, next slide please.

We first presented you our proposed approach for developing the annual evaluation agenda back in July 2025 last year.

Today I'm going to walk through how we implemented those plans.

I'm going to share the draft agenda that resulted that agenda features 16 potential evaluations that are organized into a queue that is ranked in order of priority.

You haven't already done so.

You can refer to the attached exhibit.

Which describes the 16 evaluations, along with information on why the evaluation was prioritized and how it would be implemented.

The order of those priorities in the draft agenda is important.

It will determine the order in which we implement evaluations based on available capacity. Our capacity to do evaluations is determined by how much measure a funding we allocate to the annual evaluation agenda, how much internal staff capacity we have, where appropriate to conduct.

In house and the extent to which we can secure external funding partnerships with film and academic organizations.

Next slide please.

So because the order of priorities is so important here today, what I'm primarily seeking your feedback on is how we prioritized.

So would you move any evaluations up or down in that queue?

We also want to know if the topics are clear and relevant and whether we missed anything that you believe should be included on the list.

Next slide, after receiving your feedback on priorities today and ekra's next week, we're going to make any needed revisions and officially release version 1.0 of the annual Evaluation agenda on a public website.

We'll share it back with all of the partners who participated in the development and continue to revise the agenda as feedback comes in.

It's intended as a living document, so there will be a version 2.0.

There might be a version 3.0.

In parallel, we are going to work on getting the first requests for.

Proposals, RFPs released using the FY20 6 and FY20 7 measure a funds and will begin

socializing this agenda more broadly with the academic philanthropic community to identify pathways for additional external funding. Next slide, please.

So just as a reminder, measure A requires the county to establish and manage this evaluation agenda.

The AEA, both for accountability and as a mechanism to spur innovation and improvement.

We've got the language from the ordinance.

Up here on the slide, I'm not going to read it in the interest of time, but we can refer to that if needed.

Next slide. So just before I dive into the process piece of this evaluation is just one of the data related components required by measure A that we are working on planning on the left here sets the goals that influence our performance, monitoring our evaluation and our decision making.

And under performance monitoring at the top we have.

For example, the measure, a progress tracker which shows progress towards our system wide goals.

We also have KPIs developed by the Ekra best practices for standardization of care subcommittee, the VPSC in partnership with the data subcommittee and other stakeholders.

And what I want to emphasize today is that the work to create those KPIs for the new department based on the BPSC recommendations is ongoing and it continues in parallel to this work, right.

So the work on the evaluation agenda represented here at the bottom is not going to hold up any of that other work on KP is from getting getting data out.

So what is the difference between them?

Well, whereas performance monitoring focuses on KP is that are updated regularly and shown on public dashboards.

What we're discussing today, evaluations are time limited, deeper studies designed to answer questions that performance monitoring cannot answer.

So for example, a KPI might show you that permanent supportive housing retention is lower for black residents, but it won't tell us why that is the case or what to do about it. That's what an evaluation is for.

We use research and fact finding to understand why that gap exists and what changes would address it together. Performance monitoring and evaluation.

Informed decisions about adapting existing programs and testing new approaches.

That's what creates an ongoing cycle.

Learning and improvement. Next slide please.

So let's take a deeper look at how we develop the draft agenda. Next slide.

The first version of the annual evaluation agenda was developed in the second-half of 2025 through engagement with three groups. Our governance partners, which includes you all who helped set the priorities and guide the process our Co design partners, who include people with lived experience and.

Service providers they helped actually develop the evaluation questions and advising partners who provided input key points.

Wait, next slide.

This is the process we use to develop the list of 16 evaluations I'm about to go through. So we developed the agenda in two main phases.

We started with a Co design phase. The idea there was to reduce blind spots and make sure that the agenda reflected the concerns of the people directly affected by and implementing the harmlessness system.

Now we counted.

So we gathered input through community workshops, surveys.

Governance partners existing research generating nearly 300 potential evaluation questions.

While using existing meetings where possible to limit any additional added burden on folks, just over 1/4 of those questions came from people with an experience.

Nearly a third came from providers. We then combined similar questions and asked our partners to rank them through a simple preference survey.

The final short list of 16 evaluations reflects what partners said mattered most.

Priorities raised by governance bodies and measure A's requirement to focus on learning.

What actually works?

So we produce the set of evaluation principles as well and high level logic model that I'm excited to share on the AA website alongside the first draft.

But we don't have time for today.

OK.

Let's turn to the draft agenda next slide and next slide again please.

So as mentioned, you can think of the annual evaluation agenda like a QA evaluations are going to be implemented in order of priority based on available resources.

That doesn't mean things are fixed in stone.

We anticipate updating the agenda as needed at least annually.

Our best guess, subject to a number of caveats, is that we can take no more than six additional evaluations on in the next two fiscal years, and it may be fewer than that.

So I'm gonna run quickly through the top six evaluations listed on the right hand side of this slide and you can refer to the exhibits for more detail.

The top priority on increasing system wide impact.

Is there to address 2 closely linked system level questions. Number one, what is the causal impact of our investments on key homelessness outcomes?

And #2, where does current system capacity fall short of what would be needed to meet our goals?

So those goals include the measure, a goals and broader system aspirations such as making homelessness rare, brief and non recurring.

That evaluation sits at the top because governance partners and HSH leadership, clearly.

Ask for a system wide.

View of weather measure A.

Investments are working and where gaps remain.

And it will help leaders across LA County decide where to put limited resources and where to ask for more.

It also consolidated many related questions raised by our Co design partners and responds to measure a language requiring us to prioritize causal impact.

The second priority evaluation looks at a small set of new pilot programs that are funded through the measure a innovations budget.

Those all focus on improving provider coordination and helping with service connection.

Those are specifically community liaisons.

Faith-based regional coordinators.

Veteran call centers and veteran resource centers.

Those pilots we prioritize because measure A requires the innovations budget to be used to test new ideas for future large scale spending.

And so all other innovations pilots have evaluations.

We're trying to evaluate everything in that budget.

The third priority evaluation focuses on improving.

And tracking referral pathways.

It asks how referrals and intake actually work today, where people fall out of the system.

What changes would be needed to better track referrals and hand offs between providers? So we prioritize this evaluation because governance partners have consistently raised referral visibility as a major gap.

I've heard it in this form as well.

Ecra's BPSC subcommittee called for focused fact finding in this area.

The data subcommittee has noted that referral tracking is not currently possible without foundational work that likely requires reconfiguring provider workflows.

The leadership tables Equity Subcommittee has emphasized the need to understand where bottlenecks differ across racial and other marginalized groups, and these concerns have also been reflected in the Community preference survey that we did.

So that's why we are we have that one at #3.

The 4th priority evaluation focuses on improving housing retention and graduation and graduation from support.

Some would be done in two phases, so the first phase uses existing administrative data to identify what predicts housing retention, graduation, and possibly returns to homelessness, and where racial inequities are the largest that phase could be done internally, we think.

And would allow work to begin quickly while an RFP for the second phase is developed.

That second phase would test a targeted intervention informed by the 1st using a third party evaluator to assess.

In fact, that topic we prioritize because it's repeatedly been raised by our governance partners and Co design partners.

The BPSC recommended multiple evaluations focused on permanent supportive housing retention.

The equity subcommittee of the Leadership Table is called for closer examination of retention outcomes for black and for American Indian and Alaska Native tenants.

Those priorities were also strongly reflected in the Community engagement that we did 5th and 6th evaluations, priority focus on system issues that affect how well providers can do their jobs.

One looks at how data entry and reporting create administrative burden and identifies where the biggest changes are. That could free up staff time.

The other focus is on the provider workforce and examines what supports staff.

Retention reduces burnout and improves service quality and test strategies that could strengthen workforce capacity.

So together, those evaluations address structural barriers that limit system effectiveness, regardless of program type.

Next slide please.

In the interest of time and turning to the discussion, I'm not going to go through the remaining evaluation priorities on the shortlist as I'm sure it comes to a great relief.

But they are included in the attachment.

I'm happy to answer questions on any of them.

Some of those evaluations focus on specific parts of the system, such as outreach and interim housing to diagnose problems there, how to improve how those parts work.

Other evaluations look across the system like coordinated entry, clinical supports, federal benefits to draw down.

Funds and those are focused on improving efficiency and making better use of limited resources.

Processes equity is addressed throughout the tension.

The outcomes for sub populations like Tay families transition aged, I should say, families with children, survivors of domestic violence and other priority populations mentioned in the measure award. Next slide please.

We have a number of ongoing evaluations that we are still cataloging.

This is by no means the full list here.

Those some of those are funded by the county and lots of them are not funded by the county.

So version 2.0 is going to try much harder to sort of catalog what's already out there and what's ongoing and include that.

But I did want to flag that we do have ongoing evaluations as well as units. Next slide please.

So on the next slide on this slide that we're on the final slide.

Reminder of where we're seeking feedback. And with that, I'm going to hand over to you all. Thank you.

Thank you so much Jasper.

I am curious where the.

How you're elevating the evaluations inclusive of voices with relevant lived experience.

Great. And just so I understand the question fully, I mean that's how we're including voices with lived experience in the evaluations.

Well, it's in the measure. A language evaluation must include voices with relevant lived experience. However, you're interpreting that and how that's being played.

Great. Thank you.

OK.

So that comes in a few ways. So I would say it comes through mostly as a through line in every evaluation.

That we're doing.

So I'm just gonna pull up the evaluation principles that are really instructions that we're providing to people who are carrying out evaluations for us.

So the first principle is include voices with relevant lead experience, and then what that means is you involve people with lived experience throughout the research life cycle.

So that's setting priorities, designing the research and data collection instruments, collecting the data, interpreting the findings.

And.

And that's also treating participants as active partners in the research and not just the advisors and subjects.

And I'm going to shout out one of the tee groups that we talked with for really giving you the specific language there.

So we we that community engagement, we did inform not just the questions, but also the principles that asked for the type.

So that's that's something that makes it through into everything.

There's a number of evaluations that also have as part of them, talking to people who are experiencing systems like the referral.

Pathways 1 involves actually talking to folks who are going through these systems.

And using that as data as well, right?

So it's AI would say it comes in as data methodologically, and we're we're we're needed and it's a principle we're incorporating into the lifecycle throughout.

That's great.

Thank you Jasper.

Perfect. On the proposed top 6 evaluation priorities.

A couple questions I had.

Well, the first one increasing system wide impact, I was kind of curious about that

because so many of the sub evaluations.

Would be critical to knowing that it's me.

#5 reducing administrative burden and data entry.

That's gonna increase.

That's gonna totally impact your system and but so much is. I mean, so much of this is.

So I'm just curious.

Obviously one's the ideal.

But how do you do one without kind of doing the others?

Yeah, that's such a fair question, so.

The titles of these are all they're they're not meant to indicate.

Like the increasing system, wide impact evaluation is not the only evaluation aiming to increase system wide impact.

The point of that evaluation is to enable us to respond to questions like how much of the outcomes that we are seeing in our KPI's can be actually attribute to the measure a spend, right.

That's the total impact inference that allows us to do.

That's really hard to do at a system wide scale in practice.

What the evaluators are going to have to do is a lot of modeling, right?

It's going to require.

A lot of assumptions.

We'll try to make those transparent.

There's gonna be pretty high level.

It's gonna be based on what we know about the effectiveness of programs, what providers say they would have been able to do without the funding.

So it provides us that kind of return on investment type information and it lets us know what the investments per SE are doing doesn't mean that that's the only Ave. that we're going to identify like all of this is driving system wide impact to your point, right, so.

The the the name of that is maybe.

A bit of a misnomer, since it suggests that we're only driving system wide impact there.

As you said, if we do, if we do this work to free up more time for providers, we would expect that that's also going to drive system wide in that.

And then I'll just ask, I think there should be potentially just a little reflection on the

language that's used because it's confusing for people.

So you say evaluation. Other people talk about different data analytics.

I can't parse all those out.

Performance Monitoring, performance management. Those are the same.

So I would just.

I think it'd be amazing if HSH starts kind of being the standard bearer and language.

I will also say I much like shared housing, which people misunderstand, has a negative connotation for our office.

At least that's the same as we feel about KPI.

So KPI has been used countless times for many, many years.

If you said on last the Commission and hasn't really meant anything at a certain point, so I would just just throwing that out there.

Others may not feel the same, but if they can at least be very consistent. So you use the same word every time.

To mean the same thing.

And.

Oh, and my last question is this. Admit I want to be very very transparent.

Evaluation for me is sometimes difficult because I feel like you can ask people who are doing things and then in AI mean obviously measure rate requires this. Of course I can make a case for why one evaluation, but like when we don't have subsidies, I'm like do less.

Evaluation pay more subsidies, like that's just how I'm cheating. And like, ask people with lived experience what works best and then go do that.

So one thing I am curious and maybe this could be a future presentation, but like when have we done evaluation of county wide programs in the past that caused us to actually run something new that focused like so then we pivoted the way we did the program I.

Haven't seen a lot of, I mean, like, I think we often do evaluations to prove, though we think we're doing is correct. So we can get more money.

So I understand that, but I just think I'd like to understand for the kind of investments we make.

What we get from that really?

Talk about the very fair question about the value add in terms of the decisions that we actually make, yes.

OK.

Thanks Jasper. Thank you.

I just sort of wanted to raise that with evaluation priority number three. I think we all sort of in this room know the certain referral pathways that often cause a breakdown, OK? And they're not funded by measure a, right?

So if this evaluation process surfaces something that isn't funded by measure A, how does that in Slide 7 into your sort of decision map about how that evaluation then feeds back into decision making if the decision makers aren't funded?

By measure a, how can we best inform them or push them to actually make that change?

Yeah, I hear you.

Because, because again, a lot of these, a lot of the referrals that you were talking about in the appendix like those referrals and those services aren't funded by measure A. Yeah, thank you.

That's such a great point.

So, you know, I think if we were to restrict all these evaluations, the only one is mandatory funded, we would probably not be able to make the type.

I mean, I don't know that that's even workable at all in practice, right when we start to get to how embroidered our service delivery is.

But I think we'd also really limit the impact.

Act of here about the value add of the evaluation agenda more than is intended here, so I I don't believe that that's something that we would need to do. So I don't know if we see that differently.

I think that would fall within the scope of this.

Yeah, I'm just concerned how we get from that evaluation to actually impact the decision making, OK, because that's, yeah, I would love to also like potentially sidebar on that theory of like how we do drive decisions from these results and do that up front.

That's that. As as someone's working evaluation for a long time, that's always been my dream to actually work with decision makers.

And policymakers ahead of time on what results would drive those decisions.

So maybe we could think through what that decision making pathway looks like.

Happy to do.

That, yeah.

Thank you. And I know I've been in and out of these conversations, so I might not have contact, but I was just looking at evaluation priority for about improving

permanent housing retention and graduation.

Yeah, for those.

How are you thinking about that measure, especially for?

Clients who need forever care that might be in PSH for the long term. There's no alternative.

Permanent housing.

How are you thinking about that?

Thank you.

Yeah, and and and I think behind your question is the idea that like we don't necessarily want or can graduate everyone, right, right, yeah.

So the language in there in the in the attachment I hope is making that clear, but if it's not, I'm gonna go back and edit it. That's what we're looking.

24 is where graduation is appropriate and safe, right?

What are the predictors of actually like appropriate and safe graduation?

I think given the the resource constraints that we're under, it is incumbent upon us to take a hard look at that, but obviously it needs to be done in a way that's safe and doesn't indentured thought.

So if that isn't coming through clearly in the language, I'm going to make sure that.

Yeah. I mean, I haven't.

I need to read it.

But you can't use it.

Yeah. Thank you.

I have a quick question.

I think I think it's related a little bit to what Amy was was kind of talking about.

I mean, I'm looking at like #10 for like extend local sources through federal funds, yeah.

I guess I just sort of wonder like how this agenda, this or the evaluation priority change as or like how nimble are they right as the situation changes both federally?

Yeah, at state level.

I mean, even locally, right?

Like I I just wonder how nimble we are in these evaluation priorities as things change totally. OK.

So let's talk a little bit about where things get locked in and where the degrees of freedom are, right?

So where things get locked in is when we start an evaluation and we do an RFP like

there was committed money to it.

It's gonna go through. So I think if we're doing.

We're committing like I would love to do much more rapid cycle evaluation where we get results faster than like three years, right?

We get in six months to a year.

I think we can do that, but in some cases we're gonna have to commit funds and and sort of lock them in for these two to three-year periods.

But we have to be really clear that that is something that we're willing to prioritize given that priorities made change over time with the actual agenda itself, the way it's prioritized, the questions that are in it.

What we spend the how much of the ADR budget, the Accountability Data research budget we spend that I do think there is a a decent amount of leeway with as you know availability for evaluation changes. The agenda itself doesn't require that it goes through any extensive approval process.

To be updated, the language in the ordinance just requires us to seek recommendations from ACRA primarily, and to consult with with departments.

So I created the website as a living document that's version controlled, with the idea that we're gonna update it all the time and keep it constant with priorities. So.

Notwithstanding that caveat right about locking funds in, sometimes I think we'll be able to be very nimble.

Do you have any questions?

Thank you, Madam Chair.

The only thing I would say I mean.

I'm looking at this. Obviously I see for a whole system, but specifically you know, talking about flexibility where we the ever changing landscape may be able to tweak things, talk about like the fire stuff and fire impact.

I mean obviously it touches so many parts of these different priorities, right?

But I don't know if you'd consider kind of bumping things together.

I don't wanna necessarily carve out a specific fire category.

But I guess that would be my question to you guys. Is like how maybe we drawn some of these together if that's the?

You know higher level wins though.

That I I'm trying to better understand. OK, so. So what I'm hearing? Correct me if I'm wrong here is just an interest in being able to understand fire impacts or maybe like the impacts of these types of we're talking about unincorporated fire and then

probably the third Dist.

You know the the Palisades fire.

Hmm. OK. And what you'd want to see there when we say impact of the fire?

What? What are we looking for?

What's the kind of thing that you wanted?

See. Well I I'm. I'm looking here on. Like I said, a bunch of different categories, right?

So you know, talking about looking at resources locally, but the resources federally and at the state level, how are we engaging people and this, this is obviously going to be related to multiple departments too, as much of the fire recovery work has done.

But I guess in the HSH lens you know, how are we talking to folks who are essentially now homeless that don't have a home because it was lost in the fire, that our, you know, currently in flux?

I guess you could categorize it probably in the prevention category or it will be in there are those that have already fallen out of that prevention category and are literally homeless.

I see.

And so I I I think again, I would want to make sure that that reality is is baked into some of these priorities that we see here.

In just like I said, categorizing in a broader fire recovery umbrella that's that would be my ***.

Thank you. OK.

And I don't think because you're not talking about doing impact this, any of these assessment?

Yeah, that could be like a subcategory.

That's what I was thinking.

Yeah, it's like it sounds like the interest here is sort of on the one hand in what is our preparedness capacity for future events like this.

And then what is our capacity to deal with the existing sort of fall out from past events, correct?

Yeah. Yeah. OK.

I think that that appropriate place for that to move is probably under that system wide.

Gap analysis.

Yeah. And then I don't have any other questions.

That was just like my commentary on, I don't know if there's anything that you no, there's something to. OK. Thank you.

No, no questions.

Thank you for the presentation.

Sorry, I have one question.

Is halfway home at one of the programs that are going to be evaluating this.

Yes. So in the in the in that system wide impact evaluation that would basically include pathway, great.

There's also the there's an evaluation.

On on longer, on the on the short list on outreach as well without.

As well as all the other.

Great. Thank you so much.

Thank you all very much.

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. OK.

There we have.

Now we have our motion as D2, adopting formulas to advance housing solutions and unincorporated LA County. I believe it's Wendy.

Yeah, we get away.

I'm gonna log on.

I don't think my email's working today, which now makes sense why I never got your e-mail from hours ago to Marina, so I'm gonna log on.

There's no PowerPoint and share and screen share.

Do you want me to advance for you?

Yeah, I think.

Well, oh, somebody needs to give you permission.

Actually I need to be.

I think of make a motion to give you participant because I don't have screen.

Co-authored by 1.

Seats.

If that doesn't work.

You should be able to do it. Oh I can't.

No, I don't.

I was made to shroud.

I was started at least.

Well, that works out for a lot of technical difficulties.

Thanks everyone.

So this motion is sort of mistitled since it's plural, and it really only directs for one formula.

But adopting formulas to advance housing solutions and unincorporated LA County, so as many of you probably remember, I'll go through a bit of a timeline here.

This is really looking.

At the La Casa funds that come to the county for unincorporated areas.

So you know, we don't have to go back all the way to 2022.

But in September, we had a motion that the board adopted to look into different formula distributions and so that report back that we heard thanks to Theo or I guess the new department and D CDA and LACTA for coming and presenting back in December on the five options.

Right.

They were like divide by 5 based on Reena numbers based on renford and household.

The sort of different different types of options, and So what this motion does is it adopts formula five for the RPHP and goes with an aggregating option for the production dollars.

So I'll get into that in a bit. And the reason that we wanted to have this motion come forward now is so that.

The different options that are adopted with distribution are able to make their way into the housing plan that's gonna come back in March. And so that working group has been working together to develop a strategic plan for housing for the unincorporated areas.

And so this way they're able to plan out sort of how the board is thinking through the distribution of those funds into that plan that has a two year and four year timeline that they're looking at.

So this is the whole sort of.

Measure a context, but really want us to focus on like this tiny sliver is really what we're talking about here.

And wanted to situate that in the context of the greater landscape, right.

It is really only 24,000,000 for production.

In preservation ownership, the flexible funds, the renter protection, homeless prevention or PHP dollars that goes that go to DCVA for stay house, legal services, rental assistance and the TA funds that are like a little bit less than 1,000,000.

So we saw this in the previous report backs. This is a breakdown from this year's current budget.

So it just gives you a sense again of that roughly.

24,000,000 how that's broken down.

So now getting into the directives, the first directive directs DCBA or director of DCBA or designee to adopt Formula Five and Formula Five is the rent burden households per district.

And gives DCA the delegated authority to be able to receive the funds, administer manage through La Casa on behalf of the county.

Again, these funds are mainly going to stay housed.

LA right to council rental assistance that has already been operating.

I think something important to highlight from the report back was that Formula Five and six were the most closely aligned with an equity baseline. And so for our office and the supervisor having an equitable distribution has been really critical.

Obviously we've seen that in some of the other measure.

A.

Funding and so moving that into the renter protection dollars.

As well, sort of the distinction between 5:00, which is on rent burden households and six which is displacement risk is that there are areas in the county where there are severely rent burdened, low income households who might not be facing the same neighborhood.

Wise might not be facing the same.

Indicators of like gentrification that formula 6 takes into account. And so it leaves some of those neighborhoods out, particularly in Southeast 4.

However, those aren't as well as accounted for in like the Southeast.

And so we felt formula Five was data-driven most equitable across.

For the need that it's being allocated for, also want to just quickly mention that in.

When this came back in December as a presentation of the report back, there were some questions of how does formula how do any of the formulas?

Line with how DCBA currently operates.

'Cause, I didn't put the numbers in the slide 'cause. I think it got too overwhelming, but sort of trend wise and I think DCB is happy to follow up with the full numbers after this. But trend wise it pretty much stabilizes currently the way it's been allocated and.

Formula Five are pretty much the same for SD1 and SD3, and how that funding is

being used.

It goes slightly.

Lower for our district and it increases for both SD4 and SD5.

And so and then moving on to the second directive, as you might remember from the September motion for the unincorporated areas, 2 main things from that September motion are the strategic housing plan for the UA as well as allocating our TA dollars to positions within sort of our.

Different.

Departments that touch the housing spectrum.

So the new department, DCA and LACTA to really focus on the unincorporated areas work collaboratively across that spectrum to focus on this area.

And so directing homeless services and housing as well as DHR to establish the head of the office of Unincorporated Services and their main role would really be to be the implementer and the overseer of that strategic housing plan.

We're super thankful to Kerry Miller from CEO, who has been coordinating the three departments up to this point, but feel that it's a natural way to sort of pass that work on.

Beyond the planning phase and then the second set of directives are for lacta as sort of the Board of Supervisors acting as supportive commissioners of Lachta, and here it is not a recommendation.

To adopt A formula but to aggregate the PPO and PPO flex to have that 14 million and 4 million in one pot of 18 run an annual nofa.

And.

Have that fund rotate to each district every year, and so we sort of floated that idea in December.

Would love people's additional thoughts on it.

And that's it.

Are there any questions?

SD4S, the co-author.

I just wanted to add on to this point.

You know FC2 for joining us, you know, as we progressed together on a couple of getting to our unincorporated areas and La Casa, you know I'm also the supervisor's alternate on La Casa.

I sit on the mental protections.

Homeless prevention.

The subcommittee and really looking at this funding of how we can look at our unincorporated communities.

Regarding the the production dollars and see how we can look at it as one you know at city see their you know communities and plan out their communities for the production and preservation of affordable housing. The working with the CBA and individual board offices which have very unique.

Unincorporated communities with very unique needs. You know Tyler's talked about Altadena, you know on fire. You know, SD one has talked about.

Kangaroo Valley, east LA.

You know, we've talked about unincorporated Whittier in one of park and other ones in southeast three and two, and so on, really having the ability, looking at that formula and working together with our different offices. And then finally, you know, the importance of having something really be Mars.

The resources.

And direction or, you know, addressing homelessness in housing.

Within the unincorporated communities, you know, we are their Direct Line of government.

Each board office plays a direct role.

The county plays a direct role in addressing homelessness.

And housing production and other services within our unincorporated communities.

And so we've, you know, really envisioning this individual working within the department or in addition to coordinating with these BA, lacta, DPH and other departments.

As it relates to.

Addressing homelessness in this in our incorporate communities and so you know I I our office really wants to elevate.

Our incorporate communities and see how we can address homelessness within the area, and so that's all I wanted to add on.

Well, that's right.

Well commented a question so. So first of all I think.

The there was a comment that the formula baseline, but I do want to point out that the one district that it goes below the equity baseline is SD1, which is really unfortunate for unincorporated areas. Delay and other areas of the county that are predominantly.

That the immigrant community so formula Five puts us below the equity baseline.

So I would like to point that out and then my question is, I know that when the formula was presented to us, the recommendation was to not have.

The formula so I would love to hear from you guys.

What was the impet behind selecting?

So I think two things.

And then Muriel cast it to Dcba Marina and Manny. But.

Two things, so I think.

I'll point I that's a really good catch, Danielle, that it goes below the equity baseline.

Very cognizant of that.

Based on how it's currently distributed, I would say SD One is still below the equity line, so it moves it closer to the equity baseline and these are numbers that I would love to have bcba share with colleagues because I think it was helpful for my understanding in.

Comparing the two.

And so I might be wrong, but it was about like at 29. And so it brings us to one to like 30 to 3030, that's 33.

Umm.

And the second one was that there what we found that there was a really strong case for the PPO dollars to not go into a formula 'cause, they're they don't stretch as far and the RPHP I think we've had some different conversations of different interpretations of like what?

Was written in the report back of getting clarity on like I think.

When we originally had the presentation in December, there were things that came up about, oh, this will impact contracts.

I think that was clarified and it wouldn't impact contracts, but I will turn it to dcba to talk more about that part.

Good afternoon. Liz Murray's chief housing eviction protection at Dcva.

So the question is the impacts to contracts or the question is like, why adopt A formula when some of the recommendations from the report back were for no formulas?

So having no formula gives us the greatest flexibility to ensure that there are not lines of people waiting in certain regions and that we're able to be most responsive to need the areas that we currently prioritize.

Stay housed our unincorporated areas and priority ZIP codes.

Priority zip codes are identified by a constellation of factors that include many things

like likelihood of displacement already, and so having the flexibility to be able to serve any of the regions and any of the people in those regions where we see that need is the most F.

And therefore was our initial recommendation if we were to adopt Formula Five, it doesn't drastically change.

How services are allocated?

Currently, for most of the regions, as Wendy shared in SDS one and three, there would be no substantial change or no significant change to where services currently operate.

That's whether we look at where full spoke cases currently show up or whether we look at just overall programmatic spending.

The the percentages and we can share this out later today are all within like one or two percent, whether we're looking at full scope outcomes from calendar year 2024 or 2025.

Spending those things stay fairly the same as when you shared there would be a drop in SD two and a slight increase for 4:00 and 5:00.

I think the other thing to consider though is that the dollars that we're talking about in our eligible jurisdiction allocation from La Casa are not the only dollars that we have for using in unincorporated areas because we are working to implement implement the right to Council ordinance for.

Unincorporated areas we do have.

Other dollars.

These dollars are about 5 million of a \$22 million.

Program which we hope to keep at that rate, which would mean slightly increasing in the next calendar year, so that we're maintaining the level of service.

So this is an important portion of our funds, but it is not all of our funds, which is to say that we continue. We will continue to use other funding that we have from the county for state housed to continue to focus on unappropriated areas and priorities of.

Posts. So in short, there would not be a drastic change to operations and we will continue to prioritize unappropriate areas.

Then can I just then can I just add?

There is.

There's also an opportunity regarding the renter protection dollars. You know, we talked about the unique needs of each district and their on the incorporate

community that should there be a priority or you know where the board office. And the county need to focus on certain communities or populations. And talking to Rafael, that's that's possible to do.

Yeah, absolutely.

Good afternoon, everyone.

Rafael Carvalho honor and privilege to be the Director, Department of consumer Business Affairs.

Yes, it's absolutely doable.

I think the process would look more like identifying priority populations versus winners and losers, or who doesn't get who doesn't get identifying those ladders of services in a, the need arises and then if there's availability trickle down.

But like Marina said too, we do have additional dollars. This board has committed with the second county in the nation to adopt right to counseling blue.

And we have been looking to maintain that and follow through with that commitment. So as additional dollars come in, we'll take that into account as part of the formula and the services that.

Just to confirm, it is correct that the only district that would be different on the equity baseline is FD1 lower by three percentage points. Everyone else is either the same or within one or two percentage points higher.

Yeah. Can someone remind me where the?

The equity based life care.

That seems like a year ago, yeah.

We, uh as the CEO staff, which is now uh HSH stuff, created an equity baseline as a way to compare each formula to what a reasonable person might expect if resources for the creation of deeply affordable housing to prevent homelessness were to be allocated, it looks.

At where?

Our renters, who are disproportionately impacted by homelessness and poverty.

Where do they reside?

Across the unincorporated areas, so that was the reason for creating. It is like, how would we formulas as a as just a quick comparison, there's nothing sacred about it.

It uses demographics, so racial, ethnic demographics as well as.

Number of renters in each community. I think poverty rates, right? Mm-hmm. OK.

Thank you. And I don't.

Yeah. The on the PPO side, I think it makes sense to activate. I think I'm I'm more.

Blessed Souls on the rotating district piece of it only because we may not always have a project in that district on any given year.

So yeah. So another district? Yeah. I mean, I had the same salary. And I've gone back on this a lot. Yeah.

So and I think Matt is on the call, so and you still have had conversations about it as well.

It allows for lacta to have the flexibility to open it back up right, like if there aren't enough qualified projects in an area like there still is the flexibility to open it up to select other projects.

That's right, it's 18,000,000. And so I think our intention is like can we concentrate like it's such a small profit funding reduction, can we concentrate a very small resource for production to really sort of advance goals around one like hyper targeting locally right, like knowing that S.

Three and SD5 like might have projects in the pipeline very quickly. Very soon that were impacted by the fires.

Like can we think hyper locally?

Like concentrate resources that might.

Bit a gap there.

And and if there aren't the qualified projects that we're thinking of like, you know, there's still that flexibility.

So I don't know if Matt is on and wants to say anything.

I will say Lacta provided some edits to the motion to allow for that flexibility for the wording, but Matt, if you're on.

ML **Matthew Lust** 1:35:05

Oh yeah, I'm here.

Yeah, this this does provide enough flexibility that if we do not get projects in the in the target district, we can open it up for the rest of the county, which is typically what we do with any sort of targeted work through our nofa.

JW **Jeannette Ban West** 1:35:23

He decided.

Like the target District or like where so that I don't want I we don't have in the motion to be prescriptive and and leave it up to lacta to decide but happy to hear any thoughts if you guys have thoughts.

I don't. I guess I was just curious if it was written in the motion that there would be like a report back or like LACDA would develop some sort of metrics in terms of how they would target or we can strengthen the language to like lacda like being.

More explicit.

About like LACDA developing, how they would rotate it.

Yeah. I think for us, you know, we were thinking about the districts that have been fire impacted.

But I think there's a lot of different ways to cut it, right?

Cut it by Reena.

You could cut it by like furthering affirmatively affordable housing like there's different ways I think to, but if anyone has thoughts I think be happy to include it.

Thank you all.

Yes, I I don't know what can be done to address this. The SD one that just seemed troublesome.

I don't know what would happen there.

For us sitting, we're at 1%.

I mean, I think we'll support where this goes, but the one thing that stands out is in Directive 2.

So I know that SD4 you've you've been pushing for this.

UA departments and support that support there being someone over that work, I think reporting to the director of HSH and like impacting their own chart and their development don't support particularly because so there are in the homeless count from a couple years ago, which is the most recent.

Count in the unincorporated 1973.

Obviously, I understand the board's commitment to those people.

But we have a similar commitment to all kinds of sub populations, all of which are more than 1973 use 2300 women, 22,000 older adults, 16,000.

So I don't make sense to have another direct report or an incredibly impacted director. I think we can have this manager, but they should be placed in equal chart in the way that all of the comparable managers would be placed over some populations.

And the thought was because right now in the executive team, there's there's Cherie, there's Carter, there's.

No vibi.

And then that answers to that.

They're part of the executive team of HSH.

And so the thought was that this individual be part of the executive team, sort of be the driver and I and I understand, you know, there's we have other population that we work that we work with, which those populations are all included in individuals experiencing homelessness within UN.

It's just the thought was that this person, by having being able to directly be a part of the executive team and the decision making.

You know with the different.

Individuals of the different branches can sort of work with them and their sub teams to address the issues, specifically in unincorporated. And so that was sort of the mindset of why the thought was.

To elevate this individual to be part of the executive team, answer directly to Sarah.

To bring in the coordination and resources.

They would also coordinate.

They with the other departments 'cause.

Like there's a ton. I'm looking at this from like a very holistic. You're gonna have a ton of things that go in, in out of our incorporate areas, right.

Whether it's DPSS, whether it's D MHI mean can't just say.

HSA fix all the problems on helplessness, right?

Absolutely. That will not happen and they're not funded to do that. I know, yeah.

They try though I I appreciate that.

But I'm thinking too if if your vision for my but I understand this person would also kind of be like a liaison directly to the not that we don't have.

Communication going on between requirements, but also expect specifically to unincorporated for those other departments right impacting our unincorporated, right, right, right. And then to make them a part of the executive team to then bring that back and then be at the level to coordinate with similar individuals within.

The other departments I just wanna point out that you can parse out any population with the same argument.

So I want there to be someone that reports to Sarah for every survivor. Domestic violence who is arguably universally more vulnerable than a lot of our populations. I can make a really compelling argument for that. I can do the same for youth.

I can do the same for older adults as you can do for UAI.

Think that's problematic?

And the more the board parses out populations and sort of says like, oh, this is going

to be, you know, inherently prioritized over that it impacts their ability to go have a regional response to.

So I don't support that at all.

I think the supervisor would we we sit back a lot as as prescriptive as we can often be, particularly around the organization of the new department.

So I think that's problematic.

I also know if you've had direct reports that takes time.

This person deserves a supervisor who has the time to invest in them, which should be one of the people who report to Sarah.

And then I mean, they can have access. They're gonna.

They're greatly.

You know, there's been a lot of push around, even naming who this person is.

Sending the board doesn't do specific to staffing in my experience.

I don't think they should.

That's happened here, so I think it's it's just, it's so overreach to me to say this is how you should fund your your chief line.

And again I I mean I think we could hear from all kinds of subpoena.

As number of thousands of us and the people exiting child welfare, those are every bit as much ours as the UA.

So why don't they get their own person?

Can I can I respond to that?

I think you know the board is the UA's most direct, most local form of local government.

Government and they're responsible for municipal services a lot, which needs to be coordinated for things like encampment cleanup.

And you know, for those of us that have large UA populations that it feels like a lot of the time that are because the county is board is county wide that, but it even though only one million of the people have that direct, there's they have no other.

Form of elected that that is an important.

Population that gets overlooked when we talk about regional coordination when there's.

On top of the board, there's also cities and things advocating, right.

So I hear you, but I don't think you can make an apples and apples to comparison because at the end of the day the UA communities are don't have another form of government BBQ for them and that we are responsible for things like.

Trash pickup. Illegal dumping.

Direct service direct services, right?

So that's not what this person's going to do.

And this person the the UA is going to get a manager because of the argument you just made.

I don't think that person should report to Sarah.

That's all I'm saying, and that's what it says here.

Direct report to the director of HSH.

What do you mean that that this person isn't going to do?

They're not going to be over tracking up.

They're working in HSH, right?

But they might need to coordinate that with like encampment resolution, things like that, that require all, and they should continue to do that in the department and then report to the appropriate person in the way the org chart has been set up.

100% they're getting this person orders agreed to that.

I think the issue is at what level this person is sort of, elevating the importance of the, at least for our elevate, the importance of the unincorporated communities that this person's at a level that they go directly to the director to address homelessness and housing and all.

Its other related activities in unincorporated LA County.

And all its other so, can HSH weigh in here please?

Sarah van I have the privilege of being the director of the Department of Homeless Services.

Housing appreciate this conversation and the board's commitment to our unincorporated communities.

We share that commitment and we I have this has been a piece of careful consideration over the last six months and as we've been working on developing our org chart, working with C Class CEO classes, Seth is still assessing this position to determine what the classification will be.

In the new department, where it is envisioned to be sitting.

And why I think it's appropriate, we said it is under our what we're functionally calling right now.

Again, everyone's classification is still under review, but is under our senior director of partnerships and strategy.

And similarly positioned is our director of Municipal Relations, who manages our

relationships with all 88 cities.

So it would be at the same sort of reporting level as the the person that manages the relationships and strategies.

And responses with our cities to homelessness in those jurisdictions, we would under this would be under Carter. He is our senior director.

And and really would enable. I think this position to be able to succeed and have the appropriate level of supervision and support, but also be able to bring in the other assets that Carter's team has that will really enable, I think this position to be able to. To drive more results.

I'll just say that every single position essentially in HSH is going to have to be coordinated with other county departments and helping bring the county's response. It is not just this position that is the work and that is the charge of the board is that we are bringing the full county set of resources to be responding to homelessness and my job to be working with my colleagues who share in that commitment and the.

Board's commitment to homelessness.

So I just want to say like I I don't.

That is the charge of everyone at HSH.

Is not just people who are in the executive leadership level who who have that responsibility to be working with, with other other count departments. And I'd like to offer Carter an opportunity.

Just add a little bit about how you're thinking about the skills of your team. Can be cross leveraged.

Yeah. And I wanna reassure you, we understand the like, the hope for this and my I feel confident that by leveraging it in our team.

The kinds of things you're wanting to see accomplished.

Will be accomplished. For example, our team overseas communications, highly effective communications and one of the things we've heard from you all is that we are not effectively communicating and engaging with our unincorporated area partners.

We're not understanding who those stakeholders are.

We're not understanding how they receive messaging, how they can keep track of what's happening in their communities, and we have a communications team who would be part of helping this office.

Be successful at Strategic communications in the unincorporated areas.

We in our team manage the Local solutions fund resources for the unincorporated areas.

And so the resources to drive progress and the coordination across the entire department on those strategies to achieve the measurable in the unincorporated areas is what this team is sort of charged with doing.

And so it's where we sit.

Like what are we trying to accomplish and how are we coordinating across the department to accomplish it? So it isn't what I just want to communicate mainly is like I see.

Absolutely a pathway to deliver what you want in the way that we're setting it up right now and the synergy that we have on my team, I feel like is the kind of synergy that we need is to make this successful. And the reason I'm confident is in.

Part because, you know, we heard you on encampments with the work we've done with home and we have focused a heavy part of that intense coordination on on corporate areas. Impacted. Mm-hmm. And.

That has that's been something we've protected and that has not been always a popular choice among all the other municipalities that expect results on a camera resolution.

But we hear you that like there is not enough progress in unincorporated areas, we see a pathway to improve it.

Set this office up for success with this energy in my division and I just wanted to sort of communicate that.

Can I chime in? Because so in full transparency like we've had a lot of conversations partner and I've been mainly sitting back 'cause I wanted to hear people's reactions and their thoughts and.

You know, I I know our conversation came after submitting this for cluster.

And so I think like our intention really is that like from the supervisors perspective like thinking how do we impact systems and how do we think systemically about right like.

Currently, you know Sarah's here. Carter's here.

But like beyond us, our board offices are here.

But like beyond all of us transitioning out of these positions, like what does it mean to have someone who is solely focused to unincorporated services, even though similar to sub populations that should be something that everyone is doing right, not just in this department, across departments, across differe?

Programs.

But how do we really have that person?

You know, I think.

It's important right now, 'cause. We're all at the table.

We all have buy in about who this person is.

I know you guys have been very dedicated.

Our office has been pushing on.

Beyond our time here, right?

Like, how do we find that balance to make sure that this person still has the authority and ability to be able to move through?

Very complicated bureaucratic systems.

While like maintaining obviously what you guys have been creating.

And so I think for for part of the intention like it is that like beyond, yes, there is buying now.

So beyond that, how do we assure that this person has authority and delegation?

Beyond all of these being here, so I don't know if that's that's sort of a question to you question to other board colleagues that they have suggestions.

I think I do.

That's how I am thinking about it. If I can rephrase that and I think what you're asking is how is this position gonna be empowered to, I think execute what the the board offices who represent a large majority of the unincorporated areas, want to see done and prior.

Without, you know, having to go through maybe a more bureaucratic or I don't want them to be like a technical assistant.

This is, I think, the vision was somebody who could go in there say, this is what the unincorporated prior for the board and be able to leverage and execute so.

With no disrespect to the current structure, I guess the reason you know for having it carved out was feeling like maybe for this world it'd be more efficient.

It would operate better outside of that structure, right? I think what?

I think what I experience is that we the department through the boards, directed authorities, have authority.

We have emergency authority authorities. We have been instructed to move with urgency and I think in in several examples we've done that in several not not enough.

In all the inappropriate areas, but in several ones, we've made a tremendous impact.

What I think I'm seeing maybe differently than you is like I'm not thinking about the

person as much as the capability and what we need to enshrine is a capacity of this office to make impact.

Yeah. The capacity of this office to coordinate a capacity of this office to elevate the needs of the unincorporated areas, just like to a level that we've historically elevated the needs of cities.

And to really deliver on that and I think ice can see it.

Just because I'm sitting here looking at these capacities and figuring out how to put them together and therefore I'm not as worried about the person being like enshrined as I am, the the skill set, the capacity, the functions, and I think that might be one of the differe.

I think I'm also not worried about the person, right?

I think that's actually quite opposite like I think by systematizing it like you're removing like it, it should be that regardless of the person, right? So.

I think.

You're the positionality is what you're. Yeah, like I think right now, right.

Positive. The people who are here. You get what the concept is.

Sarah gets what the concept is like her board colleagues, beyond us being here like, well, that's the case, right?

And so I am thinking about the capacities like how do you enshrine the capacities to make sure that they are and empowered?

In the ability within the arts, yeah, I think you've done pieces of it like you're you've created.

Did this office.

It's it's it's required to create it is either real authorities that need to delegate it to this department.

So I think there are pieces of it.

You've already.

This board has already set in motion, and maybe I'm just acknowledging like I find those pieces very helpful to achieve the effectiveness to achieve.

And we can keep going.

But I think that you've you've done substantial taken substantial action to empower other.

And it's it's in, like, enshrined literally in the duty statement of the position.

And and what they're responsible for and what they're tasked with. And like I'm clear about wherever this person sits on the work chart, even if there are many low wages

below harder, which I'm not saying, then we'll be right pursuing that.

But this person has to have a direct relationship with your offices. And because these are your unincorporated communities and we are the frontline, so they need to be working with your offices on developing the strategy and approach for the communities in your districts.

And working together on that. So and then it's going to be different.

That's your point, Ivan.

Each each of you know our each of our areas really are different and we need to respond differently.

And so this person is going to be charged to be working with your offices on developing the plan and implementing the plan for each of your unincorporated areas to make sure it speaks to these needs.

I have a question if y'all can say where other departments have Deputy chiefs that are just UA specific.

This would be sort of BBS I think, right that way.

They're based on the other TA.

There's other positions within lacta that would be focused on UA.

And similar in other position, I think within DCBA, but they've asked for in their budget though, so that'll be a definitely cheaper.

But they're also not in charge of like, implementing the whole plan, so there's a bit of a difference.

But I I thought our conversation yesterday was really helpful.

I mean, I don't.

I don't but.

Anyone else?

I think SE three technically still had it, so we we still have 45 minutes.

I think I've said.

Any questions on anything else?

OK. We will close out the cycle. OK any item?

Thank you everyone for for joining any items for future.

Do you have an item?

I don't know how to tee it up though. When I was, I really wanted to have time to talk to Coco first. So.

You know, obviously the relationship that we have with the city of Los Angeles is also really important.

People are homeless. Are there 70% of the resources go there?

And when you listen to them at, you know, press conferences with us or I think what I often hear are different electives talk about in their private conversations sounds very different than how they talk about the county like H&H or HSC. I would encourage anyone in.

This room listening in to listen to the the conversation that the Council members had yesterday in H.

That is not partnership.

It was very difficult to listen to and so I just, I just think we cannot have.

These conversations here, the success of HSH new County Department.

I don't know how we would agendize that, but like it, it feels like we're dancing around something by not calling out the kind of accusations that were making publicly in these small committee meetings.

And then we just kind of come here and act like it's not happening when.

Our partnership and integration is so critical to the success of all of our response.

I don't know how we tee that up and I don't know if that's a conversation that maybe Anna can help us.

Sorry, Ann. I didn't talk to you beforehand about this, but maybe we talk about like, I don't know what that looks like.

An update from Gov Affairs on I don't know, but I I guess at the end of the day, I encourage everyone to listen to H&HA little more often because I think you'll be surprised at the way the county has discussed and the department has discuss.

Oh, that would be interesting, Jonas said.

Maybe we invite the city to come here and talk to us about they can bring their staffers, but maybe share the conversations if they're having an H directly with the county.

Because I know when we, for example, invited Councilman Mcuster came to the ECRC and seemed incredibly happy, was there over an hour that wasn't reflective of comments he made at H&H yesterday.

Let me let me go ahead and quote him and comment he made, which was.

This is like weekend at Bernie's. We're carrying the county around and doing their job.

That's direct quote.

So we got to have these conversations face to face.

We will discuss.

Thank you.

Thank you.

I had going from city to federal. The house is going through their spending plan discussions.

We'll see what the Senate and what the does, but that should be a big discussion on the federal spending update.

Cause what?

The House proposed was Billy to the dollars over what had previously been on the table.

So I think that's gonna change like depending on how that goes, that could really change the landscape for us this year.

OK.

OK. With that, we'll move on to public comment.

So members of the public, it is your right to participate in today's meeting and we encourage you to state another comment is related to one minute. So joining virtually should raise their hands on Microsoft Teams and unmute once calls upon by the chair. Those joining us via Tele.

Please press *5 to virtually raise your hand and *6 to unmute.

Yourself.

Danny Gonzalez, you should be able to unmute yourself, Mark.

 **Danny Gonzalez** 1:58:30

Thank you very much.

Hi there everyone.

My name is Danny Gonzalez, and I'm a policy advocate for the Los Angeles LGBT Center.

I wanted to uplift as we discuss evaluations and priorities regarding measure A that we continue to prioritize the lives of youth experiencing homelessness as well. The proposed fiscal year 2027 spending plan cuts.

The plan cuts deeply into programs that are proven to work for youth.

These include homeless prevention, housing, navigation, youth, family reconnection and supportive services are all being eliminated or severely reduced.

Just one year after voters approved Measure 8 with the expectation of stronger investments, not weaker ones, when prevention disappears, more young people enter homelessness. When time limited subsidies are cut, youth fall back into crisis.

When navigation is the part of services vanish, housing becomes unreachable or unsustainable. These.

Cuts dismantle fragile progress and push young people back into the streets.

We need to prioritize our youth that are living in homelessness.

Thank you very much.

JW Jeannette Ban West 1:59:33

Thank you.

Good.

Jessica Pearl.

JP Jessica Parral 1:59:42

Hello, my name is Jessica.

Hello, my name is Jessica Paral and I'm here on behalf of the Los Angeles LGBT Center as well. We thank you for the hard work of all of you who've worked to reduce the original \$303 million deficit. However, we do need the supervisors to.

Identify funding beyond measure A and reevaluate the \$52.5 billion county wide budget to address this crisis.

Our organizations are also urging Sacramento to do the same thing and restore cuts to half in the state budget at the state level. The funding set aside of 10% for youth, is already seeing a decrease in youth experiencing homelessness and addressing youth homelessness, a critical strategy to.

JW Jeannette Ban West 2:00:17

Hmm.

JP Jessica Parral 2:00:19

Ending chronic homelessness for all 50% of all chronically homeless adults had their first episode of homelessness. As a young person.

This budget severely reduces or zeroes out so many critical programs for youth.

The County budget campus.

Navigation has been zeroed out in Spa 3 alone, more than 790 referrals have made through campus pier navigation between August 2022 and March 2025.

Youth, family Right Connection has also been zeroed out. Transition youth in LA have greatly.

JW Jeannette Ban West 2:00:50

Thank you, Jessica.

We should be able to.

MA Marisol Alfaro 2:00:58

OK.

There you go. Good afternoon.

My name is Marisol Alfaro, and I work in senior housing at the Los Angeles LGBT Center. And I'm here to urge the committee to continue its efforts to identify funding to close at 219 dollars million gap in funding for homeless services at a time when. Resources are being cut across the board.

We cannot ignore who is harmed first.

LGBT people experience homelessness at far higher rates than the general population, with up to 30% of our transgender adults having homelessness in their lifetime.

For LGBT seniors, this crisis is especially severe.

Many age without family support face discrimination and housing and care settings and live on fixed incomes that leave them on an emergency away from losing their homes, cutting housing and support services right now doesn't reduce need.

It deepens inequality and denies older LGBT adults the dignity, safety and stability they deserve.

So please take the necessary steps to restore.

The funding to homeless services in LA County.

Thank you.

JW Jeannette Ban West 2:02:00

Thank you, Madison.

I think this one McDonald.

I think that was our scene.

Oh, OK, perfect. All right. With that, we are adjourned at 3:24.

Thank you.

Very good.

People.

● **Jeannette Ban West** stopped transcription