

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

## **Transcript**

### **March 25, 2026**

**P Public Safety Cluster Transcription 19:54**

Here we go. Good morning, everybody. Welcome to the March 25th Public Safety cluster meeting. Nice to see you all. We're going to start off with introductions and I'll start with myself, Annabel Martinez, Supervisor of Police and Justice Deputies. And with me, if you're my colleagues, Erin Lopez, Fellow of the First District. Emily Desmond, Fellow of the First District. Now we'll move on with District 2. Hi, good morning. Natalia Ramos, who is Mitchell Senior Justice Deputy. And online we have Melody of Billy, who's our Assistant Justice Deputy. I'm with Microsoft Deputy. I'm Dante Franklin, Supervisor Mr. Standard. Good morning, everyone. Stephen Edwards, Senior Justice Deputy for Supervisor Verbach. And with me is my colleague Ashley Servaios Hernandez, Justice fellow. And Sophia might be online maybe. Anyway, well, Sophia might be joining us as well, so thank you. Mr. Court. Hi, Corey Junior Rice, Senior Justice and Mental Health Deputy for Supervisor Han and then Alexandra Perez, Justice and Mental Health Deputy, Supervisor Han. Good morning, Cedra Crocs and to study for Supervisor Barber and my colleague Leslie Gavino is online.

Today's meeting we have 3 information items, 2 motions, 4 presentation and four closed session items. So because we do have two motions on the agenda, this meeting will be recorded. We'll get started with the first information item, which is the.

From the Sheriff's Department, Supplemental Service Agreement for DNA Crime Lab services by in between County and the other Long Beach. Any questions on that?

No question.

Then we'll move on to the next information item, which is from the fire department agreement with the LA County Fire Search Star Inc. Any questions from deputy?

So for our office, not not so much a question, but one of my colleagues did one of

me.

Want to make the request that they the that for this program there was if possible we could prioritize pulling dogs from the LA County shelters for the program before going to breeders or other third party sources. I don't know if anybody for is here for this item.

By a department.

**BM** **Brian Martin** 22:28

Hi, Brian Martin. I'm online from a fire department, so I could certainly take that consideration back to the Search Dog Foundation. This, this non-profit is a little different. They're just supplying the department with funds for training, specialized equipment and the medical needs for.

Current dogs, but I can certainly relay that message.

**P** **Public Safety Cluster Transcription** 22:51

OK. Thank you.

Employer retired to unemployed in a temporary basis. Any questions from my colleague for the?

And then, oh, that was the last, that was the last information item. So I'll we'll move on to public comment books section. Are there any public comment for items 2A2B or 2C? Please speak up or raise your hand on teams or if you're a person, please say your name.

OK, Sina, I'm back to you. Sure. OK. So we're going to move on to the motions now and we're going to start off with Supervisor Horvath and Kwan's motion by implementing the county's vision for the Department of Development. And I'll pass it off. Good morning, everyone. Steve Edwards with Supervisor Horvath's office. Thank you very much.

For for having us here and I like to present this motion. Basically, this motion seeks to follow through with the county's vision for youth justice by pushing to empower DYD to take the lead on programming in all probations against all facilities.

First, I want to begin by thanking Supervisor Hahn and her team for the collaboration and joining us as co-authors, and also thank the many advocates and those with lived experience and family members who have been pushing us in the county to continue to move forward with our vision. As you know, the board previously directed DYD to take the lead on programming.

But that's not yet the practice. So DUI has been working hard with there for this moment. They're here today as well. They've built up youth development networks, the RA program and a network of community-based providers to step in and help sort of build that support role.

And so now, now's the time. The motion before you has a bunch of directives. I won't go through all of them in detail, but happy to sort of talk it through. Broadly speaking, DYD will do a report back that includes an implementation plan and then there'll be a series of report backs and action steps that follow after that report back to sort of.

Layout the details. We recognize this is not an easy or fast thing to do, but it's an important and critical step to actually get to the place where DYD can provide the services. As you know, the board has declared an emergency related to the care provided to our youth and probation facilities.

And we're facing the threat of receivership as well as unsuitability of Los Padriacos and several other litigations. So while this motion alone won't solve all of the problems related to the emergency, this is a critical step forward, we believe, towards implementing the board's vision about what youth justice services should look like in the future.

So with that, happy to answer any questions or ask to.

I just, I have a couple of questions and maybe I don't know for the department, but for the directives 1, four and five, do you anticipate this involving updating policy manuals as well for probation and for?

UID and then for the SD3, Stephen, what have conversations looked like so far with probation? Thank you very much for those questions. So I'll start with the first part. Broadly speaking, yes, this will require updating policies and procedures, although I'm happy to say that it's my understanding that DYD and probation are already working together to do a lot of this stuff. So it will require more of that inevitably as they sort of.

Flesh out who's doing what and when they will have to sort of come up with procedures, policies, practices to actually make those those boundaries clear. But like I said, they are meeting regularly on sort of working on a lot of this stuff and then separately about what have conversations look like.

I would say they're they've been positive for the most part. My I I met, I personally met with probation a couple months ago to sort of talk through an earlier version of the draft and we implemented some of their feedback and of course work with DYD

as well. So I think folks have been aware this was coming for a little while.

Everyone is also aware of the many issues involving programming across the board and as well as the county's financial challenges and our litigation that we're facing.

So I think there's been a lot of work to kind of build this up.

But we also tried to bake into this space for the departments to kind of detail it out themselves. And so I'm hopeful that this will be a push, but they're already doing the work together. So we're we're, you know, hopeful this will keep moving in a positive direction.

Thank you. That's helpful to know. And then, David, just a question on the background checks that came up previously. What is the current process for background checks? And do you anticipate like any changes or reviewing this? First of all, thank you and thank you to the advisors for bringing forth the motion.

In terms of the background checks, the the responsibility will still be that folks that are entering the facility clear a probation background check. So that'll still be something that is performed by probation very similar to the way it is now. Just a quick refresher that we went.

Through about a year long negotiation process with probation leadership to get to the the the background check criteria that is currently being used and we agreed at that time that it would be an evolving process when we kind of come back because oftentimes folks with lived experience do face some challenges in entering the facility.

and performing in their roles, but the the process itself will remain largely the same as it is now. Absolutely. In fact, just to add to that, as Mr. Carroll mentioned, we've been working together on this for a long time. We currently have a large number of individuals from several community-based organizations with lived experience providing services in our facilities.

And that was that was made possible through our collaborative efforts in working on the background process and the criteria to clear these individuals to be able to come in and serve the youth in our care.

I appreciate that. And for the in terms of communication to CB OS and providers, who is the who would be the lead? This this may not this might be in discussion like so I understand if they'll be like it'll be in a report back and that's fine too. But just wondering who would be the CBO contacts our office and they're like what's involved in the background check, I'm not sure.

Who would we then say, oh, you should talk to this department to know under once

this motion is accepted and then it's implemented then that would be that would be DYD and it would be our our in facilities, our youth justice supports and services department as of today I think if it's a CBO that is.

going through probation, it will probably be probation. And if it's a CBO that's going through DYD, it would be, it would be DYD is the best point of contact. And if they're going through another county department, arts and culture or libraries or whatever department it happens to be, they would probably be the point of contact. One of the the major goals is for us to

Try to centralize as much of that as possible to make it easier for both the CBO as well as our county partners to be able to get their folks into the into the facilities.

Yeah, I again that goal that that has been a bit of.

Question received, so I've between that being the goal to streamline what that communication looks like so they're all aware. Um.

Should this go to the board and the board approve? Just this the last question I have on this. Just what is the communication plan to inform youth, staff, service providers?

What does that look like for next steps thinking?

I would say that some of it is certainly under discussion in our in our various work groups. You know, just so you'll know, we were charged with, you know, taking the lead in programming back in March of 2023. We've been working towards implementing and and supplementing probation provided programming. There have been joint conversations.

New programs come in and we meet with probation to determine, you know, what their best fit is, what the best location is, etc. And since that time, especially when 357 was under SB 357 was under consideration, we really went into hyperdrive working on.

Meeting the expectations, which part of that would have been, you know, some of the same programming that's in this, that's in this motion. So folks know is at the bottom line of what I'm saying. CBO's know that this is coming. I've personally met with every department head that operates within the facilities.

To talk to them about kind of DYDS new role, expanded role. So some again, some conversations will need to be developed, but most of the CB OS that are in the facilities know us. Obviously they know probation. I believe probation has started conversations with some of the CB OS and I believe the vast majority.

are comfortable with transferring their contracts over to to DYD. I don't know, Dr.

Carrel, if you want to supplement that. No, no, absolutely. I mean, right now, as Mr.

Carrel mentioned, we currently have several providers contracting community-based organizations, including DYD, Probation, Arts and Culture, LACO.

Different folks that are the lead agency with those contracts. We even have some contractors that have contracts with more than one agency. So all of that ultimately the providers will work directly with the contracting agency. And while I don't know to which level we've had those conversations that have taken place with the.

Actual providers in terms of transferring the services, at the end of the day, we're confident that these providers, their goal is to provide services to the youth in our care. And and I think it to them it doesn't, you know, whether it's through DYD or probation or through arts and culture, what matters is that they're able to be there and put our young people in a better place.

Thank you, and thank you, David, too, for being here present there as well, Dr. Vallis. Yeah, um question for um, Stephen, or um. So you have it in the directives. You have a series of report backs. But if this goes to the board, and is ultimately approvable to be any subsequent action, the board will need to take following.

These are 4 packs or is this like a go do it? It's a good question. So it's it's it's a little bit of both and part of the reason it's a little bit of both is that DYD is going to spell out the implementation plan piece of it. So I do expect there will be further action required in part because.

The hardest part of it is probably the money, so there's probably a piece there that will need to be worked out. We don't want that piece to delay the planning because this is a long standing vision and it's something we.

Very much believe we can do. And so it's a question of like making sure we're making progress on getting to the how, spelling it all out in detail and then working out the hard parts, recognizing that there's a lot of different departments involved, there's a lot of challenges involved and we'll have to figure out sort of making sure the money flows, etcetera. So I do think there will likely be.

Follow up. Hard to say exactly what that will be, in part because of where the implementation plan lies and how the details of that will shake out.

Hopefully that answers it, but.

Yeah, thank you. And then I have a question for David and for Vishen. So as far as you know the transition, I know there's been a lot of like you know work that you've said is being done like on the back end, but once the transition is is sort of you know in its place and it's going through the process.

Do you envision like DYD having like a more present role in facilities to co-exist with

probation so that you ensure that's in transition? Because I think my concern is that we want to ensure that CB OS feel.

You know received and if they have any questions they know who to go to and and as you know DYD is taking over it would make sense for DYD to have some presence on a like more daily basis if it's not happening already. So in order to be able to like assist or answer questions or troubleshoot whatever goes on.

And day-to-day operations, Sandra, to me that is the most important part. I mean, just transferring over the contracts is one thing, right? But the most important part is to make sure that the process is as efficient and comfortable as possible for the CB OS from the second they walk in the door until they provide.

Services and then leave. So yes, part of this plan, it's really kind of a three-part plan. One part is is the contracting right and making sure that there's a wide variety of programs available. The next part is the actual program coordination and that would be DYD staff co-located in the facilities, which there are some now, but we would increase that number.

To actually help CBOS from the second they come in the door, get through the the the entrance process, then get to the unit that they need to go to provide the service and then obviously exit, you know the facility and answer any questions or concerns, address any questions or concerns along the way. So that presence is. is extremely important. And to Steven's point, that's part of the financial piece that we'll need to work out. The third component is focused on the young people, which is care coordination, and that is creating a detailed, programmatic care plan from the day that that young person comes into a juvenile hall.

Whether it be Los Fresinos or CVK and have that plan, follow them as they move from facility to facility and then ultimately into community. So they have a portfolio that kind of shows all the programs that they went through when they were under the care of probation.

And use that obviously to help them into young adulthood, whether it be career or or educational pursuits. So the the short answer is yes, but the long answer is, is is a little more complicated and we have been you know talking to probation about the details of that because it is, it does become a lot more complex on the ground.

With regards to where will they sit, you know, things like that. So appreciate that.

And my last question, I don't know who can answer it, but programming has been, you know, in the the mix of compliance issues of probation. So what does that mean for like?

DOJ compliance and BSCC. Now that DYD would take that over and like, I don't know if you can, can I start with that one? Yeah, yeah, I mean, I think so first I would say that, um, so the big picture, the county is the defendant in these cases. Um, county departments don't exist independent of the county, right. So it's not like probation is a defendant, but like.

I don't know.

D by D is not right. It doesn't. It doesn't matter. It's the county that's on the hook for providing the required services and we do that through the departments. So the our obligations in the in the stipulated judgment in the BSCC world don't change regardless of which department does the work. And so for example, right now we have probation.

Arts and Culture, BYD, LACO, DMH. There might be one or two I'm missing that are all providing video programs. So the goal is the same of us being able to meet not just our minimum obligations, but be able to do programming better.

By having sort of coordinated through DYD, the obligations, the county will be the same. DYD might have some requirements to document and provide support for the services they're doing. That might be slightly different from what they are now, but really they wouldn't be actually because you know, like the BSCC inspector will walk around.

Facility and say like you know, I'm looking for program X, is it happening or not or whatever and that obligation won't change. I don't know if that totally gets at the question, but I sort of frame it that way 'cause I I definitely thought a lot about that thinking about how to do this right and how to do it better.

Because the truth is, it doesn't. In my view, it doesn't matter that much who's doing it, as long as we actually get to a place where we're able to do more better and more consistently, and also to kind of coordinate the strengths of the respective departments where they are. So probation is dealing with a lot of staffing challenges. Maybe we have other folks who can pick up fall a little bit better where someone might be better.

Coordinating, maybe someone else can do better at delivery. So there's a a way that this is really about sort of modernizing our system so that it works better for everybody. That's the.

I'm going to start today after and and just to add just a just a tiny piece that we have been meeting with probation specifically to learn more about the the, the, the, the compliance requirements that are present coming from a number of different

sources and making sure that some of.

Program.

that are provided actually satisfy some of the compliance regulation. Some are not related at all, but we do want to track the ones and report on the ones that actually can help lead to to compliance. So that is an area that I've charged my team with becoming experts on compliance and they're doing that with the the support of probation.

And those meetings, I believe there have been several that are that are taking place to this point. Dr. No, no, absolutely. I mean the the as Mr. Edwards mentioned, you know the the requirements to be in compliance whether they be from the BSEC, the DOJ stipulated settlement with all the requirements that we're mandated to be in compliance with. Our goal is to work collaboratively.

We shoulder to shoulder with DYD to ensure that the county is compliant with these provisions. So that's that's we've been working towards this. We've we've had meetings both DYD and probation have identified leads for all the key areas for this. Transition and we're you know excited to to to work with BYD. They've been great partners and just looking forward to the end goal which is improved programming for the youth in our care.

I just have one question. So I know sometimes probation staff is also in charge of programming, whether that be because the Cpl. couldn't come or just because that's just the time. So when that's the case, moving forward, would DYD be working with the probation staff to ensure that program is happening or training along programming or is that something?

That won't be a shared responsibility. That's one of the things that one of the main issues that one of the core issues that we've been discussing in our in our work group meetings, DYD is never going to have as many staff right as as probation has. But in the event that we do have program staff, you know DYD staff that is on site, we are willing to work.

Work as partners to provide that substitute programming, for lack of a better word, in the event that a CBO is unable to to to be in the facility. It is our hope that with this additional support, those situations will reduce and you know more of the CBOS will be where they're supposed to be.

When they're supposed to be there. But I think about things like, you know, a fire or a terrible rainstorm where no CBOs can show up to a facility. I think that's a situation where the the two partners may really need to work together to try to provide

something for the young people in lieu of the the CBO making it there. And I'm using an extreme.

Example, right. Well, I also think some probation staff enjoy providing right, right. So I don't think we should take away that ability for probation staff if that's something they decide. So just making sure that that's still if appropriate continues to be available.

Oh, absolutely. I think that you know throughout this process we were talking about this and you know what, you know what if, what if a provider doesn't make it? What if you know there's a traffic jam and they don't make it on time and the next program starts all these what ifs, but those would be the exception and not the rule. I think that through our collaborative planning we will.

Ensure that there are folks on site that are able to provide programming, whether it be probation, whether it be credible messengers, that there's always going to be a plan to provide youth with programming because the SEC has very strict guidelines in terms of the dosage and we want to make sure that we're in compliance with them.

It.

And we want to support the probation officers that that that enjoy what they do, right. I know that there are some that come in and they bring their own materials, you know, so we don't want to stifle what they enjoy on a day-to-day basis. And I and I believe that on on the ground, there are some strong relationships that are being developed between DYD staff, credible messengers, and probation staff.

Any other questions before we go to public comments?

Are there any public comments? I'm sorry, this motion, please speak up, raise your hand on teams or pick up if you are in person.

OK, see them back to you, Chair. OK, then. Thank you so much for being here. And we'll move on to the second motion, which is from Supervisor Han's office, ensuring the Junior Lifeguard program is acceptable for all our good months.

Thank you. Good morning, colleagues and everyone in attendance. This motion, as Ambal mentioned, has a goal of making sure that our Junior Lifeguard program, which is a program the fire department runs, is truly accessible for all Angelenos who are interested in participating, not just.

Those who come from families who can afford the program. So our Junior Lifeguard program isn't just a summer camp. It's really an important public service program

and it aims to express youth from all corners of our county to ocean and beach safety to physical conditioning.

Basic first aids and other skills that will help us build our next generation of lifeguards. So I really see it as a workforce development program for our youth and over 50% of our county lifeguards went through the Junior Lifeguard program. So it clearly is a program that inspires many youth to join our county workforce.

But our concern is that the more we raise the fee, the less accessible this really, truly incredible program is for youth from disadvantaged and underinvested communities.

So the motion is 2 things. First, it removes a decades long requirement that this program be self-sustaining so that the fire department can.

Use funding sources outside of the program fees to sustain the program, and second, it directs the department to identify other funding sources to cover increased operational costs for this year and over the next three years so that those costs don't fall on program participants.

And I want to thank the fire department for the work they did to remove the increased fee for this summer's program. You know, they worked hard to kind of rearrange the budget to make that happen. And we have some folks online who can speak to that if there are questions.

And I also understand the department has some ideas on how to increase awareness and to kind of do more outreach to these communities that are not participating in this program as much as other communities. So I truly appreciate the the plans.

Around that and I want and I want to encourage, you know, kind of continued outreach to communities that are historically underrepresented, underrepresented in those programs. The department also provided a little bit of feedback on preamble language. So I will be providing you all with an updated copy once we submit its video, but it mostly.

This reflects the change in the in the fee for this year. So I think I'll pause there if my colleagues have any questions. And like I mentioned, we've got I think Chief Deputy Teresa Barrera from the Fire Department along with Lifeguard Chief O'Connell. and Adrian Lee from the Financial Management Division online. Thank you.

Any questions?

OK. No, I I wanted just to understand for the second directive, the intention is it to find funding for the just the increase or and leaving kind of like whatever the base is for operation?

Or is it the full, like the full program? So it's to, it's to find funding for the increase for

this year. So that was I think they anticipated around 280,000 for that \$70.00 increase they were initially proposing. So it would be to find funding to cover that 280,000, yeah, yeah and then.

And I don't know if this is a question for fire and I feel like we've had this conversation like how the increases are made is another kind of question piece. I don't know if this is necessarily stopping for that, but just understanding what the what the metric is for that like is it you know cost of living like what is the what's the? Increase related to or correlated to. I don't know if you know that. I think that that would be a better uh question for the department if if they're able to answer.

**TB** **Theresa Barrera** 48:13

Yes. Hi, this is Teresa Barrera. I'll start to answer it and then if I need to, I'll ask Adrienne to finish up. But basically we're looking at our salary and employee benefits. So we're looking at those costs. So as there's cost of living increases, as there's increases in employee benefits, then that's going to, you know, obviously raise the cost.

And then of course, there's services and supplies costs that come into play. So as those costs go up, that also increases it. Adrienne, is there anything else that I should be pointing out?

**AL** **Adrian Li** 48:43

No, those are the two main increases.

**TB** **Theresa Barrera** 48:46

Thank you.

**P** **Public Safety Cluster Transcription** 48:49

OK. And then can you remind me how many staff are paid through those funds? Is it just the captain or is it more than that?

**TB** **Theresa Barrera** 48:59

Chiba Connell or Adrian, you want to take that?

**AL** **Adrian Li** 49:04

Connell, I don't have those numbers. I know it's it's more than just the captain. It

would be the captain, the ocean lifeguards, the ocean lifeguard specialist, but but I do not have the number of each.

**OO Olivier O'Connell** 49:17

Yeah, the exact numbers I I don't necessarily have, but there is the captain, the ocean lifeguard specialist that handle the administrative aspects of the program and then approximately 120 junior lifeguard instructors.

**P Public Safety Cluster Transcription** 49:17

No problem.

OK. All right. Thank you.

And and then my office had a request. I'm not sure if this could be a part of the motion or just information that the fire department provides, but they would like to know. We would like to know in the last three to five years how many youth have participated in the program and how many of those people are eligible for the financial aid or actually supported with the.

Financial.

Scholarship.

**TB Theresa Barrera** 50:00

So that information was provided.

**P Public Safety Cluster Transcription** 50:00

Is that some victory?

**TB Theresa Barrera** 50:04

Starting in the e-mail that I had sent over to you.

**P Public Safety Cluster Transcription** 50:08

I think that was provided. Was that provided for the, I think you're requesting the last five years, right? Yeah, that is that something you've done over the last five years, Teresa?

**TB Theresa Barrera** 50:16

OK. Well, we can certainly update that and we'll provide that information for the last five years. Sorry, I didn't, I didn't hear the full question.

**P Public Safety Cluster Transcription** 50:24

No worries. Thank you. And and thank you again Teresa for providing us with that additional information after we requested it and budget that's it was very, very helpful for for us. So thank you. OK.

Any more questions? Public comment. OK, Theresa, real quick. This is Dari. Whenever you have that information, just send it to me, so I'll make sure I can get it over to you all. Thank you. Are there. Thank you. Are there any public comments for this motion from from SD4? Please speak up. Raise your hand on teams.

**TB Theresa Barrera** 50:46

will do. Thank you.

**P Public Safety Cluster Transcription** 50:55

All right. See you then. Thank you, Chair. OK, thank you. So then now we'll move on to the presentations and the first one is from the Sheriff's Department approval of of social's amendment for treatment.

With public communication servicing for any telephone system services.

OK.

Thank you. Would you mind introducing yourself? Yes. Good morning. My name is Alouette Martin. I am Senior Contract Analyst with the Sheriff's Department Contracts Unit. And with me today I have Captain Bierce and Sergeant Waltz with the Department of Inmate Services Bureau. And we're here presenting Amendment #15 to extend the term of agreement number 757.

7655 with Public Communication Services Inc for Inmate Telephone System and Services. The extension is for an additional 18 month period while the department completes the implementation of a successor contract and upon successful implementation, the department was determining the agreement.

Or convenience.

The agreement with PCF expires on April 30th, 2026. The department released a request for proposals for an inmate communication system and services April 2025 and we are currently engaged in negotiations with the selected proposal.

The Department attempts to return to the board and seek approval for the new

contract in June 2026.

Well, this extension will ensure uninterrupted services while the department completes the process for a successor contract and allows the awarded contractor to successfully implement their inmate communication system and services. And at this time I will open it up for any questions that you may have.

I do just the is this contract include tap? The current contract does not include tap. The successor will got it.

OK, I I have one just to so I'm understanding. So there's this is an extension of the the contract that currently exists. You guys did a RFP in April of 2025, did the RFP, you have a successor contract or in the conversations with them?

As of now, and then when do you anticipate that going online? Since this is like an 18 month extension, when will that person start? We are currently in the negotiation process with the selected proposer. Once we complete negotiations, we intend to return to the board with a.

A new contract for approval in June 2026. Once the contract is approved by the board, then we'll begin the the implementation of all you know new phones and PLC, the concept of the tablets and so it'll they'll be two contracts running.

Simultaneously, as we transition over to new contract, got it. And then do you anticipate cause it sounds like there's still some negotiating this conversation. That means do you anticipate having or coming back to us with like another extension? No, bearing any unforeseen circumstances, no. OK.

We're trying to meet at June 2026, would that be fine? Yeah, because I know this has been like back and forth for quite some time. So I just wanted to understand that. So, OK. And then for the period of, I guess transition, do you all anticipate any adverse impacts to?

Services for persons who are incarcerated.

The the current phones will continue to operate inside all the jail facilities, courthouses, juvenile hall until such time as they switch over. But a lot of that equipment is going to continue to be used from the current contract into the new contract. So there'll be continuity of telephone services throughout.

And the tablet services too. So that's newer, right? So the tablet services will be separate from the telephone. It's the proof of concept is what we're calling it. So they're gonna go into one facility and set up the wiring, give the tablets and see how it.

How it turns out. And so they're two separate services, but and they'll be running the

same provider. OK. All right. Thank you so much.

And I know probation, I don't know if probation is here also, but do you know if the tablets are also going to be going into the juvenile facilities as well? And yes, we we do have language for probation to join and with tablets. Once we complete the proof of concept, we work out the kids and probation has the opportunity to join.

Thanks.

And so also, sorry to follow up on that. So has probation been like a partner throughout this? I know this original contract was 2011, so they've been, yeah, OK, thank you.

So our office sometimes and I'm sure other offices as well get concerns from constituents that aren't able to reach their loved ones through the phones or whether that is because the calls don't go through or they drop or other various issues. So with this new contractor, are you, how are you looking to address that issue if at all?

The process is going to stay the same regarding the telephones, but the the under the current contract the the any issues we receive regarding telephone connectivity, what not they get tracked.

It's a weekly report. The vendor has to address that they've addressed the problem and that they've corrected. So and that's done on a weekly basis by the current provider. That will not change.

In the new contract, because the contractor is responsible to make sure everything is up and running at all times and addressing any issues that come up.

To keep everything.

Keep everything and then besides the tablets, what would be something new with this contractor? Is there not anything else that would be besides adding on tablets?

Yeah, a part of the current and the current contract, it's just the telephone for the the new contract. It is a enhanced, you know?

Comprehensive communication system which will include the phones, the tablets and digital mail scanning services.

Just a clarifying question. So the \$19 million, it's already been allocated in the budget for the 2526 budget. I will have to get back to you on that, OK.

I see it on here. Final adopted budget. I just wanted to clarify that it's already been out because it's 18 months. I don't believe the total 19,000,000. I believe it's just for the month of the the fiscal year, but I will get back to you. OK. All right. Thank you.

Any other questions? Well, thank you so much. Appreciate it. And then we'll move on

to our next presentation, which is from the probation department to apply for an effort funding under the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act and the.

Would you like to introduce yourself? Sure. I'm Sharon Hawkins, the Probation Department Director. I do JJCPA administration and I'll pass it. Good morning. Stacey Lopez Maddox, the Ministry of Deputy for Probation. Hi, Casser May Director. I'm the chair. She's the chair of the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council.

Today we're here about the plan. Annually, the JJCC adopts A resolution to create an ad hoc subcommittee with two-part mission to update the plan and to create planning recommendations. The ad hoc membership includes both governmental partners and community partners.

Each year we attempt to add to our administrative assistance to ensure that the ad hoc can complete their work. This year a new budget review process was added. This is a comparison of fiscal year 2526 and new budget requests. The plan updates included a drastic and much needed change to the timeline.

To increase the amount of months available to hold ad hoc meetings to update the plan and to create funding recommendations. The change in the timeline will be more in alignment with the CEO budget timeline. It is hoped that this will assist governmental partners as they prepare budgets of January for the upcoming fiscal year. An additional positive is that we'll provide.

More time to complete our MLUs. I'm happy to answer any questions. We all are. Any questions?

I mean, I do have questions. I'm not really sure the right way to frame it, but I think the and I or the the. I've never really understood the process very well, so maybe you can help me making sure I'm understanding you right. So this part of the.

Phase is that we authorize the JJCPA and YOBG amounts to be received from the state. So this is like we have this broadly speaking plan. We do this part to say state give us the money.

The state sends us the money, then JJCC comes up with something more detailed that then the money actually goes out. So this is not the money going out to the departments or service providers. This is the money coming to us, correct. This is just to ask that the chief probation officer have the authority to receive the money from the state and then separately as the.

Of the group working to create the funding recommended checks. OK, so my my question is for later in time, but I'll just put it on the radar because I will preview in one place at once. So our understanding is that there's a lot of unspent money in this

world, so for this item and the next one.

And when you come back, I know that I'm just telling you now that is going to be like what I'm very interested in understanding how that is being addressed as part of the plan that comes together. So I know that's not entirely on you because there's the Committee members and whatever, but I'm just putting it out there as a strong area of interest. Well, I'm just gonna say it's a it's a our main, it's one of our main concerns as well and we have worked really hard to come up with.

Ongoing efforts to make sure that we don't, especially in this kind of financial crisis that everyone's in and direct services to young people. We have come up with different ideas of moving that forward and everyone agrees and is committed to ensuring that we use as much funds as possible.

You know, the last two years, last year and this year, we had unspent funds from several agencies that had money that had not been touched for several years. So last year we took 55.1% of that back from not every agency, just there were some that literally had been sitting for multiple fiscal years.

Then this year for 2627, we took the remainder from those same agencies. So some of the unspent funds have been reallocated as part of fiscal year 2627 to make up a gap because we received 8089.7 in funding requests and we only had approximately 54 million.

So we need to fill the gap. So we use those those really old unspent funds to help fill that gap.

So thank you very much.

I just want to 2nd that and I'm looking forward to kind of hearing more about how you're addressing that this gaps in funding and the unspent funds. So it's really happy to hear that's priority. I was wondering, I know that the there's kind of a process of.

Getting the final budget from the state to actually determine the exact amount we'll be receiving, but just wondering the anticipated amount which you know I I don't have here. I know it's up on the on the board letter, but how does that compare to last year's amount that we actually received? It's close. I don't have the total numbers in my head, but each of the two years.

Approximately 54,000,000 together, right. We have base and one time growth. So yeah, each year we get it in October and the ad hoc is still working and then we later find out if it's 12 November, but each year's the last two years is very close enough. OK, so we're not anticipating a a.

Decline and how much money we received. I just want to say I've shared the same concern as you do coming into this fairly new. I was surprised the money wasn't reverted back to the state to be honest and how we're using it, but they're doing, you know, a phenomenal effort on trying to get.

The money spent, but we definitely need to look at that more closely and see because I was really, I was surprised how much we could carry over coming from the state myself. So we definitely are working on that and we'll be able to respond to that and may need some help from you all too, you know, with some of our agencies that we work with because if they're not spending the money.

You know, what's the reasoning? And so you know, Miss Hawkins has come up with a good plan to pulling that back if they're not utilizing it. But we definitely there's there's so much funding available. We really should be using what's there. Obviously this is a collaborative effort because there's an ad hoc subcommittee that like I said, includes government.

Partners and community, they're very committed to assisting with this. So that's one of the tasks. We have a new subcommittee for 2728 and that's one of their tasks is to really look again and we spent significant time trying to figure out how to address these unspent funds and how to make sure we can have a budget. So because our at the end of the day it's always about this direction.

services for you.

For the as we're talking about gaps and unspent funds, are does the committee or or here have they been thinking about like evaluation on like impact? Because of course if you're not spending dollars, you're not having an impact which is the intention of the dollar, is there any?

Conversation or as a part of the plan for the unspent fund and fund moving forward. Is there any evaluation for how the fund we have a we have an external evaluator that's contracted evaluator and they're new we.

Move to a new contract that started in May. It was a little delayed. So they're working and we have, we always have the external evaluator come in to speak to the ad hoc subcommittee so that they're at least aware and getting started. So this year they're just getting started. Last year Rand published approximately.

Sorry, I don't remember exactly. It's 11 or 12 reports right at the at the end of January and December, January 25. And they've included a lot of the a lot of the programs, not all because these were mostly programs that we were able to collect data on.

There had been a data issue in the past.

So we were not collecting data on at promised youth, but these are mostly the probation funded programs that have justice involved youth. So we're looking to work with this evaluator. So they're doing a bifurcated system. So they're looking for probation for.

For our probation youth and they're going to be working with TYD and they're collecting data from the at Thomas. So we'll be having better and more information on evaluation in the future. We don't actually have it now. One of the things we added to the funding request form that we're going to be launching for 2728 is to have basic information that we can at least report out on.

To to everyone including how many were served by program in total and the the spa areas because I know the board has been has been concerned in the past but it's not across all areas. We're not reaching the like Antelope Valley, so we're working on.

Making sure that there are some real fundamental items that we can include to create survey either a dashboard or a PowerPoint annually to show how many youth are served. So we're looking at those things, but we will be looking strongly to the evaluator to be able to provide more information. Thank you for that. I think that the evaluator should also.

Look at like the capacity of an organization to spend down dollars as well, because I think that's a big piece. Impact is the biggest part, at least in my opinion. But also if an organization can't spend dollars down or they're not able to maybe.

Can't spend the amount. Maybe that needs to be reconsidered when applying for funds and having a clear evaluation on why that's happening. I think it's important for like the committee to consider and look at. So just something to think about.

Thank you. We'll take that back. Thank you. Yeah.

Any other questions? Just a comment, less a question, but has CEO helped you all with some of this? Because I mean, obviously we have budget presentations from the other side of the CEO unit house today, but but it just occurs to me that we're about to hear a presentation that's going to say we don't have enough money to do XY&Z or DYD.

Public defender, alternate public defender, all of these folks, and you all have a bucket of unspent money that overlaps with the clients that some of those folks serve. So I know it's not a Direct Line, but I do. It's a real weird contrast for us to be sitting here and it's like, OK, you're working on it. I'm not. I don't want to diminish that because I really it sounds like you're working very hard to.

Identify that money. But one of our pet peeves in the county is that we have these

like barriers that go up that prevent us from seeing across the spectrum. So I don't know if you're able to stick around, but if you do, we are gonna hear CEO say these heavily NCC funded departments, public defender, alternate public defender, DYD. Because Jacob was today as well. So they don't have enough money, right? And yet they do many of the things that you all and the committee want to do, right? So any way that we can get them access to.

The money that you have that serves the overlapping client list would be very helpful, right? And you're you happen to just be in the room space because that's the way the agenda works. But really we should be doing that proactively, like going ahead and reaching out to them and saying like, hey CEO, when DYD has a need that we're not able to meet from NCC.

Why can't we plug them in this way? It's not like the committee would say they're not aligned with our priorities or goals, at least historically it always happened. So like, it's not, that's not the gap. It's it's almost like that the bucket is over here and they're over there. And so anything we can do to solve that would be hugely important because it's it's a weird thing to say.

We have unspent money here. That's like, I I think if I'm understanding things right, 10s of millions, it's a lot, it's not a small number, 10s of millions of dollars. And then we're going to hear a presentation, at least if this goes like it has before, where the CEO says we've done all this evaluation and we have to cut X program and it'll be like a \$3,000,000 program.

That's just a really weird thing to say when if it applies to a department that has an overlapping client. So to the extent there's a way for us to proactively work on that, I would really encourage everybody, everybody to work together on doing that to make sure that we're not leaving that money unspent because that's we we have the need right now, so if.

If we can get over that barrier, let's get over it and we can figure out how to get that money flowing. Just to encourage a way that you can definitely hear that. A lot of it seems to be procedural and we can. That's always a barrier in government, right? So I think we can follow up on that.

Try to fill those gaps. Thank you. We do. We can to work with CEO's office because each each department does have a budget analyst as we do as well. Since these are grants, it's a little harder. But what annually we do have the opportunity for all our governmental partners to submit requests.

So we're always wanting to make sure that we receive everything that we can. So if

there are governmental partners, many that you mentioned, they do receive funding, but I hear you because it is a very hard seat to sit up there hearing these two different stories back-to-back because I do hear.

Thank you. Any other questions before we move on to the next item? There's also you all would seem similar, but it's for the juvenile definitely the language block. All right. So this month is a little similar. Annually the J is the JJRBCJJRBG subcommittee of the JJCC.

Under SB823 and they adopt A resolution to form an ad hoc subcommittee with the same type of two-part mission to update a plan and to create funding recommendations. This year the the ad hoc subcommittee, we did that in July of last year. They met eight times between November and March of this year.

And as part of the process, efforts have been made based upon the funding request submission to ensure information included what I was talking about earlier, which was making sure we with the direct services already new, how many users serve some great more programmatic questions so that it's better targeted as well for us to understand.

And an effort has been made to utilize many of these same JJCPA standards. So we updated the same timeline process. So this too will also change its timeline so that we can finish closer to the end of this year and that will give more time for MO use to be created.

And also for for funding request to receive more time and for the ad hocs that can spend more time on their on their funding request.

Any questions for the same?

Mhm.

Well, thank you so much for your presentation. Thank you. Thank you.

And next we'll hear from CEO on the Community Care and Justice Department's budget group.

Morning deputies. Jack Dartunian with the Community Care and Justice Team. I have my team here with me. Lisa Seves, David Diaz and Vincent Emerson will be presenting to you the recommended 2627 budget changes for the Community Care and Justice.

Departments. We'll start off with justice care and opportunities, and I'll turn it over to David.

Good morning. I'll go ahead and get started with the Justice Care Opportunities Department. Adjustment #1 reflects 1 Justice Program Senior Analyst position to lead

and support pretrial services fully to for full oversight by fully funded by. Obligated fund balance committed for alternatives to incarceration. Adjustment #2 contract compliance and monitoring position reflects one administrative services manager position to support contract compliance, monitoring and auditing functions fully offset by the obligated fund balance committed for alternatives to. Incarceration adjustment #3 One-time funding reflects an adjustment to remove one-time funding for various programs and projects as listed below. Adjustment #4 reflects administrative change to align inter fund transfers with anticipated expenditures and adjustment #5 through 7 are finance targets. I won't go over them in detail, but each department is going to have those similar finance targets.

In their budget. So just that that's all for Jacon. Any questions?

I do. I was just gonna ask for the number three, um, and maybe this is a question for Jacob, but just wondering what the impact of losing that one time funding is and if there's uh funding to support these programs.

To supplement these programs, great question. So JCOD does have a quite a bit of one-time funding that is actually in multi-year on a multi-year basis. So a lot of these here may actually be a multi-year allocation, the process in which we reduce and recommend and then supplementally true up based on actual expenditures in the current.

Fiscal year. So we'll be working with JCOD collectively to identify whether there are any gaps, how much would be carried forward for fiscal year 2627 and so on and so forth. So not not all of these programs will run into gap part per se in fiscal year 2627. It's all subject to evaluation and assessment.

Once we understand the final actual expenditures from the current year, got it.

Uh, adjustment one. Looks like it's one free trial services staff member. This came up at the board meeting.

Was that two months ago? I don't know. But there was this, you know, indication that the JCOD was founded or or created it. There was a specific thing that said for services should be moved over to JCOD. It's been a real difficult thing to happen.

So this looks like this is coming out of the obligated fund balance, i.e. it's not coming from probation, correct. It's not coming from probation. My understanding is probation and Jake continue to have those discussions. I think as our CEO mentioned, probation has some.

Structural issues that they're working, working through. So the positions that were

previously under pre-trial may not be necessarily free dollars to be repurposed or redirected to JCOD and JCOD is working collectively with probation on that.

I'm not sure what the latest update is. I do know J Cot is here to give an update on that or a a a recent status if that's required.

I would appreciate. Well, it doesn't have to be now. I think I'm just flagging it, but whatever. I think it's just to me it's like a big part of the story. That's an odd one that we just need to understand better and it.

I think it's weird that the board said do this and we didn't. I mean, it's it'd be one thing for there to be sort of a detailed report back that kind of says here's why that's not moving right now because this looks like spending money from other buckets, right. And the board's intention from the beginning was that that money come from probation. So the answer is it can't right now. I just need a detailed explanation.

For why it can't, because it's sort of.

Unfair is not the right word. Like these things have to work out over time, but it's not ideal because that's \$300,000 or whatever that JCOD maybe could spend on something else that they can't spend because that vision initially transferring those positions hasn't happened.

So I think just, you know, I know there's things in the works, but it it's now five years later or whatever. So it's it's it shouldn't take that long for us to at least have an understanding of like what can move, what can move, why, why not? And to make sure that we're not it's an odd expectation to set, right. So and we're also paying for pretrial.

In two places, which is again also weird. So it doesn't have to happen now, but I would appreciate even if it's just an e-mail, just like a better understanding where things are at and we'll probably check in about it periodically because it just sort of doesn't make sense to me.

OK. And well, we'll work with Jake Cod and we'll try to get back some detail on that for you. Thanks. And as a follow up on on Steven's point about the free trial, I would like to also in that report back if you could confirm if the initial agreement was to also move the funding or just the service, totally fair, whatever the lay of the land is, right, I think in a nutshell.

The understanding just generally and we'll get back to in more detail, but the general understanding was JCOT was not really going to do very, not do exactly the same type of pretrial service. It was always imagined to be different, right. It was imagined to be. It was charged to JCOT to develop what that looks like and that's what we're

seeing.

Today. So this mission here really is to kind of help push that forward while they continue in those conversations and continue to evaluate what is available and whether that can be redirected. I think the scale and magnitude in which JCOT is trying to grow is going to far exceed what's probably available probation. So these investments.

Now will also probably be collected with whatever happens probation at some point in time. So I think that's one thing to note, but we could definitely get that detail and kind of lay that out like kind of crosswalk what exists at existed or exists at probation and what exists now at JCOT and how that looks and then also for the funding component as well.

Yeah, because if I think that it makes a difference to understand if like the funding was always part of the equation or not. Because if like to see what's fine, if we're saying we're finding like in two different places, was there always an understanding that like the money would go with services or just build services somewhere else? Because I differ else is also a huge concern of privation because they're using a lot of those.

Positions or salary savings to plug other holes within a department, what that means for their operations if that money were to be transferred over. That's part of like the big question mark, right? Yeah, I think for me, like historically, what was the initial conversation and what was the, you know, basically agreed upon and supported? Um, to better understand like where we are today, I think would be humble. OK, not it.

Any other questions? I'm going to youth development again, David. I'll go ahead and move on to Department of Youth Development. Adjustment number one for our spot teen centers and additional staffing support reflects 3.8 million in one-time funding from the obligated fund balance committed for youth justice reimagine. To continue the R Spot Teen Center partnership and additional staffing at Magic Johnson at Wishing Tree Park in collaboration with parks over a two year period through fiscal year 2728.

Adjustment #2 Programmatic support positions reflect 3 positions to lead and support programming in juvenile probation facilities and divergent navigation services fully offset by existing resources.

Adjustment #3 one-time funding reflects an adjustment to remove one-time funding for various projects and programs as listed below. Adjustments #4 and five represent

finance targets and that's all for DYD. Any questions?

For item one, it says that additional staffing, but there's no budget acquisition listed. Is that because the staffing is going to a different department or? Yes, it's a partnership with parks, so they're funding staffing at parks for the R spots program as well as additional staffing to bolster.

The Magic Johnson and Vision Tree Park, which are understaffed, so it's temporary staffing that UID is supporting on a temporary basis. I'll just circle back to the comment I made before for when probation was here. The JCCJRBG fund. I mean, it's literally like 10s of millions of dollars between the two groups.

Some of the items listed here in the adjustments and I don't know what their real impact is on the programming, but some of that likely is in the covered group like in JRBG is for the SYTF like folks. So some of that might be relevant here and then so I guess I.

For me, it's one of my kind of challenges, right? Like that unspent money is kind of offensive, right? That's no one's fault by it. I'm not trying to blame anyone. I'm just saying it's it's really like a terrible position for the county to think is to say we have 10s of millions of dollars inaccessible and then to say.

You know this other department or whatever who would actually do the some of those work, those services is not actually seeing that. I don't know what role you all can play in that JJCCJRBG conversation in terms of how to better allocate that money so it goes out the door, but I would strongly encourage like whatever you're able to do to actually line them.

Folks up to actually say like here's some stuff that we can really do that to the extent it's consistent with the regulations there that we're actually doing it because it's not a great spot to even and in terms of we know DYD is like a NCC heavy department. So they're always going to be in this position of when there's a financial downturn looking for more funds. So we we need to be, I would encourage all of us to go past those boundaries and sort of looking at how that money works to make sure we're accessing it. Again, I don't know exactly like.

Where this sort of fits in, but it just seems that we're going to keep having that conversation. It's going to get more and more frustrating for everybody that there's unspent money, like 10s of millions of dollars of it. So I don't know. I'm just, I don't know how to solve that, but I do. I think it's a really.

Awkward spot. And I really think we should do whatever steps we can do to make sure that we're at least trying to get at that money because I I I believe that some of

those services could be provided like like right now, right now, if that money were accessed. Understood. And I do meet with my colleagues at at UID often.

And some of the discussions we do have understanding the current fiscal climate is trying to identify alternative resources, particularly outside resources, right, state grants, federal, so on and so forth. DYD is a participant on the.

Committee on the JJCC committees for these and they are heavy advocates for DYD related programs and they actually are largely funded by both JIRBG and JJCPA funding. So that is their two largest single funding sources. So they do continue to kind of maximize that use and continue to kind of.

Evolve and evolve the level of programming and the skill programming that they're providing with those dollars. So we do continue to work with them and we'll continue to work with them and and the JJCC, JIR, JIRBG, JJCPA committee to help advocate as much as possible as well as you know try to maximize the use of those dollars.

In in ways where we can limit any impact to potential other one time funding. Thank you. That sounds great. Although do you all do you all get a heads up about buckets of unspent funds that are?

By growing in your portfolios like so that you would be able to have a heads up ahead of something like this, this thing is crazy like the amount, the size of it is really large, so like.

I appreciate that we're making it to maximize analysis. Fantastic. But like what? What did what do we do like prospectively when we realize like, hey, something is not getting spent so that we can kind of try to figure out like how do I cross over these procedural boundaries to make sure we can actually get that money out the door? Because it seems like it should not have gotten as large as it did.

And I'm not sure why exactly. Yeah, I'm not. I'm not sure exactly to what extent my colleagues on the public safety side work hand in hand with the JJCCJJCPAJIRBG committees, but I I think.

The state.

Essentially delegates the JJCC as the entity to come up with the funding plan and the CEO kind of just helps implement that. I think to your point, the CEO can probably better partner if we're not already doing so, but I definitely do on my side partner with DYD.

And J Cod to ensure that they are trying to maximize these dollars. And I do work with my counterparts on the public safety side to better understand which what

funding is available, if there's any large buckets of dollars as you kind of are expressing. So there are there are definitely communication through CEO.

To help identify sources prospectively and also as things come up, right. So but is there opportunity to better align and better coordinate with JJCCI would probably. I would probably say that would probably be on the public safety side a little bit more, but they would probably have a better answer because they do work a little more close, closely with probation and and the. Thank you.

Real quick, the the funding for the our spot, our spot team center, I know he found the obligated fund balance. I know the department also requested funding from the obligated fund balance for to continue their youth development networks and expanding development networks and that's not requested in this budget. So I'm wondering.

If you can speak to that talk about how you kind of make that calculation and if there's opportunity in the future to fund these development networks. Yeah, that's a great question. So the R spot program just kind of set set the set the stage here. The R spot program was funded last year from the obligated fund balance and was part of a three-year partnership that.

ID and Department of Parks and Recreations entered into. So this essentially continues that partnership through fiscal year 2728. So that's what this does here. The youth development networks is a MO is a more recent.

A recent gap that UID identified with the shift from MHSA funding to PHSA funding, as you guys may be aware of, and essentially what we're doing and we're trying to work with UID to better understand is that is there alternative funding sources other than the very limited pot of dollars that could potentially be tapped into first?

And if that is the case, can we try to tap into those? And ultimately, if that isn't the case, then we can work with them, you know, down the line to see if there's opportunities to and potentially tap into the obligated fund balance. But I think we're trying to maximize and Steven's point.

Use all available sources outside of NCC unless and use NCC as a last case scenario.

Thank you.

Any other question?

If not, I'll pass it over to my colleague Elisa Seves to go start with public defender.

Good morning, everyone. For public defender, change number one is the addition of two new positions fully offset by revenue. Change #2 is a budget realignment from services and supplies to other charges.

Change #3 is a board approved reclassification of two positions. Change number four and five are revenue adjustments with funding reductions or increases to ongoing and one-time funding. Change number six reflects 3 AB 109 adjustments to the holistic.

Advocacy Program, the Social Work and Investigator Internship Programs, and the Post-Conviction Units Resentencing Project. Change number seven removes prior year one-time funding for immigration defense, and changes eight, nine, and ten are finance targets.

Good question.

For the AB109 funding, is that one time funding that they're losing and not getting back or what's gonna happen to those funders? This happens each year where we because it's one time we back it out and recommended. So then they will reapply because AB 109 funding is handled in the supplemental budget phase, the last phase.

In early fall. And then it's up to the Amy 109 analyst and the my God, the committee name is failing you right now. Thank you. Thank you so much.

The funding that they will then either re award or award new funding, they will make that determination at that time, so the department will likely reapply again.

And would would there be a funding gap or does it usually just get covered? There is a slight gap because the funding will not go too into effect until the next fiscal year.

So the department tends to either absorb the positions, use their savings to cover them. Sometimes the positions, if they are staff related, the funding is funds.

Yeah. Sometimes they are vacant and so they are able to have that savings available.

So it just depends on what the scenario is at the time of the fiscal year end.

And I know that Ogden PD has the same issue, so I wanted to raise the same answer for that. Yes, thank you.

Yeah, I have a question for #5, the homeless mobile unit. It seems here I just want to clarify, it was fully funded by CACI. This is a portion of the funding.

OK. Yes, they also they fund with NCC. They also receive JAG funding for this. So this is a portion of it. OK to sustained services. And then what's the because it seems to me is this, is this being at? Sorry, is it being added or is it being safe? No, it's it's being this is new. Oh, it's being added.

OK. Yes, I was like, what are they gonna do? No, it's being added. OK, cool. And and through now CFCI, they requested and applied through CFCI. Yeah, I read the top as removal of prior year funding and then the list out of all of those things. So, OK, that

had me a little trick. OK, thank you. I appreciate the clarification.

Sir.

And then can you remind us how many positions the department requested? I I see we we're getting two, one additional PDD4 and a psych social worker too. How many positions did they request in total through their whole budget request? OK, give me one moment. I'm sorry, I should have thought that available.

But I do have it.

Yeah, one hundred and twenty-one. OK, wait. They requested one hundred and twenty-one, and they got two.

Yeah, I I I don't know if anyone from the department is here, but I I know that this is, I'm just, I'm concerned about you know potential of them going unavailable on more cases and I know that you all are aware of that concern as well. So I'm hoping that they will be able to get more positions in future budget phases.

And if not, I think that we'll need to really do an analysis to see whether it's a wise investment to remove those positions and have to depend more on our, you know, outside panel. But yeah, just.

Flagging as something that we're concerned about, as you know, of course, we're also working with the department to right size their pipeline program within available resources. So uh, we've been in communication with the department.

No, John's here. They're one program. They're they're a pipeline program, right, which is essential for it to be able to not go on available. Yes. Yeah. And also the reduction in positions that you see here on the change form are mostly revenue funded.

And so it's because of the revenue adjustments that they're being diluted. Some will come back like the AB109 positions. Hopefully that usually happens every year, although I can't speak for the AB109 team, but that is the usual expectation.

And 84 of the 121 positions requested was was under the pipeline program. Part of it was here to be asked for a restoration of the curtailments and so that's what we're trying to work out with the department.

Thank you. Was there was, can you remind me, was there ever any kind of like written report that talked about the balance between their salary positions versus what happens if they go on available and pay it co-work through private?

Like a way of comparing because their argument has always been when you give us the staff, our staff do more and are more efficient than if you do Gitco or the court appointment process where we end up paying like a higher rate effectively like for

the lawyer time.

Was there like a written evaluation? I I could just be there hasn't been a formal written evaluation of that. We have had ongoing internal discussions with ITCO, PD and APDAPD is the organization that went unavailable in the summer last year.

Public Defender has not to date.

But that is always a possibility that we're very aware of.

But to your question, there is no formal written analysis of the costs, but there there was an analysis being done within CE. I know like you said, you've been working with the department. Is that something that it's a little challenging because it's not apples to apples. So we're we're trying to continue to work and have these conversations so we can.

See the best we can what the comparison is. Yeah, I guess we're just asking if, you know, if you can share with us to keep us in the loop on that, that would be really helpful, of course.

I guess like just stick with the theme to the extent there are public defender, I guess just for for all of the items, if there are people that can access that JJCCJRBG money, please do something. It's really annoying to me. The number is huge. The more we learn about it, it's growing, right? Yeah, it's not actually getting spent there. I know they're trying very hard to catch up, but it's crazy hard to catch up when you're 10s of millions of dollars behind. So again, I just throw it out there to make sure that yes, I know y'all are aware of. The Hertz Defender are very strong advocates for their revenue and and are reaching out for different sources. They do have JJCPA and JRBG funding.

So I will definitely check in with them to see if there's an additional opportunity that can be reached or if there and this is also kind of weird. So maybe I'm asking, I'm cursing myself and asking for more work, but if there are boundaries that you all at CEO think because you have a better view of.

Everybody's problems, right? And if you are like, whoa, here are some boundaries that we have in place that don't, that don't line up with the board's priorities about how to spend that money. I think we'd appreciate hearing that right to say like right now there's a boundary that doesn't allow us to spend that money on X. If you cross that, here's how this will change.

Because that number is ridiculous. I don't know what the total is, but my understanding of it is that it's large and getting larger. I'm almost like like it just so I really would just appreciate, you know, it just based on your expertise, right? Like see

what he's asking for X, but we can't give them that money from this bucket because why?

I might be able to change Y or if it's County Council or somebody saying like we can't change Y but we can change Z so that we can have a better understanding of like how to actually get that much out because we can't say like we're in this huge budget crisis and then simultaneously have a bucket of unspent funds that is 10s and 10s of millions of dollars.

No, totally agree. Sorry, sorry, I I promise I'll get off the soapbox. It's the last thing I'm gonna say for now. Also in that piece, Steve, it's my understanding that there has also been like a formula change to this funding and so that may also include expanded ways to use the funding. So maybe also looking into that to see.

Where can we can like use that planning for in the future? Because yeah, there is been a change to the formula that could be beneficial for DYD cost. OK, thank you for that. Can I also step on with sofa 1 foot though, not the whole, not the whole day. I guess I I can kind of hear potentially the argument of a lot of the desires and needs for funding in the county are related to staffing or ongoing costs and some of these funding parts are like one time correct funding costs and trying to be a little conservative about that part.

However, put on the soapbox, I think with these funds, we know that they're at least consistently know that they're there and can plan for, you know, five years of funding for. I'm using the homeless unit even though I know it's not feel like you know that that.

That time frame to hopefully when we're in that space where we have a better budget situation that we can then make up whatever that the rest of it is. I get not wanting to. I can see the desire to not want to allocate one time.

Funding for staffing costs. But I think given the crisis that we're in, if there's those opportunities to do that for a short period of time, five years, three years, whatever that may be, I think that's something to to sure, sure. And you know, when those requests come in, we absolutely look at them in that way, right, especially in light of the current climate.

And can this assist them now until we figure out what's coming because they're revenue offset requests, right. So we look at those with a very different perspective than a straight NCC request. So we definitely want to make those type of requests work for the department if we can.

Without causing structural issues. Absolutely. Which is we never want that. We don't

want to kick the problem down the road, right? But we also don't want fun sitting somewhere, right? Opportunity to be. It's a fine balance because it's not perfect. That's right. OK, but I'm still.

No, all good stuff. Any other questions for public defender? All right, moving on to ultimate public defender. Change number one is an 8109 adjustment to remove serial one-time funding.

Which includes 7 positions. Change #2 removes prior year one-time funding for immigration defense. Change #3 is a finance target. Change #4 is a cost of living adjustment for an existing position supporting the Felony Incompetent to Stand Trial, also known as FIST program.

And changes #5 and six are finance targets.

Immigration defense. I I guess I should have asked about it last one, but it's OK. It's the same. It's one time funding at that was done at the board's direction, if I'm remembering, right? Yes, with the IT was settlement funding from the site price settlement. OK. And so because there's no more settlement funds.

That's why that's going away or no. So the funding is one time in nature. So this also needs to be managed each year where we back it out and then we're going to put it back. They have up to five years to spend from the time they receive the money. So they both APD and PD received the funding in fiscal year 2526, the current year. So now the clock starts, right? So they.

We have up to five years to fully spend down their allocations, so we will put it back in fiscal year 2627. That request hasn't come through yet, but we have time to get it. OK. Thank you. Sure.

You said that it's true the same for it's for both. Yes, it's from the same settlement. Any other questions for APD?

All right, moving on to trial court. Change #1 is a reduction in ongoing funding for information technology services cost fully offset by revenue. Change #2 removes prior year one-time funding for indigent defense.

PACE rate increases in cybersecurity. Change #3 provides funding for compensation rate increases for select PACE appointees initially approved in fiscal year 2526 using one time funding. Changes #4 and five are finance targets.

And for IDCO, we have two changes. Change #1 removes prior year one-time funding to support care court operations and change #2 is a finance target.

For the care code operations, just is that another situation where they actually will receive funding down done pipe for? Is this a \$5 million reduction in care? It's a

reduction to what they currently have, so they will have a remainder of 3.8 million. For the coming year and that was sufficient at the moment, yes, they did say that they are working with the state that let's see the State Bar anticipates that they will be drafting A three-year funding agreement through budget Act year 2027. So there's possible that it's possible that even more funding will come through. However, the final word on that has not been.

received yet from the state.

And to your question of whether it's sufficient, unfortunately the spending of care court has not been at the level that they expected. It's always been lower. So, so because of that they have sufficient funding to cover what they need, however, from the first.

Budget Act year which was 2023, the state Budget Act year which runs from July 23 to December 31st 2024, so a year and a half. They had 737 cases this past Budget Act year which is 2024 from July 1st 24 to December 31st 2025 they had 1006.

615 cases. So it did exponentially increase and the funding that they had was sufficient to provide those services. OK. So even if it continues to kind of increase at the pace, it's it's growing right now, there's enough to sustain it, correct, correct. And then hopefully we will hear that there will be additional funding coming through. When do we find that out? You said. I'm not sure. To be honest, I believe it will be in line with the governor's budget, so maybe not till fall, but I can find out for sure for you. OK, sure.

And then lastly is grand jury, which only has one change and it's a finance target.

Thank you so much. Thank you. Vincent, go ahead and cover the Carefirst meeting coverage committee investment changes and then I'll cover the calculation.

For CFCI, the first two adjustments sparsely offset each other. The first adjustment reflects the deletion of the 2526 one-time carryover funding in the amount of 427.3 million from the CFCI to the allocated budget. We added the one-time carryover funding in 2526 up on changes, so now we're reversing that adjustment.

In this budget phase, the second adjustment reflects the addition of 413.5 million in one time period of funding to various CFCI budget units to continue to support the board approved CFCFCI projects, including the year four and year five spending plans.

The projected one-time carryover funding is impacted by year-to-date actual expenditures, primarily from year four plan year four programs, and a carryover amount will be refined in a future budget phase to reflect the available one-time

funding.

The third adjustment is the CFCI Homeless Services and Housing Funding. This adjustment reflects the transfer of 19.8 million in ongoing funding from the DHSCFCIDHS budget to the CFCIHSA budget to provide funding for housing for health programs. That's consistent with the Ford's with the.

HSA board letter that was approved by the board on December 9th of last year with a net zero impact to the CFCI budget.

The 4th adjustment is the adjacent funding recommendations. The adjustment reflects net 0 adjustments to the year one spending plan to close Bend Central Jail project funding, including a reduction of 4.9 million to J cut stop program, reduction of 4.7 million to J cut Central Housing program, and a reduction of 2.4 million to the ODR Maternal Health program.

The adjustment also reflects 8.3 million in new ongoing funding for the ODRP 3P4 jail to population. BEDS program would take the budget from 20.6 million to 28.9 million to align the budget with the anticipated spending needs in fiscal year 2627 and 200,000 to new.

Two ongoing funding for public defending diversion for staffing for one new position to support jail to population efforts. So the funding for the adjacent programs and positions that support the county's jail to population efforts are already budgeted in this CFCI budget, so there's a net 0 impact and then the last adjustment.

Is the CFCI year six set aside adjustment. This adjustment reflects an increase of 26.7 million to the CFCA annual set aside from 20 from 287.6 million to 314.3 million in ongoing funding reflect year six of CFCI funding support programs.

That include direct community investments and alternatives to incarceration, consistent with the board's directive priority of care first and jails last. We calculate the change to the CFCI set aside in all three budget phases. However, we only update the set aside and recommended.

And that's because the Measure J, the CFCA budget policy and the county code required that the set aside be updated annually. So we only do it one time a year and I will turn. Are there any questions or any adjustments?

Mm.

Can I just ask a clarifying question before? So she's looking at me on for the the STOP. What I'm hearing is this is already allocated in the current CMCI with STOP and the interim housing program, those programs they're.

What's happening here is they're losing their ongoing because they were awarded

one-time funding. We have the year five spending plan. So those two, those two JCOP programs actually receive one-time funding. So what C, excuse me, Jason is doing is they're pulling their ongoing funding because they're they want to put more money into the jailed population plan program.

So they're just reallocating, but it's not as if those programs don't have funding. They have one time funding. It's just being replaced. They're ongoing goes like one time with CFCI, all with soft CFCI.

So on that point, can you remind us how much Jason's like, what's the pot that they're, how much the pot is that they're allocating? It's it's 42 million and they have about 3.5 million left that's unallocated that they're planning to allocate in final changes.

And then to to the last item that Vincent covered, which is the year six set aside amount, if you would please scroll to the next slide.

This is the table that covers the calculation of how we arrive at that number. I can go through the long process or the short process to not belabor you guys with all the details in how we arrive at that. I'll start with just a brief overview of how the the chart works here.

You'll see that we start off with the ongoing locally, locally generated revenue and here we cover 3 phases just for the for the visibility. Here we start off with the 2526 recommended, which is column two.

And then we identify the supplemental changes, which is column four. But the the column that matters most and at this point in time is column six, which is 2627 recommended budget. So we start off with 9.4.

Billion dollars in locally generated, ongoing locally generated revenues. Then we adjust for the restrictive NCC uses that are called out for in the board policy 4.031, which includes.

CFCIATIDCI program investments, contractual obligations, employee benefits, legal obligations, state federal statute requirements and so forth. And then we arrive at the total offsets figure, which you could see the total of the offsets is \$6.258 billion.

Leaving us with an unrestricted NCC amount subject to CFCI calculation of about \$3.1 billion. We apply the 10% to that figure and that's how we arrive.

At the.

Yeah, so the the \$314.3 million and the difference between the 314.3 million and the 287.7 million from 2627 is what represents the \$26.6668 million.

In the new set aside, just just the note to remember that this number can adjust up

or down in the following fiscal year, but that's that's just the gist of how we got to that number.

Any questions on?

Can you just like curious, do you know what we can attribute the almost 400 million?

I think that looks like increase in locally generated revenue from last recommendations, property tax, property tax.

Thank you.

Any other questions?

Thank you. Thank you so much. One public comment before the presentation. All right, here we go. Are there any public comments for item 4ABC or D? Hi, I'll be quick. Wendy Julian, Probation Oversight Commission. I want to appreciate CEO. I know this is very hard.

And disappointing to see such small growth figures for DYD and Jacot in particular understanding the countywide curtailment. But the irony is not lost on me that part of this curtailment is because of harm to youth who are in who were in facilities and it's preventing us.

From doing better around preventing harm to youth abuse facilities, I wanted to say that I appreciate the conversation on the spending with JJRBG and JCOD, but I think Natalia hit it on the head about part of the problem, which is the long term funding positions.

And I hope you'll also ask questions about how many positions are in those departments, like probation. The Probation Oversight Commission and looking at post-secondary education found 33 FT ES around post-secondary education. I'd love to know how many FT ES there are around the programming that could be used to support the DYD efforts.

Around the pre-trial services, just some data on how many FTS there are, how many vacancies there are that I think could help address that issue. So thank you and POC will be talking about the budget on April 9th.

Are there any other public comments with these items? I will move to general public comment. Are there any general public comments today?

We see them for our future for adjournments. Well, that concludes today's open session for the public customer meeting. Thank you everybody for coming and we'll move on for session.

□ **Dardy Chen** stopped transcription