

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

Transcript

January 28, 2026

□ **Dardy Chen** started transcription

P Public Safety Cluster Transcription 11:34

Good morning, everybody.

Thank you for being here for today's public safety cluster meeting.

We're gonna go ahead and get started with introductions. We'll get started with SD1.

Hello, Martinez and I'll pass it off to my colleague here.

Hi, I'm Emily Desmond.

I'm fellow Aaron Lopez, also a fellow.

Hi, good morning, Natalie Romo, Senior Vice senior deputy and I'll let Paul introduce.

Dante Franklin.

Melody of Philly supervisor Mentor's assistant Justin.

Good morning, nick. Why Bill and justice?

I had some colleagues online and.

John Leonard, assistant chief staff.

In the SEC online, I would like to introduce himself.

ES Edwards, Steven 17:29

Good morning, everybody. Steve Edwards.

Sorry, I'm not there in person.

P Public Safety Cluster Transcription 17:35

NSP one I enclosed in your eyes senior justice and mental health deputy Supervisor Han and I have some colleagues in the room.

Alexandra Perez, just as mental health deputy. Hi, Esther linsen.

Your policy advisor, grandchildren and budget deputy Supervisor Han and I believe someone progresses through this work.

Hi, good morning, Senator Crossing district for supervisor, Barker.

We have our budget, deputy Michelle Vega online, and then I'll let my additional

colleagues introduce herself.

Hi everyone.

Leslie Gamo, assistant justice deputy.

You can all see for today's agenda. We have one informational item, one motion and one presentation item, as well as all closed session items.

So I do have a motion on the agenda today will be recorded so that it can be transcribed. And since we do have a packet, let's go ahead and get started.

We'll start off with the informational item, which is a board letter from the fire department.

To approve the acceptance of grant award funds from the state of California from the Department of Forestry inquired.

Is there any question from the deputies on this item?

Yes, I have a question, yes.

Is this the first time receiving this grant for this use at in Boldie?

Is anyone here from the fire department that can answer that question?

BW Brad Weisshaupt 18:53

Good morning, Brett Weiselp, assistant chief of the Forestry division line.

It is not our first call fire grant, but it is the first one in the Mount Baldy area.

P Public Safety Cluster Transcription 19:05

And is this work gonna be performed by higher personnel or is it gonna be subcontracted?

BW Brad Weisshaupt 19:10

Uh, it's gonna be a combination of fire personnel and California Conservation Corps crews.

P Public Safety Cluster Transcription 19:17

Thank you.

Any other?

Can you just clarify that this is creating essentially a road that cars can drive through to to get off the mountain?

Is that is that correct?

BW Brad Weisshaupt 19:33

No, this is widening the brush clearance along Mount Baldy Rd. which is the single point of access in egress for both residents and emergency personnel.

And there's roughly 400 structures, including an elementary school and everything in Mount Baldy. 358 of them are zoned residential.

And this is their one way in and one way out.

So the Forest Service.

The Angels National Forest Service is conducting fuels treatment around the community.

Of Mount Baldy and along their portion of the road under federal, and we're doing our portion of the road under state jurisdiction with this grant.

P Public Safety Cluster Transcription 20:14

Any other questions from the deputies on this item?

OK.

So now we'll take public comment on this item.

Are there any public comments in person or online for item 2A?

Please speak up in person or raise your hand if you can.

Seen them back to share. OK, so now we'll move on to today's motion, which is from SC3 with the title, transparency and unfairness in collective bargaining for LA County public safety workers through binding arbitration. And I'll pass it off to S.

Yeah. Hi Cecilia Kibeho for SG3.

Collective bargaining levels. The playing field between management and the workforce by giving workers unite the United Voice to negotiate for better pay, benefits and safer working conditions and increase job security.

This benefits management through lower turnover.

Clear expectations and more predictable planning.

This motion creating binding arbitration for 14 of the county's bargaining units levels the playing field at the bargaining table for state law.

Public safety unions are not allowed to strike, yet the power to call a strike is one of the most effective tools unions have in negotiations. Finding arbitration offers our public safety unions a different tool, while at the bargaining table.

It incentivizes both parties to come to a fair agreement and increases transparency at the bargaining process. Both parties appoint one representative to the three member

panel of the Arbiter and 3rd is chosen jointly by both parties, providing equal and fair representation to resolve disputes, the panel must consider.

A variety of factors when making a decision, including the financial condition of the county.

Currently 21 California jurisdictions have binding arbitration, two of which Sacramento and San Francisco, are counties.

Only six of those 21 jurisdictions have gone to binding arbitrations for the past I believe, six or seven years that they've had it.

The point of having our binding arbitration is to avoid going to binding arbitration, an incentive for both sides as outcomes are determined by a neutral third party.

As mentioned before, this proposal affects 14.

Bargaining units for a total of 16,535 employees. This is a particularly important, important moment for our public safety partners, as their and their ability to improve recruitment as they face staffing challenges while heading towards major events like the World Cup in the.

Olympics and happy to take any questions. So we'll open it up to questions now.

Any board offices have any questions?

I have.

I have some for the six of the 21 jurisdictions.

Could you let us know with what jurisdictions those are sure, Alameda.

Anaheim, Gilroy and I'm happy to provide this list too.

The chair, who can share to the CEO who can share it with them with the rest of the committee.

Cluster. Excuse me?

Alameda, Anaheim.

Gilroy, Hayward, Modesto, Monterey, Napa, Oakland, Oroville, Petaluma, Redwood City, Sacramento County, Sacramento City, San Francisco, which is both the city and County, San Jose, San Leandro, Santa Cruz, Santa Rosa, Stockton and Watsonville.

OK.

Thank you. You're welcome.

Any other question?

I just wanted to clarify what is a non administrative civilian like what classification would that be?

I'm going to have to defer to the lawyer on our team, Steven, like non civilian

administrator we I know, but not non administrative civilian.

Yeah. Is that the language?

ES

Edwards, Steven 24:02

I have to double check that.

I'm good.

P

Public Safety Cluster Transcription 24:04

OK.

What the classification is, because I I I don't know what that means.

That would be helpful.

Yeah, we can.

We can actually answer that now. If you're allowed to have.

Executive director from a labs. Well, that's dirty chair, even by my standards.

Yeah, Derek.

Sure, executive director for the Association for Los Angeles County Sheriff and also the chairperson for the coalition that represents the the Union seeking binary arbitration.

I believe that what you're speaking to is the language that exists in the ballot measure that's been submitted to the register recorder, and it's a clause.

And I don't have the document directly in front of me.

It's a clause at the end of the paragraph that says. I think it's a nonadministrative personnel on the following departments. In other words, it would exempt clerical from inclusion in the ballot measure. Is the purpose of that language?

OK.

Thank you.

But these are some people that are represented by CC.

No. In most cases those employees would be represented by SCIU 721 and they would not be included in the binary.

Trish. OK. And I think the the difference is that they are as members of 721, allowed to strike where in members of Ayla's Popa, etc.

Are not OK.

Thank you any other.

Yeah.

When the Prio talks about.

Other other terms and conditions of employment somewhat vague.

Are there some examples of what?

What would be disputed was when we're talking about other terms and conditions. Employment and also.

Benefit MOUS, fringe benefits, those kind of things.

Yeah. So I I'm again partially disadvantaged 'cause I don't have the document in front of me. The two pieces that you speak to there and this is from recollection is wages, hours and conditions of work is a term of art that's used in labor.

Wages and hours are pretty self-explanatory and public safety hours would include the the length of your shift.

For example, firefighters work 24 hour shifts.

Deputy sheriffs can work 8/10/12 hour shifts. That kind of thing.

And also the start time and the way the overtime is applied.

Conditions of work would include such things as safety, which for public safety employees is extremely important.

Other aspects of conditional work that could be included in a memorandum of understanding would be a uniform allowances, for example, public safety employees have to purchase their own equipment, so that's not wages or hours as a condition of work.

And that list is pretty expansive.

Depending on what's referred to as mandatory or permissive for bargaining.

And I'm not an expert on that, but that's kind of an expose and of itself.

Going back to the other piece where you mentioned the fringe MOU in the preamble and in the.

Both what is submitted to the register recorder and what has been submitted by the supervisor's office.

The aspects of the fringe where you're excluded from minor arbitration.

For the public safety unions and the unions that are represented by these folks here that are part of the team that's moving forward, finding arbitration, we are also members of the Coalition and county unions of which I'm the chair. That agreement encompasses approximately 35,000 employees, so.

In an effort to keep things I hate to say it simple.

That agreement is not included with this, so everything that's within the four corners of the.

Fringe Mou is excluded.

From binding arbitration in the form of interest arbitration.

All current MO US are included in what's known as grievance arbitration.

I may have confused the issue by drilling in there, but no, I appreciate that. Yeah.

Any other questions?

I have a question and then my colleague.

In the I think this might be a STC question, but in the preamble it talks about several other cities that have done this.

It means Sacramento County, San Francisco, et cetera.

Of those, are they?

Do they still have this process like they would still in existence today? Yes.

Hasn't been repealed at any point.

No, not that I'm aware of, OK.

And can we get that confirmed and I can Google it?

Sure. I just want to understand if it's been successful or if anyone else knows.

Yeah. Yeah, no.

Happy to send you the full list and which of those 21 jurisdictions did go to binding arbitration? Of those, only six did. I will ensure that I get you a list that says whether or not it's been ever repealed in other jurisdictions above and beyond the 21.

I don't believe that's been the case, but I think that's kind of illustrating. My point is that you have binding arbitration to avoid going to binding arbitration so that both sides are incentivized to come to a deal I understood.

I want to know if it's been successful, if it's, if the community doesn't like it. Whatever happened there, I don't know if I could produce a community survey, but I could definitely let you know if it's better.

Repealed in any of those versions, I hear. I hear you, and that we can look it up soon, but.

Just wanted to understand if that was something that went into the analysis of I'm putting this motion together.

That's my question.

KK

Kouassi, Koffi 29:33

Thank you.

Can I?

Can I go or?

P **Public Safety Cluster Transcription** 29:38

Yes.

KK **Kouassi, Koffi** 29:40

Good, good morning, Kofi Kwasi with Provost of Holly Mitchell. I have two questions. The first one is do we know for all those jurisdictions that did this, what was the impact on their budget?

Reason why I'm asking is we know the kind of situation, budgetary situation we're in and you know, so I just want to make sure that you know for those different other entities that use this process.

There wasn't a deleterious impact on the budget, you know, and again I'm I'm always.

P **Public Safety Cluster Transcription** 30:18

Unintended consequences.

KK **Kouassi, Koffi** 30:20

Yeah. So you know, I mean, there's one we really and weed right now, right. So I just want to make sure that again, given our budget situation, we're not putting ourselves, you know, down the road or downstream in a situation where we cannot afford the outcome of of this.

So do we know what was the budget impact or implications or consequences of using this process for those jurisdictions?

And do we analyze it?

P **Public Safety Cluster Transcription** 30:44

Did you not?

We we do not have.

We did not analyze 21 jurisdictions.

Budgets are especially budgets that did go to binding arbitration.

It's something we can possibly look into.

I don't know exactly when they did this.

I will have to look that up. However, I think that as we stated both in my opening remarks and I believe in the preamble, the part of the conditions of this, this

arbitrating panel would be to take into account what the city can afford. They're not going to bankrupt the city in favor of a negotiated MOU or an MOU. Rather I guess it's non negotiated at that point. So I don't believe that it's going to have an adverse effect, but to your point, we're happy to see if that had any adverse impacts in the six jurisdictions that did go to budget finding arbitration.

Yeah. And as Cece mentioned, you know the financial condition of the county is one of the factors that has to be looked at by that three member panel and assessed mentioned previously 2 two of the Members are selected by each sides and there's a neutral third party in.

There, the neutral third party is really kind of the one that is scary. That and so they will certainly be looking at the financial condition of the county and I don't think it's in the best interest of any of the parties to. Bankrupt the county or make a situation financially worse. That is part of the interest of binding arbitration, correct?

KK **Kouassi, Koffi** 32:10

So so speaking about that though, I mean, you know, yes, it's one thing to say we're selecting because that also speaks to my next question.

It's one thing to say that, hey, we're going to select, you know, a panel that hopefully you know, some of which can, you know, represent our interests and what not.

But how about you know, how do we know that they really understand the intricacies of our budget again?

As as a manager, the county as a manager, you know when the county comes to the table.

We have that expertise at the table, so aren't we removing that power and that knowledge and expertise you know and giving it away to, you know, a panel that may not have that understanding?

And again, we're assuming that they will have that understanding and you know, have that judgement. You know again in a way that will not undermine our budget.

But again, Matt, that that's what I'm we removing though that power away from ourselves.

And then, you know, undermining ourselves down the road.

Potentially.

P **Public Safety Cluster Transcription 33:11**

No, that's incorrect.

Because our side, the county side is selecting one of the panel members.

So the county member would bring the expertise of the budget and of the county's financial situation to the table. The Union representative would bring their side of their expertise to the table.

That's the exact reason that each side selects a member so they can bring the expertise and they can bring the information for that side to the table.

And then you have the neutral third party to look at both of those sides.

And come to a conclusion. Do I have anything Derek?

Yeah, Sir.

Additionally, during the arbitration process in the remote chance that it does occur, both parties can call witnesses. Both expert witnesses and staff witnesses.

The County of Los Angeles is extremely well equipped as a jurisdiction to provide staff witnesses.

It's well resourced in this budget and it's understanding and has robust staff in that area and so I would not anticipate that the county of Los Angeles in any way would be disadvantaged in making a budget presentation.

I come from a jurisdiction that had binary arbitration to settle our contract and I come from a state where the economy was extraordinarily cyclical from Alaska, where the price of oil literally would wake up and it would change our economy.

We never utilize binding arbitration to settle a contract, but the threat was out there and brought the parties together.

In my opinion, and I think you will find.

Find this if you read arbitrators reports both for binding arbitration to settle labor disputes or even business disputes where it's used widely.

The intricacy of the discussion of detailed aspects to be considered by the arbitrator is robust.

It is essentially a court process.

Witnesses are sworn in. In addition to the experts, the parties can provide exhibits, and so it's extremely detailed and there's precedent for this. When the county was negotiating 218 settlement agreements, the county brought in budget experts and individuals to explain the county's budget process and what.

The county's budget looked like during those settlement agreements for 8280, so

this is something the county's done before.

And finally, the county has to agree on the 3rd panelist, so they will not agree on someone who is not going to fundamentally understand what the county's budget is, and the county spot forecasting is and what the county's budget process is.

Kopi I would also add that I think with the current process.

I don't know that negotiate on behalf of the county have the budget experience.

They're the employee relations folks.

They're not the budget folks.

That's in the correct.

So just add that in for context.

KK **Kouassi, Koffi** 35:53

OK.

Thank you.

P **Public Safety Cluster Transcription** 35:56

Any other questions?

Yes, I just have one more additional.

So we know that.

Other jurisdictions have this model.

Curious if there's anything that's been proposed in this motion that is unique or just specific to LA County, or if we just kind of take took pieces from, is this in jurisdiction?

Looks like they're joining in a friend.

We'll invite another representative. Sure, sure.

Hi, Barry darling with a lads. Let me answer that question.

What's specifically different in this one is the fact that it carved out the fringe.

That's very, very unusual.

Normally it's everything on the table.

This is a way more focused initiative and a more focused way to get to a result. In addition to that, many of the other.

Initiatives that are out there in charters across the state are made-up of in two different ways.

Either they have a three person panel or just one person. You have the option in this to do either one. Whichever the parties decide to give him the issues that be in front

of you.

Thank you so much.

Any other questions?

Yeah, just a quick question. I noticed in the preamble it says that the existing meet confer system would still apply to topics like employee discipline.

Policies governing departmental operations, procedures, practices, just wondering if. That was just a decision just to keep this. It sounds like you said, like limited to a very kind of limited scope, is it?

Is this not an option in the future to expand it to those types of negotiations as well? I mean, I think everything's on the table in the future.

There's nothing precluding that the purposes of this, we wanted it to be narrowly defined to be the wages MOU. Thank you.

And I also think the county and other entities within the county wants the flexibility for the fringe benefits for working conditions, etc.

So instead of having to go to finding arbitration, but this is really about the wages where we get stuck as we've seen in both past and current contract warden negotiations.

Sorry, could you just explain a little bit about like the fringe benefits?

Like exactly when that, like an example I guess of.

Go ahead.

Yeah, yeah.

So again, Derek, in in this case, I'll represent the coalition and county unions.

So Los Angeles County, in my experience, is extremely unique.

Some time ago and it would be decades ago.

There was an agreement struck where?

Unions within the AFL-CIO formed the Coalition to county unions.

The coalition of county unions negotiates Los Angeles County's I refer to as the Fringe MOU, and it covers such things as the medical contribution, primarily it it covers certain aspects of other benefits like leaves.

It includes contributions to pension and the things that frequently are referred to as fringe, and so in this case.

When we developed this, that was excluded from this process.

In most cases you would include it, and that's been my experience, but because of the system and the structure that's already in place in Los Angeles County, the intent was to provide minimal disruption to those structures.

Yeah. Essentially it's a separate MOU that covers a much larger group of employees. So that's why it's it's not the same group that is covered in the other muns. So that's why it was called and in general fringe is what we consider our benefits. Retirement, health care, et cetera.

OK, cool. Thank you. Mm-hmm.

Any more questions before we move on to public comments?

OK. Then we'll move on to public comment.

Everybody will have one minute.

Are there any further comments in person today?

Seen that.

Are there any public comments online if you are online, please raise your hand on teams or speak up please.

Once. Twice. OK, thank you everybody.

Thank you for presentation.

So now we'll move on to our next item, which is.

Johnson, start your time when you start speaking.

You can have one minute.

Go ahead.

HJ Hans Johnson 40:30

Good morning. Justice deputies and good morning assembled stakeholders including Cecilia Cabello, and I'm pleased to see they're representing Supervisory District 3. I wanted to speak on behalf of concerns by our civilian oversight Commission about the language involving meet and confer used in the motion and the recent efforts.

To misuse, meet, and confer to Trump.

State law and county.

Ordinances about protection of the public's right to transparency and accountable public safety in Los Angeles County.

I just want to raise questions about the effort to reinforce, meet and confer as a form of an end run or a possible trump card against other existing policies, including state law, that it was not intended to do and that the origins of meet and confer from ninet.

69 in the Myers Meeleus Brown Act do not give it authority to do so.

I just want to raise that concern for the supervisors and their deputies and for the representatives of Labor there about how meat and confer has.

P Public Safety Cluster Transcription 41:49

My minute is up.

Sorry about that anymore public comment.

Thank you.

And so thank you everybody.

We'll move on now to the next item, which is a presentation on modernizing probation related.

Sorry for the disruption. Thank you.

These are.

Good morning, deputies.

My name is Stephanie Sorella.

I'm the CEO and I will allow my colleagues to introduce yourself. Good morning.

My name is Al from CEO and we also have provision Tasha with LA County Probation Department and the one Belt Department of Youth Development.

So today's presentation is a report back regarding the response to Directive, one of the motion that was adopted by the board on September 30th, 2025 to modernize PROBATION'S discretionary funds.

CEO convened a work group, including probation, Dyd County Council and the auditor controller, and the work group collaborated and developed and modernized draft policy, which was included in the agenda for your review.

So the policy was developed by utilizing existing CDPP and anti gang guidelines as a foundation and incorporating feedback received from the board offices and it addresses directives run a through 1D of the motion. Some of the highlights of the draft policy is it consolidated the CDPP and.

Anti gang into one single program which is the youth delinquency and gang prevention program.

This is to improve administrative efficiency.

And provide greater flexibility for the board offices. Also part of the draft policy is new quarterly reports will be which will be provided to the board offices to provide more timely and accurate visibility into contract activity and funding availability.

Also, new request forms that were included and the board may use this as part of the request process, but the draft policy clarifies that.

It's the administrator's responsibility to obtain the information on those forms. Also, the eligible population increased from 18 and under to 26 and under to include the Tay population. It also removes the requirement of a 501C3 nonprofit organization requirement and expands eligibility to organizations, public or private, that are community based agencies.

It also expands service categories and includes an other service category to offer flexibility.

It also clarifies the funding divided among each.

Supervisorial district and it also clarifies the current process for regarding the unallocated funds at the end of the fiscal year and that any amount unallocated at the end of the fiscal year is not automatically carried over, but it will be evaluated during the budget process and subject to.

Approval by the board during the county's budget process, and it also clarifies and defines direct costs that they're for expenses specifically identified with and necessary for carrying out a particular program.

Project.

Or service and that allowable direct costs include infrastructure, equipment upgrades and any start up costs that support program implementation.

So if there are, well, we would love feedback from the board, from the board offices regarding the draft policy.

But if there are no concerns, the next steps would be CEO would draft a board letter to request board approval of the board policy.

I do want to flag the draft policy.

Does have a placeholder for to designated administrator?

On the second page. So we're requesting feedback to update the policy that that will be attached to the board letter. And just to note, if transfer of administration were to occur, there would be no interruption of services to existing contracts, it would just require coordination between the work.

Group partners.

And that concludes our presentation.

Open up to any questions and feedback.

Questions from Debbie.

Thank you.

So I I want to start by saying I think it's great that we're trying to one focus these

funds, consolidate them, make sure they're expanded to more new, particularly transitional ages.

I think that's great and the flexibility of the funds because God knows it's been a struggle for me.

It's more I I my question is more on timeline.

Particularly.

The I know the motion, the original motion said that after the cluster there's kind of up to 45 days to bring it to the board.

And if I'm looking at it, that means sometime in if if it is the actual 45 days that would be sometime in like April Ish or end of March.

Is that correct or OK before I make that assumption?

I guess for me it's it's really understanding kind of it sounds to me after that 45 days after the policy is in place.

Any new contracts or new allocations would be subject to this policy.

Correct, right.

OK. And also the existing contracts?

There's some language in there about a minute existing contracts to add, to expand for the new policy, right?

If if someone wants to right, yes.

If there's existing contract and you say, hey, you know, I actually want to expand it to. The transitional agency, you can do that.

Then the administrator would do a modification.

Got it.

So I for me it's more the the timeline, it feels kind of quick to one get it done.

I'm not saying that you guys can't do that, but to like change kind of how this works before the end of the fiscal year is is a little concerning.

I also think for.

Like for example like our office we do.

We have like a funding request portal that we open up quarterly.

And.

This would kind of interrupt that, right?

Like if a if that Portal opens up the the person's midway would be subject to this new.

This these new criterias right 'cause the policy would then go into effect before.

Or after they would come in after the policy had went into effect.

So kind of switches that up and maybe that's just like a personal thing for our office, but that's where my concern is with lying right now, just in the end.

No, that's not you.

Also, more so maybe the author's office on the 45 days situation versus starting this at the in the new fiscal year, right?

Like starting from that point on, we're doing this.

So I just.

I wanted to understand kind of some.

That's my feedback, but just wanted to understand if there's flexibility in in that and is it feasible?

I know it was like a long shot, but so I can address that question.

Not unless you want to set it. OK, so a lot of the contract that we have are not in the fiscal year, which means we just got to request a contract yesterday, which means that contract will probably have March 1st to 2026 states like March 20.

27 So you have a lot of contracts that are staggered. I think maybe one or two maybe in the fiscal year.

The new policy is expanding the services, so if you do have a process in place right now and you're about to open up a portal, of course solicitation or agencies to request funding, what will allow them, they would be able to submit.

Submit their request and then it 45 days later add to that request.

So it's not taking away any of the any of the policy.

Now it's just enhancing it so the population is to be 18.

Now it's up to 25, so you have expanded the policy used to be for nonprofits.

Now you can open up to open it up for for profits, so you won't really have too much of A disruption.

As far as your policy, because we are adding to what the existing policy is.

And the it's just a lot of process.

So to follow to Natalia's 45 day point, but that's under the assumption that the administrator wouldn't change, right?

No, I think it would be the same thing. It would be 45 days if it transfers over to Dydi would I would think so, yeah.

I mean, I yeah, I'm not sure what the process is as far as the funding and what that would look like, the funding having to transition over and I don't know whether adjustment if that's gonna be part of the Seal's board letter. You know, once the the. Funding transfer's over.

Then if they make it that way, then of course the 45 days will kick in and it's something they can start on right away. If the decision is made to transfer, you don't have to wait for 45 days. So we don't anticipate if the board Dec.

To do the transfer of administrator and disruption in the contracting portion from your part from the UAT stance, no?

So you have staffing and everything prepared in order to receive and function as the administrator.

Yes, yes and no.

From a contract perspective, from an administrative perspective.

Yes, we do have.

Staff in place to be able to absorb the workload and assist with the transition, however.

We do have there would be exposure on the county side.

Right now we have 3 accountants that processes roughly 1000 invoices per year and so right now they're sort of stretched in and I think as a part of the as the County Council's response, there is a modest request to add 1 accountant to be able to.

Be able to absorb their workload. So to answer your question is both yes and no. In terms of the handling the workload.

Do you want to clarify also?

The through discussions in the work group, I think for clarity and keeping things as clean as possible.

The goal is maybe to do that transition with the administrator as well, funding wise in the beginning of the fiscal year as opposed to in the Meadow. I think it would just align with the budget processes.

So is that. Does that mean that in the before the end of fiscal year, let's say through June 30?

Probation would still remain the administrator, and if the board choose to make a transition then that would be effective July 1st.

Ideally that would be the the best process action.

Could you talk more about those conversations about the administrator and how you all are getting their information especially?

I know that this has been.

It was recommended to explore transferring the administration, UAT and we talked about the administrator, but.

I think just fitting in with your programmatic needs and you know the future of both

departments, how you each are thinking about each department. CEOs have made their recommendation yet. And I think that.

Our input would probably be taken into account there, so our recommendations included in county Council's confidential report that could include as an attachment.

Did not.

I don't know if you get to speak on the transition.

I can't look into that.

Come.

Things under asked the question I initially had, but can you speak of bit more about what at the end of that fiscal year I guess reevaluate and ask done by CEO, can you just share a little bit about what that process would look like at the end of?

Next fiscal year.

Like with any unspent unallocated funds.

So that's something new.

So Stephanie has to that.

So the current process, so the draft policy is the current process. So usually at the end of the fiscal year, whatever is unallocated probation will submit with their supplemental budget package, they'll submit a request for carryover of those unspent funds. And that's weekly goes through the budget process.

Where it's evaluated.

And then it's presented.

We come back to cluster also.

It's part of the package that's presented for carryover and if approved and approved by the board, it gets added as one time funds to the to the budget.

It's currently in the community based contracts budget, OK.

So it would come back as this is what was like the carryover and then it'll come back again in terms of like what the recommendation is and how where that carried over would go. OK. Right. Thank you.

****.

Any other questions?

I think we have some folks that received the cocoa analysis.

So if ever had that kind of research related, you know?

You said you didn't receive it.

Maybe. Yeah. I think some of us did not.

Yeah, I think it went to the chiefs with the JDS. Did not receive this.

OK, we can we can make it distributed.

Yeah, it was our analysis along with the CE OS analysis is attached. Thank you.

If you want to send it to me, I can give it to you.

Sure, I will.

Thank you, Jerry.

Any other question?

Can you verify the next steps?

So depending on I guess feedback from the board offices, we would need to update the draft policy cause. Currently it has a placeholder.

Of who?

The administrator should be and then we would CEO would submit a board letter to request for board approval of the policy.

And then if the administrator were to change, we'd have to include delegated authority for the potentially new administrator to execute contracts.

And we're confident that can get done 45 days after or after it's approved.

The policies could then all the I'm I'm I'm concerned because I do think that this goes in 45 days in April. By that time hopefully everybody's you know together.

I know the words working together, but after that 45 day mark or whenever it comes to the board that that policy is now in effect and all the all the things that go with it, which are great things, right, like quarterly reports, all these different things we.

Confident that whoever the I'm looking at your whoever the administrator is can do that and pick it up and go with it right at that time.

Or whether it be alive, kind of like what are we expecting?

So for probation, it would just be modifying some existing exhibits to to the current contract and once we find out who the administrator is, whether it's dyo probation, we can start either probation or dye can start a contracting process. We don't have to wait until it's approved you.

Can anticipate the approval and start the contracting process.

So the sooner whichever department knows, it'd be the better.

So that we can actually start working on the the modifying the existing contracts, modifying new contract or developing a new contract so that when you start making your future allocations, then we can be be prepared. So it doesn't really matter if it's dyd.

The sooner the better.

So whatever department is going to be the administrator and from a so from a

process perspective, when is that notification then given like for example let's say. We I'm using this but like say oh we want to keep it in stock and some of the other office no we wanted in dyd like that seems like it's not gonna officially happen until it goes to the board or in a board letter goes to the board.

In the board approved it so like you wouldn't know in advance if it's gonna be either one of you all until that happens.

OK.

Not unless it's like unanimous.

No, Please wait now.

But if there's an unanimous decision, then we kind of know.

And then we can prepare to transition the work over.

Are you guys preparing now?

Like, no, we're not OK.

No, we're not.

That's that's where I'm.

Yeah, I hope we thought we would have been. We thought we were gonna be notified.

We didn't know that it was gonna be a close report.

OK.

So we thought we would have known, but even that report what I'm saying is that report is still a recommendation, right?

Like the board has to offer, of course.

And if that until that happens, none of us know what that means, right?

Until they vote on that. So from that point on, then you'd be preparing for this transition and that's where I'm seeing the concern is because if they don't know now and they won't know now until that 45 day mark or whenever it comes to the board.

Then they only have this kind of really not even a period to transition.

If there's a chance that that kind of like, unless we have like a grace period after it's approved by the board.

What what's gonna happen and transferring those if they're getting transferring those things over?

That that I would say, Natalia, given that this was an ST3 motion, I don't know that if it's possible to change in, you know, in CEOs, network games, I think that would be fine with the longer runway, right.

And if that's afterward an issue for for, I'm not concerned about.

It being transferred within 45, if that's the move for did you want to make? If it if we want to move to 90 or.

Overlong, Umm, CEO may recommend, or we may recommend. Uh. I think we'd be OK with that, would it?

Would it make sense to depending I mean I guess the administrator wouldn't really matter who that entity department will be, but to a line up policy with the fiscal year, I was just thinking about that during the discussion, maybe it would make more sense to align that because.

Ideal transition would take place at the beginning of the fiscal year, and that way maybe the new policy, if it were transferred, could align as well.

I mean, you have that kind of runway from like I'm using April because like the 45 days have been April, but it could be whenever.

But like you haven't run away from April to the first of the fiscal year to then transfer. And and have. If there's a transfer, have those conversations. Get the mechanisms up and going. It doesn't seem like it's gonna take that much, but get that like you have a little leeway there to do that versus like the positive effect.

Now we gotta do it.

Here, let's get it going.

So that's that's kind of where I'm at.

I appreciate the issue though.

Can I clarify?

Sorry, you you the board letter does need to specify who will be administering the program, right? Right.

Draft policy.

That's attached to the board letter Umm. And if it were to yeah, it should identify as well, because delegated authority is currently for the CPP and anti gang and because we're creating a new policy and a new program, we should extend that delegated authority to whichever department.

Policy so and then how exactly are we identifying that that's what, that's where my.

That's where we're, that's where we're.

Yeah, I I think that you all were saying that you were gonna take the feedback that we provide.

And make your own recommendation.

That's how I was taking it.

But again, I think that we all didn't receive that Coco report, so that analysis taken on

I think would be helpful for us to get that feedback and then feedback to like we take it back to our bosses and then give feedback to the CEO to 'cause you.

You all will be preparing the board letter. You can reach out. You can reach out to me and he will and be happy to to gather that feedback and put together a report later based off of the feedback.

Just one more question for probation.

How many staff are currently like working on this?

We have one analyst, though. Contracts OK and that's like their role. Like that's like, no, that's not their only role.

They have other responsibilities, but we have one main one main Wayne main staff and this is about 35% of his work. Thirty 4040% of his work. Thank you.

It was helpful asking in terms of like capacity.

Oh yeah.

Well, he does competitive stations. All that other.

So this is part of his workload. Thank you.

Today's January 28th.

So by when would you want us to get you?

That's possible.

I don't remember the exact.

I should have a timeline to meet the to go before the board, but I I did hear you mentioned there is a little flexibility.

As soon as possible, which is the 17th, and I'm OK with that transition via fiscal year.

For both policy and administrator, if we wanna make that change.

So being that, I don't think that we would necessarily need to rush this in the next week.

Any other question?

Thank you.

Thank you.

Right now, we'll.

Are there any public comments in person or online today?

That person, or if you're online, please speak up or raise your hand on teams, please.

OK, seeing them back to oh, let's we'll move to general public comment.

Are there any general public comments?

I'm seeing them all right, then I that concludes today's opening session for public meeting.

- **Dardy Chen** stopped transcription