



Board of Supervisors Family & Social Services Cluster Agenda Review Meeting

DATE: May 6, 2026

TIME: 2:00PM

MEETING CHAIRS: Anthony Cespedes, 1st Supervisorial District

CEO MEETING FACILITATOR: Claudia Alarcon

THIS MEETING IS HELD UNDER THE GUIDELINES OF BOARD POLICY 3.055.

To participate in the meeting in-person, the meeting location is:

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012
Room 140

To participate in the meeting virtually, please call teleconference number
1 (323) 776-6996 and enter the following 995 916 944# or

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

For Spanish Interpretation, the Public should send emails within 48 hours in advance of the meeting to: ClusterAccommodationRequest@bos.lacounty.gov

Members of the Public may address the Family & Social Services Cluster on any agenda item during General Public Comment.

The meeting chair will determine the amount of time allowed for each item.

THIS TELECONFERENCE WILL BE MUTED FOR ALL CALLERS. PLEASE DIAL *6 TO UNMUTE YOUR PHONE WHEN IT IS YOUR TIME TO SPEAK.

- I. **Call to Order**
- II. **Consent Item(s)** (Any Information Item is subject to discussion and/or presentation at the request of two or more Board offices):
-- No items --
- III. **Motions(s)**
SD4: Language Justice: Enhancing Consistent Language Access to the Department of Children and Family Services' Asian Pacific Program
SD3: Aligning County Behavioral Health Services for Young People
- IV. **Presentation/Discussion Items:**
-- No items --
- V. **Public Comment**
- VI. Standing item(s) and those continued from a previous meeting of the Board of Supervisors or from a previous FSS Agenda Review meeting.
-- No items --

VII. Adjournment

IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO EMAIL A COMMENT ON AN ITEM ON THE FAMILY & SOCIAL SERVICES CLUSTER AGENDA, PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING EMAIL ADDRESS AND INCLUDE THE AGENDA NUMBER YOU ARE COMMENTING ON:

[Family Social Services@ceo.lacounty.gov](mailto:Family_Social_Services@ceo.lacounty.gov)

MOTION BY SUPERVISOR JANICE HAHN

Language Justice: Enhancing Consistent Language Access to the Department of Children and Family Services' Asian Pacific Program

Asian American and Native Hawaiians/Pacific Islander (AANHPI) residents make up 16% of Los Angeles County's (County) 11 million residents. One in six people identify as AANHPI. The AANHPI community spans a range of languages, ethnicities, and cultures. Over a third of the AANHPI population in the County speak another language other than English. There are more than 240,000 children of AANHPI descent, which accounts for one in seven children in the County.

The Asian Pacific Program (APP) is bilingual bicultural service section of the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) established in 1987 to assist AANHPI families with culturally and linguistically appropriate child welfare services to prevent child abuse and to improve their quality of life. Today, it is staffed to serve some of the following languages: Cambodian (Khmer), Cantonese, Mandarin, Japanese, Korean, Tagalog, and Vietnamese.

While the existing program provides critical language services to AANHPI families experiencing involvement in the DCFS system, more must be done to expand the list of languages and ensure that communities such as the South Asian and the Pacific Islander diasporas are not left out. Large language populations including Punjabi, Hindi, Bengali,

MOTION

MITCHELL	_____
HORVATH	_____
HAHN	_____
BARGER	_____
SOLIS	_____

Tongan, and Samoan need dedicated resources and staffing within the department. According to the latest Census data, there are more than 50,000 people in Los Angeles County who speak these languages at home, many of whom are monolingual speakers.

In 2024, the County Board of Supervisors (Board) adopted a policy to mandate departments to develop language access plans, including DCFS. In response, DCFS issued its Language Access Plan (LAP) in July 2025¹. The plan includes a variety of steps implemented by DCFS to ensure language accessibility. For example, “DCFS identifies priority languages by extracting data entered by Children’s Social Workers (CSW) into CW/CMS for each child’s case. This process ensures that the languages reported are directly linked to the children and families we serve and reflect the linguistic needs of our client populations. The primary languages are determined by assessing active cases and identifying the most frequently reported language other than English (LOTE) spoken by children and their families.”

Despite the plan and a dedicated unit within DCFS to communities with diverse language needs, advocates have raised concerns with the department regarding cases involving families and children who need language services but did not receive them, resulting in adverse consequences that should have been avoided. Notwithstanding previous motions emphasizing the need for and to expand accessibility of language access and services, master agreements, and shared resources from other County departments, or even on-demand interpreters, there is a gap that needs to be addressed and resolved.

Additionally, the provision of language services does not end with having materials

¹ <https://file.lacounty.gov/SDSInter/bos/supdocs/209127.pdf>

available or on-hand for the 13 threshold languages in California² and Los Angeles County³, but to also have a plan to address language needs to accommodate those who engage with the County systems that are not represented in the list of threshold and concentration languages. The County prides itself in its diversity in communities and languages and has worked to expand language access resources to its constituents, in-language translation through software for Board meetings, and under the Board's direction for more engagement with ethnic media with a focus on inclusion in all forms.

Advocates cited an alarming example of a client who experienced physical, emotional, and financial abuse during her marriage. During one incident, law enforcement was called. The police arrived to get a statement from both parties. DCFS was then dispatched due to a child being in the home. The client's English was very limited, yet no interpreter was provided. Due to her testimony not being properly taken or understood and no culturally informed assessment made, the investigation wrongly labeled her the "perpetrator" and removed the child due to the client's alleged failure to protect. She lost custodial rights to her child, and the court was taking steps to grant the visitation rights for the father, despite his potential danger to the child and the system players' reliance on incomplete and false statements and information. Through the intervention of South Asian Network (SAN), a nonprofit organization based in the Fourth Supervisorial District, which provided a dedicated caseworker who spoke Bengali, advocated for the client and child leading to their reunification.

This is one of many examples that child welfare advocates have raised to highlight

2

<https://www.dhcs.ca.gov/formsandpubs/Documents/MMCDAPLsandPolicyLetters/APL%202025/Threshold-and-Concentration-Languages-for-All-Counties.pdf>

³ https://file.lacounty.gov/SDSInter/dhs/1078266_AttachmentA-LosAngelesCountyThresholdLanguages.pdf

the gaps in language services within the system with dire consequences.

The reality is that an aspect of our constituents' engagement with County departments can be negative and stressful, for example entanglements with law enforcement, child welfare, juvenile justice, and the like, and LOTE individuals, navigating a complex system with a language barrier creates even more anxiety. These individuals are less likely to have informed consent documented, significantly reducing their understanding of procedures and processes, but also their autonomy in decision making. It increases the likelihood of individuals receiving inaccurate or insufficient information to make decisions, confidentiality breaches, and increased service errors and inefficiencies. Overall, miscommunication wastes time and resources and has the potential to cause irreversible harm.

Due to the critical and sensitive nature of child welfare services, more must be done to expand language accessibility in Los Angeles County.

I, THEREFORE, MOVE that the Board of Supervisors:

1. Direct the Department of Children and Family Services, in collaboration with the Office of Immigrant Affairs and the Office of Child, Youth, and Family Wellbeing, to report back, to the Board, in writing, in 90 days on the following:
 - a. The current languages and language services provided by the Asian Pacific Program section, including data-driven justifications of the selected languages currently being provided, if languages are outside of the threshold criteria;
 - b. Operating hours and policy and protocol considerations made for after-hour calls;
 - c. DCFS Hotline policy and protocol considerations to identify Language Other Than English (LOTE) callers and clients to provide consistent access to

language support, resources, and services; and

- d. An accounting of staff dedicated to the APP section, including any outside contractors or consultants; and inventory of bilingual and multilingual staff within the department, including their spoken and written capacities, as legally allowed.
2. All existing departmental protocols and policies for language service provisions, including but not limited to:
 - a. Status and current roles and duties of any and all individuals who are responsible for coordinating and/or overseeing the provision of meaningful language services, e.g., language access liaison or other staff delegated to perform these tasks; screening, evaluation protocols;
 - b. Procedures and process for when DCFS receives language service requests that the APP section cannot fulfill;
 - c. Current screening and evaluation protocols for translators and interpreters to provide services to DCFS; and
 - d. Current training provided on the DCFS Language Access Plan to APP section staff and all DCFS staff who are client-facing.
 3. Assessment and recommendations on how multilingual communications are meaningfully provided in languages that are emerging, have been historically isolated, are of lesser diffusion, and/or do not have a commonly used written format.
 4. Assessment and recommendations on how multilingual communications are meaningfully provided during urgent and emergency response situations.
 5. The feasibility, including the amount of funding needed, of expanding the number of languages served by the APP section. The feasibility report should use the following

data points in determining additional languages needed:

- a. The most recent census data from the United States Census Bureau, or recent data from any other relevant databases, including but not limited to, any of the following:
 - i. English Learner Data, available on the DataQuest reporting system, or any other relevant data provided by the California Department of Education;
 - ii. Any relevant data provided by the State Department of Finance;
 - iii. Community-level input from various mechanisms, including evidence-based data provided by community-based organizations or advocates⁴, focus groups, roundtables, and advisory bodies, especially during times of emergencies; and
 - b. Any relevant factors other than those described in this section, including levels of linguistic isolation⁵ and percentages of limited English proficiency within each language group.
6. A progress report on the Department's implementation of its Language Access Plan, to include status on trainings, briefings, and updates to policies and procedures.
 7. Assessment and recommendations on safeguards that will be developed and implemented around the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and machine translation, utilizing the State of California Guidelines for Evaluating Impacts of Generative AI on Vulnerable and Marginalized Communities (GenAI Equity Guidelines) (December 2024).

⁴ AAPI Equity Alliance, South Asian Network, Center for Asian Americans United for Self Empowerment, Asian Americans Advancing Justice, Center for the Pacific Asian Family, Korean American Family Services

⁵ Households where no one over the age of 14 speaks English well or at all.

- a. Safeguards must include mechanisms for accountability, qualified human review, monitoring and oversight, ensuring no adverse impact on communities with protected characteristics, i.e., national origin and ethnic group identification⁶, and transparency and notice to linguistically marginalized communities.

I, FURTHER MOVE, that the Board of Supervisors

1. Direct the Department of Children and Family Services to report back, in writing, within 90 days on the following, with an emphasis on individuals who are Language Other than English (LOTE) speakers:
 - a. The current departmental policy on Failure to Protect and ensuring cultural competency and sensitivity are incorporated in the implementation of it;
 - b. The existing resources provided to domestic violence survivors with open DCFS cases, including in-language system navigation; and
 - c. The training that all client-facing DCFS staff, including investigators and social workers, with specific emphasis on the APP section, receive on domestic violence, along with evaluations and recommendations on the need to expand the trainings to be more culturally competent.

#

JH:el

⁶ California Government Code 11135

MOTION BY SUPERVISOR JANICE HAHN

VOTES REQUIRED:

- 3-VOTES 4-VOTES 5-VOTES

CATEGORIES: (Please check those that apply)

- Arts, Culture and the Creative Economy
- Child Welfare
- Community and Youth Empowerment
- County Services
- Delegated Authority
- Economic and Workforce Development
- Economic Justice
- Education
- Environment
- Fiscal
- Governance
- Health
- Homelessness
- Immigration
- Legislation
- Parks and Open Space
- Planning/Land Use
- Public Safety
- Social Justice and Human Rights
- Technology and Data
- Transportation
- Veterans

EXEMPTION FROM CLUSTERS: (Please check if the motion is exempt from the cluster process and the reason for exemption)

- See Rules of the Board, Section 22.2(f)

REASON FOR EXEMPTION:

- 1. Emergency, as provided by the Brown Act
- 2. Urgency, as provided by the Brown Act
- 3. Declaration and ratifications of emergency and all recovery and related actions
- 4. Fee waivers
- 5. Reward motions
- 6. Proclamations without substantive policy directives
- 7. Adjournments in a deceased person's memory
- 8. Presentation of scrolls
- 9. Actions that are in response to, or otherwise related to, any action taken by the federal government, including all of its branches and any department, agency, or instrumentality under their authority.

CLUSTERS: (Please check which cluster meeting the motion will be introduced)

- 1. Operations
- 2. Community Services
- 3. Family and Social Services
- 4. Health and Mental Health Services
- 5. Public Safety
- 6. Economic Development Policy Committee

CLUSTER MEETING DATE:

5/6/2026

BOARD MEETING DATE:

5/19/2026

MOTION BY SUPERVISOR LINDSEY P. HORVATH

May 19, 2026

Aligning County Behavioral Health Services for Young People

According to the LA County (County) Youth Commission’s [2025 Annual Report](#), mental health is the leading concern for young people across Los Angeles County. In the report, based on surveys of 881 young people from all five Supervisorial Districts, mental health ranked higher than education, employment, and even housing as the most important priority for young people. Of the youth surveyed, 551 or 63% identified as system-involved, defined as having had involvement with any County department including the Departments of Children and Family Services (DCFS), Mental Health (DMH), Public Social Services (DPSS), Public Health (DPH) among others, emphasizing the need for stronger coordination across County systems to support young people, particularly those in care.

This issue is not new. Over the last several years, this Board has elevated the needs of young people and encouraged County departments, including DCFS and DMH, to continue to work together to align and better support our young people. Mental

MOTION

MITCHELL _____

HORVATH _____

HAHN _____

BARGER _____

SOLIS _____

health is part of the behavioral health continuum, and the County must ensure alignment across this continuum to meet the full range of young people's needs. Behavioral health includes mental health as well as substance use prevention and treatment, crisis response, and community-based supports.

As part of the County's broader behavioral health continuum, DMH has the Child Welfare Division (CWD), as well as divisions serving transition-aged youth (TAY), and DPH has the Substance Use Prevention and Control (SAPC) Bureau. CWD is a crucial partner to DCFS in providing specialty mental health services to children in the child welfare system at different stages of their involvement with DCFS. DCFS provides funding for the cost of DMH staffing (including co-located DMH staff at DCFS offices) for these programs as well as services for those children/youth who are not Medi-Cal eligible. The Department of Youth Development (DYD) additionally funds community-based providers across the County who may also be providing mental health supports, including to young people served by DCFS and DMH. At the same time, it is currently unclear how DMH housing resources are allocated to foster and probation-involved youth, and how these resources align with the new Department of Homeless Services and Housing (HSH).

Despite these efforts and the resources available, young people, especially those in County systems, continue to face increasing mental health challenges. Given the ongoing budget crisis and cuts to our health safety net, the County must align services, leverage resources, and strengthen coordination to ensure that young people – both in and out of care – have access to the full range of behavioral health services they need. The County must reexamine our existing systems, referral pathways, and

available resources, not to place blame or make excuses, but to improve and enhance available supports. Young people are telling the County what they need, and it is time for the Board to listen and take action.

I, THEREFORE, MOVE that the Board of Supervisors direct the Office of Child, Youth, and Family Wellbeing (OCYFW), in partnership with the Departments of Mental Health (DMH), Public Health-Substance Abuse Prevention & Control Bureau (DPH-SAPC), Children and Family Services (DCFS), Homeless Services and Housing (HSH), Probation, and Youth Development (DYD), and in consultation with the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE), to report to the Board in writing in 90 days on the behavioral health services provided to children, youth, and young adults up to age 26, including those currently or formerly involved in DCFS and Probation systems. The report should include, but not be limited to, the following:

- a. Behavioral health programs funded or administered by the departments listed above that serve children, youth, and young adults, including for each program: funding source, referral mechanisms, population served, eligibility criteria, service capacity and vacancies, total number of individuals served annually, and outcomes or performance metrics used to assess effectiveness.
- b. The most current data available, including identifiable trends, on how many young people are receiving services through Medi-Cal managed care plans and the specialty mental health and substance use disorder plans.
- c. Identifying which programs and funding are new investments through Behavioral Health Services Act (BHSA) or other funding sources, and which are specifically allocated to current and former foster youth, probation-involved youth, and

transition-aged youth.

- d. Identification of applicable unspent, underspent, or flexible funding within the departments listed above that can be repurposed or leveraged to expand or enhance mental health services.
- e. An analysis of gaps in services; duplication or overlap across programs and departments; and barriers to access, including eligibility restrictions, referral processes, and challenges in connecting young people to appropriate levels of care.
- f. A mapping of how children, youth, and young adults currently access behavioral health services, and specifically mental health services, across County systems, including key entry points (e.g. schools, DCFS, Probation, crisis response systems), transitions between departments, and identification of points at which young people are most likely to experience disruptions in care.
- g. Recommendations on how to improve alignment, coordination, and service delivery, including how to better leverage or expand resources and funding to provide behavioral health services to youth.

#

LH:es