>> Can we see if we've met quorum?

I know we've met quorum in the room, but can we see if there are some folks online.

>> Ladies and gentlemen, it's 4:12 and I think it's time to get the meeting going.

I believe we have quorum between those that are in person and those that are virtual.

So, good evening everybody.

My name is Michelle Fuentes-Miranda.

I'm the co-chair for this committee meeting.

I'm calling the meeting to order.

I want to thank everyone for joining this CFCI advisory meeting.

Before we begin, I'll hand it over to Kassy who can read the meeting disclosures.

>> Thank you.

This meeting is being recorded.

By remaining in this meeting, you consent to being recorded.

This is a public meeting and subject to the Brown Act.

Since is conversations and statements on the chat are not visible to people on the telephone the chat function is limited to technical assistance.

There will be no response or forwarding.

If members of the public would like to provide comment, please do so during the general public comment period.

For closed caption assistance, CART services are available.

You may access these services by clicking on the Streamtext link that will be pried in the chat.

When accessing Zoom or smartphone Zoom app, scroll to re, as on the bottom tab and you will see the raised hand feature.

Control to more at the bottom tab and you will see a dropdown menu.

Telephone dial-in information will also be provided in the chat.

And press star six to unmute.

For Spanish interpretation, please click on the globe icon in Spanish.

Written comments are to be sent to JCOD@LAcounty.gov.

These public comments will be shared with the advisory committee members prior to the meeting and will be reflected in the meeting minutes.

Written comments received after 5:00 p.m. the day before the meeting, the end of the meeting, will be made part of the public record for the meeting.

Advisory members may not have the opportunity to read those comments.

This includes the meeting disclosures, I'll pass it back to the committee.

>> Thank you.

I want to once again thank everybody for being here today.

We have a wonderful meeting planned and another presentation, part two to the year one program.

If we can go ahead and do roll call.

>> We will now conduct the roll call.

To expedite this process, we ask all advisory committee members to be ready with the microphone before your name is called so you can be ready to announce your attendance promptly.

If you're unable to unmute yourself, please raise your hand on the Zoom platform so we can assign co-host privileges to you.

If you're calling in on your phone, you can unmute yourself by pressing star 6.

You can raise your hand with star 9.

If you're participating remotely please indicate this by stating present, remotely, under just cause or remotely under emergency circumstances when your name is called.

After roll call is complete, we will review the list of members attending remotely.

For those attending under just cause, we will ask you to briefly state your reason for remote attendance.

As a reminder, no further action is required for just cause.

For those attending under emergency circumstances, we will ask you to briefly describe the emergency necessitating your remote attendance.

Following these descriptions, the committee will take a vote for your parse aegis under emergency circumstances.

We will begin the roll call by last name alphabetically.

Member Armstead or alternate.

- >> Alternate present.
- >> Member Carbajal or alternate
- >> Alternate present.
- >> Member Castillo or alternate.
- >> Present.
- >> Member Contreras or alternate.
- >> Present.
- >> Member Crunk or alternate.
- >> Alternate present.
- >> Member Cyrus-franklin or alternate.
- >> Present remotely.
- >> Member Eakins.

>> Present.
•
>> Member Tsai or alternate.
>> Present remotely.
>> Member Fuentes-Miranda or alternate.
>> Present.
>> Member Garcia or alternate.
Member Hong or alternate.
>> Alternate present.
>> Member Lewis or alternate.
>> Present.
>> Member LoBianco or alternate.
>> Alternate present.
>> Member O'Brien or alternate.
Give me one moment, please.
Member knight or alternate.
>> Alternate present.
>> Member Scorza or alternate.
>> Alternate present.

>> Member Steele or alternate.
Member Stevens.
>> Present.
>> Member Williams or alternate.
>> Alternate present.
>> Member Myk 'l Williams.
Member Wong or alternate.
Okay.
We will now go back to
>> Hi, this is member Soto.
I think I was skipped.
I'm walking in.
Present.
>> Thank you.
We will now go back to those that are remote.
If you can indicate your reason for remote whether you're attending under just cause or emergency circumstance.
>> Yeah, this is Gary Tsai.
I'm driving in.
I should be there in about 20 to 30 minutes.

So I'm actually not remote.
I will be there in person, I'm just going to be late.
>> Noted.
I'll mark you arrived after roll call in person.
And we have one other member remote.
>> Yes.
Member Cyrus-franklin.
Parenting responsibilities.
I don't know.
How to articulate it.
Got to get my daughter.
>> Thank you.
Thank you.
This meeting has reached a quorum.
>> Okay.
We're going to open up our meeting with the land acknowledgement read by member
Castillo.
>> Thank you.
The land beneath our previous ancestral land of people who've lived in Los Angeles county and surrounding areas for thousands of years.

I would like for us to acknowledge the tribes and the Chumash people.

The native people understood and respected the land.

Connected and respected the four-legged creatures who once roamed the earth freely everything in between and in the ocean.

Their hearts told them never to make more than they could use ask always give back to mother earth.

These amazing people are still here today living and breathing among us and still giving back to the community around us.

Thank you to our ancestors.

>> Thank you.

And the committee labor acknowledgement by member Stevens.

>> Labor acknowledgement.

Most modern day United States institutions have benefited from the unaddressed legacy of stolen labor as a foundation of the nation in its vast and inequitable wealth.

We respectfully acknowledge the debt to the enslaved people primarily of African descent whose labor and suffering built and grew the economy and infrastructure of a nation that refused to recognize their humanity.

While the 13th amendment to the constitution technically ended slavery in the United States, we know that slavery ongoing impacts are still felt by countless people forced through violent threats and coercion to work in the United States.

We recognize our debt to exploited workers past and present whose labor was and continues to be stolen through unjust practices.

We acknowledge our collective debt to the indigenous people of this land whose labor was forced and exploited.

The Chinese immigrants who built railroads that allowed for westward American development, Japanese Americans who properties and livelihoods were taken from them.

All incarcerated during World War II.

And immigrant workers from the Philippines, Mexico and central and South America who have worked Pacific northwest forms and canneries.

We recognize the immigrant and American born workers of African, Asian, central, and South American descent whose labor remains hidden in the shadows but still contributes to the well being of our collective community.

We recognize that our economy continues to rely on the exploited labor of incarcerated people, largely people of color who are generating billions in goods and services each year.

And we know there are many other people to numerous dimensions who are prevented from reaping the true value of their labor by unjust systems and cruel practices.

We morn their loss of life, liberty, and opportunity.

We acknowledge the theft of labor is the theft of generational progress.

Nearly all people of color have been robbed of the opportunity and wealth that their ancestors may otherwise have passed on to them.

>> Chair: Thank you.

And now for the committee agreements.

Number one, be respectful of the diverse voices, be represented and remain open minded.

Be mindful of the power dynamics in this space as well as the historical disenfranchisement of black and indigenous communities.

Prioritizing throughout this process.

- >> Be mindful of the audience you're speaking to and make sure you speak with clarity.
- >> Be collaborative
- >> Assume best intentions.

>> I'm sorry.

Excuse me.

First, I'm going to take public comment before you take the roll.

But, um, I just want to confirm I know we talked about marking people absent when they got here.

But I want to understand.

I'm absent on both of these dates and I don't think I was absent on the 6th and the 20th.

I'm sorry.

On the 6th.

Most importantly I just wanted to remind you we've got to take public comment before you vote.

>> Thank you, member Lewis.

We will now open the general public comment period.

Please note the general public comments are limited the matters within the subject matter of the CFCI advisory committee.

As a reminder for this agenda item it's one minute per person.

Please use star 9 to raise the hand feature.

Computer and smartphone users locate your raised hand to be placed in the queue.

We will call you in the order your hand was raised.

Please remember to state your full name.

We will now begin.

Seeing none, are there any on zoom?

There are no public comments.

This concludes a public comment period for this agenda item.

We will now take roll for the vote.

>> Member: I'm sorry.

I was not present at the March 6th meeting.

>> It was La Shonda Diggs as an alternate member for her.

Is that accurate, member Contreras.

>> Member: Yes.

Thank you.

>> Clerk: And member Lewis you indicated that -- okay.

And we'll go ahead and move forward with the vote.

Member Carbajal or alternate.

>> Member: Abstain.

Clerk: Member Castillo or alternate.

>> Member: Aye.

>> Clerk: Member Contreras or alternate.

>> Member: Aye.

>> Clerk: Member Crunk or alternate.

>> Member: Aye.

>> Clerk: Member Eakins.

>> Member: Aye.

>> Clerk: Member Tsai or alternate.

>> Member: Aye.

>> Clerk: Member Fuentes-Miranda or alternate.

>> Member: Aye.

>> Clerk: Member Garcia or alternate.

Member Lewis.

>> Member: Aye.

>> Clerk: Member Hong or alternate.

>> Member: Aye.

>> Clerk: Member LoBianco or alternate.

>> Member: Abstain.

>> Clerk: Member knight or alternate.

>> Member: Abstain.

>> Clerk: Member Scorza or alternate.

>> Member: Abstain.

>> Clerk: Member Soto or alternate.

>> Member: Aye.

>> Clerk: Member Steele or alternate.

Member Stevens.

>> Member: Aye.

>> Clerk: Member Joey Williams or alternate.

>> Member: Abstain.

>> Clerk: Member Myk'l Williams.

Member Wong or alternate.

Motion passes.

>> Chair: Okay.

Thank you.

Agenda item eight, the review and take appropriate action on the minutes of the CFCI advisory committee regular meeting on March 20th, 2025.

Do we have a motion?

>> Member: A motion for the approval of March 20th CFCI meeting minutes.

>> Chair: Thank you.

Do we have a second.

>> Member: I second that.

>> Chair: Thank you.

Motion made by member Stevens, seconded by member Chavez.

Any discussion?

Okay.

Hearing none, we're going to go to public comment.

>> Clerk: This commences the public comment period for this agenda item.

Please note this public comment is limited to the matters within the subject matter jurisdiction of the CFCI advisory committee.

As a reminder, the public comment period is one minute per person.

Telephone users dial star 9 to raise hand and star 6 to unmute yourself.

Computer and smart moan users locate your raised hand to be put in the queue.

Please remember to state your full name and we'll begin the public comment period for this item.

Are there any public comments in the room?

Seeing none.

Are there any online?

There are no hands raised online.

Seeing none.

We are now concluding the public comment period for this agenda item.

We will now go to the vote.

>> Clerk: Following the same process for voting, I will start the voting by alphabetic order.

Member Carbajal or alternate.

>> Member: Abstain.

>> Clerk: Member Castillo or alternate.

>> Member: Aye.

>> Clerk: Member Contreras or alternate.

>> Member: Aye.

>> Clerk: Member Crunk or alternate.

>> Member: Abstain.

>> Clerk: Member Cyrus-franklin or alternate.

>> Member: Abstain.

>> Clerk: Member Eakins.

>> Member: Aye.

>> Clerk: Member Tsai or alternate.

>> Member: Aye.

>> Clerk: Member Fuentes-Miranda or alternate.

>> Member: Aye.

>> Clerk: Member Garcia or alternate.

Member Hong or alternate.

>> Member: Aye.

>> Clerk: Member Lewis or alternate.

>> Member: Aye.

>> Clerk: Member LoBianco or alternate.

>> Member: Abstain.

>> Clerk: Member knight or alternate.

>> Member: Abstain.

>> Clerk: Member Scorza or alternate.

>> Member: Abstain.

>> Clerk: Member Soto or alternate.

>> Member: Aye.

>> Clerk: Member Steele or alternate.

Member Stevens.

>> Member: Aye.

>> Clerk: Member Joey Williams or amount.

>> Member: Aye.

>> Clerk: Member Myk'l Williams.

Member Wong or alternate.

The motion passes.

>> Chair: Thank you.

If there's no objection, I'd like to move agenda item 10 up and then have the presentation first.

Everyone okay with that?

Okay.
Perfect.
Thank you.
So now we'll have the CFCI county program presentation the C-set year one program part two.
Welcome.
>> I'm sorry just really quick.
I don't object to moving it, but intelligent it will still be here because what we talked about related to our work, because of the motion, it may impact J-sit.
Hopefully they can still stay here for that.
>> We're planning to stay.
So that works for us.
We're planning to stay.
>> Okay.
>> So then your recommendation is to keep it.
Okay.
>> All right.
Good evening everyone.
>> Good evening.
>> Thank you for that.
I know traffic got the best of some of us but I appreciate the energy so far.

Hello, my name is Chitima Uma.

I'm formerly the team.

It's good to be back in front of you all.

I met many of you at the special meeting several weeks ago now.

Today, we are continuing what is now becoming a series of presentations about the funding that has been allocated to the closing T.J. project.

This is funding that our team has been stewarding since year one.

You heard last meeting from our executive director Wilford about our approach.

He opened up the series of presentations with some of the programs from the justice care and opportunities department.

So today's a continuation.

With that, we can go to the next slide and I'll just set the table for what you're about to here.

So as you saw last time, our strategic approach to developing a plan to closing the central jail, it includes three main prongs and this is not rocket science and it is continuing the work that has been done before but I only say it to try to give context for what you'll hear today.

So, of course, it's important to keep people from coming in to jail so we're reducing in-flow into the county jail and increasing out-flow so we release them safely and appropriately into the community.

But just as importantly how they get there.

So level 2; length of stay is about how quickly they're able to access out flow opportunities and free up bottlenecks to get them towards programs that may be able to take care of them in the community.

So with that, we can go to the next slide because what our going to hear today is about lever two.

So all of the programs that we fund with the CFCI funding, we have two programs that we need attorneys to really help us make sure that people have access to alternatives to incarceration.

And those programs are essentially legal staffing that gives people access to the office of re-diversion or re-entry.

So in the context of traffic because, again, I'm sure it got the best of many of us, not just me today.

If we think about starting and our end point as in-flow and out-flow, lever two is how fast we get there.

Is how much traffic do we have?

How many bottlenecks do we have?

And I'm not sure it's not surprising for anyone to hear in the legal process, there can be quite a few legal hiccups and court dates and processes that it takes to get people to legally resolve their case so that they can come out of jail.

So in doing this work, we also have made available resources for peoples' attorneys to help them cut through some of those barriers.

So you will hear today from the public defender's office and from the alternate public defender's office about their legal staffing essentially making more lawyers available to help people get access to O.D.R.

We can go to the next slide because it is the last slide.

This shows you how much funding both programs have and the current fiscal year.

So public defender has roughly 1.3 million and alternate public defender has also just south of that, but roughly 1.3 million as well.

They are both working on these efforts in a complementary way and they will both be sharing more information about the programs for you.

First, I'm going to call up the public defender's office colleagues and they will be happy to present and as I mentioned before, member Lewis, we are happy to remain here and answer questions.

>> So good evening CFCI advisory board members.

My name is Justine Essick.

I'm the chief deputy public defender and I have to tell you it is a great honor and we're excited to coming present to you today about some of the services the public defender's office offers about what we have done already with the funding that we were allocated through J-sit in the last CFCI recommendations and also to talk to you about really a new pilot, a new project that we really want to try to L try something transformational that will take us in a different direction that will help with our collective goal of closing the jail.

So I said to you that my name is Justine and I'm the chief deputy.

I've been the chief deputy for about five years.

I actually got appointed to the position the day of the safer at home COVID order.

So you can imagine over the last five years have been like.

I've learned a lot.

Before that, I was the head deputy of the lead attorney for our collaborative courts for O.D.R. and for our efforts at getting peoples' records cleared.

And before that, for most of my 28 years in this office, I was a trial attorney for the Los Angeles county public defender's office.

So, you know, what I would say is that being a public defender for me and for most public defenders I know is a labor of love.

It's a life's calling.

It's not just a job.

We care about what we do and we care about the people we represent.

And so as I move along, I want to introduce you to two other members of my team who I know feel just like I do.

They'll help me present today.

They're the real experts.

I'm just the chief deputy.

They're the people who do the work on the ground and really help our clients through our different programs.

So Marcus Huntly is the head deputy public defender for the collaborative courts O.D.R. and record clearing and restorative justice.

Our colleague Dana cherry is our mental health program manager and she leads our entire social work program for the public defender's office.

So you'll hear a bit from them about the specifics of all the programs.

I want to take just an opportunity to go over, you know, more of the basics to really reintroduce you to the work of the public defender's office because I think particularly in the last six years since public defender Ricardo Garcia, the first Latino public defender was appointed to his post, so many good changes have happened in the office and we offer so much more than we ever have in my 28 years in the P. DVMENTD's office, so I'm excited to share that with you.

You know, I also want to say, I've been coming to the CFCI advisory board meetings, some members of my team have as well particularly recently, and I do want to say I have been so impressed by the work that all of you have done to make careful and thoughtful recommendations about how is this money will be spent to really benefit the people in the communities.

And I'm also really humbled as I've listened in particular to the last few meetings because I understand, you know, what the basis of this money was and I understand that this was meant for community and I understand this was meant for direct services for people who live, work, and suffer in our communities and that it doesn't sit well necessarily to have to

share this money with county departments and that, you know, many of you might believe that there are other sources of money the county should be funded by.

So when I say I'm humbled by what I've heard here, I am.

But I also want to tell you that, you know, we hope that after hearing our presentation today, you will also believe that the services we offer and the services we're asking to be funded for, we're asking for your recommendation for are ones that are aligned with your alternatives to incarceration vision and your goal for jail closure without a replacement.

So if we could go to the next slide, please.

So I love the part of your meeting where you do acknowledgements.

I think it's really important to acknowledge what's come before and, you know, what still shares space with us as we move forward with, you know, the things we're doing and so I can't start this presentation without acknowledging all the work that's already been done not just for the last few years but for decades really in terms of alternatives to incarceration and jail closure.

You know, these efforts I know were started as grass roots efforts and many of you if not all of you were instrumental to those things.

And I hope you'll remember that public defenders, we're you're partners in these efforts as well.

You know, we are insiders in some respect because we're inside this criminal legal system and we have system insight that we can share with you, but we're also allies to community.

Because the same people you care about, public defenders care about them.

We care about everything you do and so public defenders share with this community the deep sense of frustration and sometimes anger at how slowly the system changes even with all the promises that have been made over the years about change.

We know that the current carceral model is fatally flawed.

It's never worked next slide please.

So I want to talk for just a minute about what has been done because I think that's really important.

We're frustrated, we're angry things haven't changed, but they've changed a little bit and we're on the cusp of what could really be a transformation and we believe that.

This board of supervisors, your advisory board, people within the community have made changes.

There have been motions that the board has passed to talk about jail closure JCIT was created.

Two new departments dedicated to care, JCOD, and JCIT were created and funding for mental health services have been dedicated from the county budget.

O.D.R. was created and expanded in some ways.

Even despite that, we're still not where we want to be.

But I'm here to tell you this work has not been in vain and public defenders do believe that system transformation, a destruction of what, you know, exists now and building something better is possible and we are dedicated and committed to working with our partners at JCOD, O.D.R. and at JCIT.

I'm still going to call them JCIT even though their name is CSIT.

I feel so strongly.

I'm keeping that name.

So, you know, I pledged to my team and I pledged to all of you that I would be super candid when I spoke to you today and so I want to talk to you about why we have not yet achieved this transformation.

Why we haven't.

And it's because the criminal legal system is an adversarial system.

Now what does that mean?

What it means is that the district attorneys and the prosecutors in the courtrooms have an enormous amount of discretion and an enormous amount of power to do what they want to each individual case and each judge who sits in a criminal court is what they call an independent judicial actor.

That means that they really don't have a boss.

They get to use their discretion and it is wide to do what they believe the law allows them to do.

And their decisions can't be challenged by the Superior Court's judicial leaders.

They make administrative decisions but they can't change a judge's decision and so the judges have a lot of power too.

And now with the pendulum swing with more progressive laws, we have seen the passage of prop 36 in late 2024 making many drug and theft charges felonies and we have seen a newly elected district attorney whose policies have increased the jail population just in six short months, have brought back sentencing enhancements which lengthen prison sentences by decades as well as have brought back the death penalty to Los Angeles.

To put a finer point on it just to illustrate for all of you, this is data that's available from the C.E.O.'s office.

On December 26th of 2024, twelve people were in county jail for drug and SHEFT defenses.

As of may just think about that for a second.

Next slide, please.

So I'll tell you something you already know and that you talk about it every meeting.

Where the money's allocated matters.

It matters to the services that are available to the people in your communities, to the people we all care about.

Now the C.E.O. groups county departments into what are called clusters for budgetary purposes and other things.

And so, you know, there's something that you all may know about, the big fund which is the general fund or net county cost, N.C.C., it's one large fund from which the county staffs many of its departments.

Departments that have similar functions tend to be grouped by cluster so that C.E.O. can try to make sure the needs of the community are met by the services provided.

So when I say the departments with similar functions, what I mean is departments that operate in the same sphere, so they may not do the same thing, they may oppose each other, but they work in the -- they work in the same sphere.

And for years, you'll see on the slide, there's something called public safety cluster.

For years, public defender and alternate public defender were part of the public safety cluster that included the D.A., that includes the sheriff's department, that includes probation.

And so, you know, probation in the sheriff's department, they're the people who arrest the people we represent, the district attorney's office are the people who prosecute those people in court.

And so when we were part of the public safety cluster, our budgets were considered alongside of the budgets with the sheriff's department, the probation department, and the D.A.'s office because we have to fight them to protect our clients.

But in 2024, about a year after JCOD and DYD were created.

When JCOD and D.Y.D. was created a new one was formed.

They were our care departments and so they were part of that cluster and about a year later in 2024, public defender alternate public defender and the independent defense council office were added to the CCJC cluster as well because we too offer care services.

So now all of our budgets are considered together.

And, again, even though N.C.C. is one big pot, you know, it makes a difference how resources are allocated.

Next slide, please.

So I want to say this, I think I've said it a couple times tonight but I want to say it unequivocally.

My boss said it tonight.

I get called to speak.

If there's a question on where public defenders stand on where jail closure without a replacement, here's the answer.

We stand with all of you, with the community, with JCOD, with O.D.R., D.Y.D. and with the jail closure implementation team.

We believe the jail can be closed without replacement and we want people out of jail fast and in large numbers because we believe there are programs that exist, treatment that exists and housing that exists right now which are better for people than being in a jail that doesn't treat people like humans.

So that's where we stand but I also want to make this caveat for you because I will tell you that most people, most leaders in this county believe this jail has to be closed and many believe it has to be closed without replacement but not everybody agrees on the way we get there and that's an important distinction.

I want to make one thing clear that I think it's really important for this advisory board to realize, the jail shouldn't be depopulated by sending people to prison fast and without due process.

There are counties in this state and there are states in this country that do not have a jail overcrowding problem.

But what they have is a human beings in prison without a fair trial.

That's not the way to keep your jail population down.

And so the big correlation that you will see in those counties that don't have a jail population problem but have a lot of people in prison and due process is under funded in the community and under funding public defenders.

That's not a mistake that should be made in Los Angeles county.

Because public defenders in Los Angeles are the ones standing in the way of that fast track to prison.

And we're the ones who are advocating to judges and convincing district attorneys that community alternatives will serve the interest of public safety because no matter how many beds we build out, no matter how many programs exist if they're not getting out of jail because we're not resourced to do so, NEN you haven't solved the problem.

Next slide, please.

>> Real quickly, hi everybody.

How are you doing today.

I'm sorry about my tardiness and I have a reason why I'm absent today.

There's a lot to get through the rest of this.

I think it's fantastic because you're giving a lot of great information.

But in the essence of time of making sure we can capture the things we need to capture today.

I want to make sure we're being very thoughtful about the presentation behind you.

>> I think there is.

I think it's alternate public defender.

>> Okay.

Cool.

So I just want to move -- just to make sure we're being thoughtful of time.

It's heading into 5:00 and I want to make sure we can capture and make sure there's room for questions and things as well.

>> Absolutely.

Just so you know, public defender and A.P.D. pre-talked out our presentation.

So we think we're good on time.

But I'll move along.

So just quickly, I want to distinguish between what the public defender is, what the alternate public defender is and what the independent defense council office is because we're three separate offices.

The public defender is the largest we call ourselves the first and the finest.

[Captioner Change 5:00 p.m.]

- >> Make sure we can capture and make sure there's room and for questions and things.
- >> Absolutely. Just so you know, Public Defender in APD pre-topped out our presentation and I think we're fine on time, but I'll move along.

I want to distinguish between what the Public Defender is and alternate Public Defender and independent defense counsel is. The Public Defender is the first in the nation and we have the most cases, the most clients. APD Jane Yang is here from the APD office. Conflict office. If there are two people charged in the same case, we can only take one and they can take another. If there is a conflict for the alternate Public Defender office the ID CO independent defender counsel take that's client. Next slide, please.

Public Defenders have two paths. This is the core work that we do. We are litigators. Every day our teams of bare legals and investigators and Attorneys collaborate to file and litigate motions and challenge policing and systemic racism and defend clients in trial when they are innocent, overcharged, or when they are facing draconian state prison sentences. Keep our clients in jail, get them outline if they are there. Divert them entirely out of the criminal legal system that has harmed so many people.

Next slide, please. We are holistic advocates and we have special units within our office, paralegals and social workers health services or getting them immigration help and clearing pathways to get a job or housing or custody if they are fighting for children. Next slide, please.

I'm going to turn it over to Dana Cherry, our Mental Health Program Manager. But she's going to talk a bit about our social work programs. I want to tell you about Public Defender

social workers and why they are unique because there are lots of social workers in LA County. When a client speaks to one of our social works, what they tell our social worker is protected. It can never be used against them in court or any proceeding. They are embraced by the same privilege that covers whatever is said to their Attorney, with that, I will turn it over to Dana.

>> DANA CHERRY: I'm Dana Cherry, the Mental Health Program Manager for the department. I want to tell you why it is important to have social workers in the Public Defender's office. We get to tell their stories. Who are you? Tell us about yourself. What are the gaps along the way? The reality is so many of our clients have trauma histories and they have stories that really got them to this point. And now saw these people as individuals coming along the way.

We are all somebody's mother, sister, brother, and that needs to be highlighted for the court. We have several different programs and three different slides.

I'm going to talk about mostly about our adult programs which you'll see on the slide. We service all people from youth to whatever age. And we have programs specifying to women. We have social workers that are in custody helping our clients who may be in crisis and custody and need immediate support.

The reality is we fight constantly to get more social workers because the work is so important. It sounds very easy.

You go to court, you find a program. Oh, wonderful. They get to go out into the community. That's not the Ruth and that's not what happens. So our social workers, bio psycho-socials write a host of different reports that really allow the DA. And judges to know who this person is. We have to go in. We get called to testify. We fight in a way in which -- well we get the information for the Attorneys to be able to fight and tell the client story to get them in the programs.

We make recommendations about what the client feels is best for themselves. And what community-based organizations they can go to. And we really encourage the courts to understand that this client is better served in the community, that sending someone to prison is further traumatizing them. They are not getting the supports that they need in custody. They will get that in the community. If they had someone holding their hand,

supporting them along the way. Most of what our social workers do are write intensive reports to educate the courts.

I want to focus on two programs that are losing funding. A lot of our programs are grant-funded and I'm not going to get into auto of those details but a very, very, very successful program that focuses on women is losing funding in July. As well as our post-conviction social workers. Because so many of our programs are focused on grants, it is a highlight.

If we can go to the next slide. These are the programs that service our individuals in the mental health unit. So we focus on individuals with intellectual and develop disabilities, as well as our clients who are conserved under LPS.

Next slide. and then of course our youth division. We really want to support and highlight the fact that it takes a huge team to service our youth. We make sure that the majority of them have social workers involved so that we can support their development as well as getting school-based services, regional-center services, and a host of other services.

>> Sorry about that. I'm a little ahead of myself. Today we specifically want to talk about ODR for CFCI funding. The Office of diversion and reentry is one of our main programs that allows individuals who would otherwise go to prison to get services within the community.

I'm going to focus on the Maternal Health side and Marcus is going to focus on the ODR housing piece. So within the Office of diversion and reentry every pregnant woman that is in custody is linked with one of our social workers, as well as a social worker within custody under the jails. And then ODR assesses every single pregnant woman so see if they are eligible for their program services and that really expedites the client getting out of custody because it gives them the opportunity to have programming to go to. So currently there are 71 pregnant women within the program. And 248 have been released during the duration of the program.

We wanted to highlight that because over COVID we really were -- it was one of our main goals to get women out very promptly and it highlighted a linkage for all of us to get together to ensure that every one of our pregnant women have social workers involved.

>> MARCUS HUNTLY: I'm Marcus, Huntly, head deputy of collaborative and restorative justice. I supervise many holistic units and ODR is one of them. We're litigators, trial

Attorneys. We find ways to divert our clients that have serious mental health needs and get them out of custody and into supportive services.

ODR has helped to fill this void. They have started in 2015 and helped 13,000 people from jail into community-based services. This is ground breaking. If it was not for ODR, a lot of clients that go through ODR would be in state prison and somehow released back into the community without services and dealing with trauma that they had to deal with in custody. ODR is a service that benefits our clients.

Next slide, please.

We have three different hubs for ODC. First hub is CCB. Second is LAX, three is Van Nuys. We have four Attorneys funded for these positions. We had to borrow one of our trial Attorneys to place them into the CCV hub because of the caseload, to try to get the time that clients are waiting to get into ODR because the cases were so high.

When you look at hub two and where the clients come from in hub two, these are mostly our Black and brown clients. When you look at the number of sue ability hearings in the different courthouses, if you see, it's exceptionally Hyatt LAX. You may be asking about suitability. When a client comes into custody a client is referred to ODR and there is a hearing where the Public Defender and District Attorney argue to the judge to ask why clients should be in ODR.

When you look at the different hubs Attorneys and CCB object to 40, 50% of the cases and Ativan identifies it's probably the same. Maybe 50% of the cases. When you look at LAX hub, the District Attorney about 95% of those cases. So we have one Attorney at LAX who has to understand the history and background in specific detail for every client who comes through that hub.

>> One Attorney.

>> MARCUS HUNTLY: One Attorney. And it takes so long to get these clients through these hubs because it can take months for our clients to get a court date at LAX.

Can you go to the next slide, please.

As was mentioned earlier, if you saw the quote from Ricardo Garcia, the LAX hub, when you look at the Black population it's 8% and when you look at incarcerated population, 30% and this is where most of our clients at LAX are from: Either Black or brown.

Next slide.

The time it takes to get a suitability hearing at LAX is extremely high. Almost 200 days. There are many reasons that cause that that I'll get into in a couple of minutes.

You will see later this is idle time for the clients. They are sitting in custody not receiving services. Until we get them out, they don't receive services from ODR. The other hub we were able to get the number down because we were able to get an Attorney from trials and bring them over there. LAX is just one Attorney that is there to do that. Can we go to the next slide.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: Got it. Got it. Got it. Hold on quickly. I think I strongly understand where this is going and the committee has the ability to look through the rest of this. We have, I want to make sure that we can get through all of the content and you all have, you know, the client stories and then there's also the alternate public defender part of the presentation too. As you're looking through this, can you all please move on to the main points of requests and understanding that we need to know? Because I think all the background information that we are able to receive today is very helpful to really understand the nuances of this which is incredibly important. I do understand that. Being that it's 5:13 and we want to make sure we can get to questions, I want to make sure we can get through the rest of the presentation. I went to give you all the time but I need you to get to the highlights of the rest of the content that you have before us. Please.
- >> MARCUS HUNTLY: I appreciate that comment. I will. I'd like to -- we can move onto the next slide. Appreciate the comment. I will go beyond the challenges. We can skip the challenges.
- >> REBA STEVENS: I want the challenges.
- >> MARCUS HUNTLY: Court capacity and staffing shortage; I have discussed that. The date million the client gets a hearing is an extremely long time especially at the LAX hub. There are challenges getting clients transferred to court and that takes delays and it can be a delay for a couple of months because a client was missed out of court. Next slide.

I'm going to bring Justine for this slide because it's a specific ask.

>> JUSTINE ESAK: The court want to see expand ODR courts but they won't do it unless the Public Defender and alternate Public Defender are funded to do that because it doesn't work if we don't have people in court to represent the people.

Our existing ongoing funding from CFCI are for four deputy Public Defenders. The new ask is to double that amount of deputy Public Defenders and add four more with two legal secretaries. And there's one-time funding that has to do with enhancements to case management system in office and the reason for that -- can we go to the next slide? Can we skip this slide and go to the next one? We want to shift the model. Right now our Attorneys appear exclusively in court.

They are in court with the clients; they run the calendar, meaning they go through progress reports, suitability hearings, that sort of thing.

Some of the challenges that Marcus alluded to earlier have to do with transportation of people from the jail to the court. That's part of why it takes so long for people to get, be found suitable for ODR. For people too ill to be transported to the court and people who the sheriff great many are miss outs and people who just don't make the list because there are so many cases on calendar, a Public Defender will be right there in the jail with the client every single day talking to them, getting then assessed. Connecting with partners in ODR so that we can find out early, connect with the Attorneys who are in court and advocate to the judges and to the District Attorneys to get them to agree to release our clients quickly and really cut down on the amount of days it takes to have somebody found suitable and released to ODR housing.

Our ask for legal secretaries is because there's so many connectivity between the lawyers in court and the lawyers who will be embedded in the jail that needs to happen. Also communication with the trial lawyers if the case is ultimately not accepted by the ODR court and we have to reconnect that client to other services outside of ODO railroad get that client on a path towards trials so that they can fight their case.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Got it. Can I ask a question real quick?

>> JUSTINE ESAK: Of course.

>> CHAIR STEELE: For the unspent funds or carry over that existed, is that for this part of the work, the ODR? Where in the continuum of the information you have shared with us thus far and also that is still to come is the unspent funds actually happening?

>> JUSTINE ESAK: Our understanding of unspent funds is somewhere under 50,000. If you go back to the previous slide, please. That one, yeah.

That is, that \$48,000 that references one time funding for the ability for us to upgrade certain parts of our case management system and develop an office. Because we don't have an office in the jail. Public Defenders, the Attorneys have never, ever before actually been located in the jail.

You know, I have spent a lot of time in the jail over the course of my 28 years and it's very much, you know, you don't have great wi-fi connectivity. We're completely digital, even though I'm holding a bunch of paper today. Just ignore that and pretend you didn't see it.

We are a digital Public Defender office and our case file is on case management system and we can chatter from real time from the lawyer in jail to the lawyer who is in court and to our social worker and to everybody on the Public Defender team. So the under spend that we have, under \$50,000, we are asking for permission to be able to use it so that we can have, you know, enhancements that we need to set up an actual office in the jail. We're in talks with the sheriff's department about that right now. And to be able to make our system work so that we can cut down any red tape.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Got it.

>> VERONICA LEWIS: I have a question.

Correct me if I'm wrong that half a million dollars from public work was cut out of measure A and is that being captured?

>> JUSTINE ESAK: Unfortunately, it is not. Marcus is over that program. It's horrible because he oversees so many wonderful programs and it's tough, right? It's the same thing I was talking about before in terms of where the money comes from makes a big difference. The reason they cut our program is for a great reason.

- >> VERONICA LEWIS: I understand. Briefly. There's a different conversation that we might not have a chance to get to in terms of recommendations. Briefly, what is the program cut from measure A.
- >> MARCUS HUNTLY: Homeless unit. We go assist client to see clear their criminal records. There are a locality of times when clients would come into the courthouse and they talk to a paralegal that at the scene this is what you need to do. We go to skid row and go out to different courts and meet the clients and we draft the petition and declaration and sign it and we file it and make the appearances for them.
- >> VERONICA LEWIS: Thank you. One next question. People from south LA in LAX?
- >> MARCUS HUNTLY: Absolutely.
- >> VERONICA LEWIS: Thank you.
- >> Any other questions in the room?
- >> REBA STEVENS: Regarding the presentation?
- >> What's been discussed so far.
- >> REBA STEVENS: I want to say thank you and acknowledge how important this information. It's critically important to who we are and where our responsibilities. But some of the information in which you shared was so very, very alarming to me. Particularly, not clear on understanding why there's only one trial lawyer and not sure, Chair Steele, what advocacy we can do, to change that.

I don't know if it's dollars or if it's making noise.

The other is around highlighting -- and thank you so much for highlighting the over representation of Black people in the challenges. But more importantly, in our underserved communities, that LAX area of high numbers. And still the inequities of other areas having one trial lawyer and seeing the numbers are very, very low and seemingly being managed. But that's, uh ...

I'm curious about more so than just the dollars. You would agree that interests a need for more than one trial lawyer? And even if that's enough, but then the other is around that, the cuts that you talked about with the clearing --

- >> MARCUS HUNTLY: Records clearing unit.
- >> REBA STEVENS: Which I am entirely familiar with and it does help. The one thick we need to know as a community is that too often times people don't know that there are these programs that exist. My experience has been in the community as a resource where you resource the tables to educate and assist folks in the community.

So I want to thank you for your great work and thank you for having a recommendation or ask. Truly appreciate that.

>> MARCUS HUNTLY: Thank you. One last thing before I conclude. I'm just going to show one more slide. We have Judge Bianco the presiding judge at ODR. Next slide? And I'll conclude after this slide.

[VIDEO RECORDING]

>> JIM BIANCO: I'm Jim Bianco and I'm a judge and I preside over the ODR court downtown.

I've been asked to make some comments about what I see as the role of Public Defenders in the ODR's courts. I've been a judge for twenty years and I've been in this ODR court for the last two years and I think the Public Defenders in this court have a really, he are an important role in helping people succeed in the ODR program because ODR is helping people that are the highest need and sometimes the highest risk folks.

You know, who come into the program because they are homeless, they are in jail and they have committed a felony. What we ask is for people to turn their lives around in a very significant way. You know, so the Public Defenders with advocates and counselors but also help their clients with the life changes. So it's an extremely important role.

It also adds a lot to the workload of the lawyers and Public Defender office. Most Public Defenders work hard but I can say based on the last two years the lawyers here work incredibly hard. The caseload in the two years I have been in this court has gone up very significantly. Not quite double but close. I sometimes wonder how the Public Defenders are able to continue with that kind of workload.

I'm told that the Public Defender's office is looking to embed one of ore more of their Attorneys in the County jail to help facilitate referrals to ODR which I think would be an

absolutely fantastic improvement. Time in jail for someone that's going into the ODR program is really just idle time and it's not helping.

And so the sooner folks can get referred to ODR and the case can get to court and a decision can be made about whether they are going to go into the program, the better. I think having an Attorney in the County jail would help streamline the process and shorten the time that folks are waiting in jail to be referred to ODR.

- >> MARCUS HUNTLY: Can we go to the next slide?
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I appreciate the message. I'm going to have to take executive privilege here and I need to pause the presentation here. And I appreciate what was received.

As far as the next part of the presentation, is there anything that you feel like that we need to know that we can't read?

- >> MARCUS HUNTLY: I was going to take us to the last slide to conclude it at this point and ask if there are any additional questions.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Indeed. I'm talking about the following presentation behind this one? We're just at 5:30 and we still need time for other items on the agenda today. Is there anything that we can't read from the slides that are already provided to everybody that we need to know from the other presentation? I appreciate the one you all just gave. A lot of great information. A lot of solid pieces. And I want to get to questions but I want to make sure we got all the information so that we can get to the questions.
- >> MARCUS HUNTLY: Absolutely. I'll bring Jane Young up from the Public Defender's office.
- >> JANE YANG: I can promise you that this will be a very short as the Public Defender's office already cinched most of our information. As you know from Justine's presentation the APD is also a partner with ODR and receives CFCI funding.

CFCI funding is the only funding that APD receives. We have never received any NCC funding from the County to participate in ODR.

Our office, the alternate Public Defender's office handling the most serious cases and it's just the nature of a conflict office. As I said to Dr. Hunt, I remember the day six days ago an ADR link popped up in my email and I was able to refer my clients there. Our clients have

the most serious charges and to have the opportunity to get our clients into a program who are mentally ill without restrictions other than with judges and prosecutors fighting on these things was historic.

APD CFCI funding status: Carryover amount of 1.25 and for budget Year thousand 24 we have 2.55 million. I want to highlight the approximate spend is \$1 million.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Got it. So what kept you all from being able to spend the resources that you had?

>> JANE YANG: Currently we have it to take trial Attorneys off the line to bill against these hours for ODR. I will say we don't have people in these positions 100%.

What we have are people who are high-level Attorneys who are billing against the, who are billing against the amount.

Because we have one Attorney at our central branch handling the cases that are in ODR, every other Attorney on the line still has ODR clients and are responsible for actually getting the client into ODR. It's only when the client is in ODR that we bill those hours.

So that is a part of [...] we're trying to address that. We did only, we claimed in the 2023-24 year 196k, but just in this year, because we are putting more people in those places, we have claimed close to a million dollars so we are working on that gap.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: So then what is the ask? The ask is what?
- >> JANE YANG: The ask is just to keep our funding.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: So outside of the ongoing you're asking for additional resources or you're asking for the continuance of the ongoing.
- >> JANE YANG: Continuance for ongoing.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: You're not asking for additional resources from carry over?
- >> JANE YANG: No.
- >> VERONICA LEWIS: Is the unspent balance on the list of what was supposed to be taken away already or no?

- >> JANE YANG: I am not sure.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Looking at the first list from CSIT you have the first two items that were the unspent funds in conversation today, right? Is that one .25 part of that?
- >> JANE YANG: Yes.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: You're not asking for the carry over. You're wanting to make sure the 1.3 in ongoing continues?
- >> JANE YANG: In our ongoing, yes.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Does that answer your question, Member Lewis?
- >> VERONICA LEWIS: Not really but I'll just keep it in mind as we look at the list, what you all ask for. Thank you.
- >> JANE YANG: We are moving toward hiring permanent Staff and building paralegals and support Staff against the hours.

I want to highlight some of the challenges here. Consistency with the different courthouses. I think Marcus highlighted it just a bit. Really our clients getting into ODR hinges upon the players in it IE the prosecutors and the judges.

I'll give you an example. We have unbilled hours with our appellate department ridding, which is appealing a decision by a court, not to allow a client into the program.

That is, you know, I can't, that's like close to probably 40 to 50 hours spent just on appealing one decision and so those are challenges that we see on the ground with getting clients into ODR.

We can have one Attorney spend upwards to 20 hours, unbilled hours at this point, working on a warrant for one client, calling different across the country, trying to get one warrant lifted for a client so that they are accepted into a program and transferred into the program.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: Got it. We're going to pause there. I think I receive that and thank you very much for identifying the challenges.
- >> JANE YANG: Thank you.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: You're welcome. For the Advisory Committee, are there any questions?
- >> REBA STEVENS: I have a couple of comments.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: You got it, Member Stevens.
- >> REBA STEVENS: Everyone knows that I'm going to always be true to myself. I really wanted to be able to embrace this presentation. It really meant to a lot to me because I have a lot of concerns.

I'm concerned about, you know, trial lawyers not being able to recommend folks to ODR Beds.

I'm concerned that it's a fact. We know that you cannot get well in a cell.

And then I'm also concerned about what is serious mental illness? And how do you measure when most folk may be on some medication? So while you're taking this medication, there are often types that you seem to be at a lower level than you are serious. Once you're released and not taking or med compliant. It is deep, y'all. This is really deep. And I don't know what to ask here, a redo, there has to be more.

We're talking about people's lives right now that are suffering, that are not being able to exit. And we need to know what is serious mental illness? And how do we address the mild to moderate? This has to be about change.

So I have to admit that I am very pleased with your presentation, what you are offering here today. But I do not like the way that this actually went down. Because there's so much more to uncover and I want you to know that and I want the public to know it as well.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: Thank you Member Stevens. Anyone else?
- >> JANE YANG: Thank you.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I hear what you're saying, Member Stevens. I totally get it. And what I'm also hearing is that in the greater ODR under spend and correct me if I'm wrong for anyone that is wrong, the pipeline of folks being able to have access by way of the starting point is throttled so that there aren't enough people to actually get into the beds that are available; is that correct? is that what you're saying? That's what I'm saying. They are empty beds because this beginning piece of getting people out of the system to be able to go to a bed

because there's not enough on the front end to help open up the opportunity for it, then there's only but so many people that can go to beds. It starts here. Is that a correct assessment from the folks who are doing this presentation?

>> Chair Steele if you would let me attempt to answer your question and Member Stevens' question. Our understanding is that people are characterized by the highest level of acuity. Right now where it stands the population of people at P-3, the second to highest, and P-4, are the only people who we as Public Defenders can recommend for ODR housing, for the ODR program.

So that's a whole population, P-0 through P-2, it encompasses when you look at the population of people who are pretrial and are only partially sentenced, over 5,000 people in the jail.

And we cannot refer them to ODR at this time. And some part of that over 5,000 population are going to have the medical criteria that would satisfy ODR's criteria. If we were only allowed to refer them. And so it's a bigger problem than just the public defender and alternate Public Defender staffing.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: Right. Right. Who makes that call though as far as the classification to be able to make the recommendation?
- >> So DOJ compliance. There are DOJ rules that govern both the way -- maybe Dr. Hunt could add to it if they has something.
- >> JENNIFER HUNT: The classification is within the sheriff's department because of how and where they are placing the individuals within the sectional setting.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Does sheriff's department have the ability to open it up?
- >> I know there are other items on the agenda. I'm happy to stay afterward to get into this. For the interest of time I'm happy to take this maybe after the rest of the agenda.
- >> VERONICA LEWIS: I would ask, especially if you're going to come back, I know there's designation for competency to stand trial and other designations like fact sheets with all the different types of categories, who makes the decisions of the categories and other types of information in table form would be really helpful to see.

- >> Specifically, mental health needs and designations.
- >> VERONICA LEWIS: IST is different than what you're talking B all of the different opportunities for exist. We understand there's a gap of people with serious mental illness but listing so that everybody is on the same page of what are those things and who determines that criteria and what are the nuances and that would be helpful to see if you all are going to come back.
- >> Definitely.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: That becomes really critical because as we're thinking of programs that can be supported from resources of CFCI we can help support that process along the way. Do you know what I'm saying? Again, I appreciate this presentation and I apologize if it feels like I'm cutting it way short. I just know that in the essence of some of the things that have also transpired over the last week, there's some things I want to make sure that we get to talk about before we leave for the day.

And we got about twenty minutes left. Thank you very much. Good to see you on Camara.

- >> Good to see you too.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: You are the A.M.D.. Thank you very much, y'all. I want to move us back really quickly.

Anyone else have clarifying thoughts or anything they want to say on item ten, to that? Okay. Cool. So I want to move back to item nine.

The ensure cents transparency and accountability of care first funding.

As you all know, this motion actually passed. Ensuring transparency and accountability of care first funding.

In the meeting, was that last Tuesday? You want to say, Member Castillo?

- >> MEGAN CASTILLO: Yes.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Okay. Thank you. And in this item it basically -- and it was voted on five-zero. It gives guidance to the CEO's office and also just the process of how the resources that are unspent have to flow.

And so it gives us the ability to give the recommendations, the funding recommendations in the flow to the to CEO and then go to the Board of Supervisors. I want to say thank you on record to the Board of supervisors and those who meant to with us and the Members of the Advisory Committee to make sure there were there to represent us to continue to lead in this effort.

That also now puts us in a peculiar position, right? Where there is now the budget process that is on the way that we have the ability and the supplemental process to provide our recommendations.

You know, so that the reallocation of those CFCI dollars can actually be a part of the budgetary process and go based on what we're bringing to the table. It awakens a part of the work we have done historically to be a part of what's going on today. What I mean by that is community engagement process and form we have done in the past and being able to take recommendations from the community, from the departments, now even from the CEO's office by way of some of the Board motions that they wanted to bring forward. And we get the chance to vet all of that as proposals and come up with a strategy after the reallocation of those funds to recommend to the Board of Supervisors how they are to be spent.

Before any thoughts on what that can look like, I want to see if there are any questions about what I just said and what this means, any questions that you might have.

- >> VERONICA LEWIS: I have a question.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Yes, please.
- >> VERONICA LEWIS: Can you clarify, given the truncated time frame and we know what this looks like.

Are you thinking in terms of the method we use that we start with the CEO's existing recommendation and modify that or we literally are starting from scratch?

>> CHAIR STEELE: I am recommending that yes, there's a tight turn around but utilizing information that we already have. We use our process that we have done before by way of the recommendation form to formalize these requests.

Right now there is some Board letters that are out there. Right now there are presentations from the departments. There is questions from the community, but there's not a uniform way for us to digest the information.

So the process that we have done by way of communication as well as the recommendation form and survey to make sure the dollars are going to places where the need actually exists, like, we have done these things in the past.

So I am recommending that we formalize the process in that way and then come up with a set of recommendations from there. Does that make sense?

- >> VERONICA LEWIS: Um, yes. I think there's some nuances I want to understand.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Yes.
- >> VERONICA LEWIS: Are we going to pause the presentations to do this work then?
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Yes. That's what I'm suggesting. I think there's a lot of value that we're getting out of it. But it's also one part of the story of need in our communities.

And so and the idea of making a decision about where the resources go. If we don't make recommendations the CEO is able to move forward with their recommendations on how the unspent funds are utilized. By way of this motion we have until July 31st to submit a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

- >> ADAM BETTINO: I have a question. I don't know if you can see me? This is Adam.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I can hear you.
- >> ADAM BETTINO: Okay. Thank you. Just to clarify on Member Lewis's question. The comment recommendations that are moving forward that were sort of presented here, after decisions were made from CEO, that current list we're proposing to sort of review and then make a different set of recommendations, potentially? Or same set of recommendations? Or is that what we're discussing here?
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I have a feeling it's going to be a different set.

- >> ADAM BETTINO: But it is to review, it is to review, to have this body then review that set of recommendations and then make a, whatever recommendation from this body based on what's been presented to you all up to this point?
- >> CHAIR STEELE: No. No, no, no. Yes and no. But the yes part is yes, the information that's been provided to us to this point. We will be formalizing a request from those things by way of the process that we have already indicated in the past, that we will utilize in this process. So I don't know if you all remember but we had concept recommendation form that we had trusted advisors from across the County help to get out to community and there were recommendations that were provided to us to vet from the community but what I'm also suggesting is the County departments and the CEO's office can also submit this so that we're vetting similar information from across the Board from different parts of the community to determine what the recommendations will be. Does that make sense? So it's not only the CEO. It's not only the departments.

It is a formalized way for us to look at the content and make a decision about what we want to recommend gets funded.

That's what I'm suggesting.

- >> JENNIFER HUNT: I want to ask a clarifying question, Chair Steele?
- >> CHAIR STEELE: You got it.
- >> JENNIFER HUNT: This is Jennifer Hunt from ODR and I was slated to share ODR's information in an upcoming presentation. Is there a different format or how can I support to make sure you have the information that you're seeking from me and that's open to anyone in the room that can help me understand that. I want to make sure that you have, everyone has the information that they need to have.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Got you. Okay. So let me -- in hindsight, I should have been able to pull this down. So let me take it a step back and take it step-by-step because I'm recognizing that there are some people who have participated in this and some people who have not.

In our last funding allocations the process that we got to determine what those recommendations were going to be to the Board of Supervisors, we had a subcommittee, the community engagement subcommittee that it two main jobs. The first one was to do

public sessions with community to garner concept recommendations and we had a form we created for people to fill out to submit to us. Right?

The second job was also to make sure that we had a survey that we had developed to really understand, based on the criteria of what is needed for CFCI, what the needs were in community so that when we made our decisions, we can make sure that it's been pinpointed to the right parts of the committee and in the right ways.

That process happened over a month and a half of like community engagement, and once it was ended, we were able to take in all the concept recommendations that were received through that form and vet which ones we wanted to support. I think we had about, I think it was over a hundred different concepts that we received, that we had to narrow down into the ones that we recommended for the year three funding allocation.

I know that we are starting with departments that have plans for funds, that we have, the CEO's office that has plans for funds. But we also understand that there are needs directly in community that would like to find out how they can get access to resources too. So a way to kind of go about this is to activate the concept recommendation form, once again. To activate community support. But the process to get the information in is to use that form. So you as well as other depends can utilize this form to be able to determine what your recommendation is or what your proposal is for the needs of funds that we are going to be allocating.

That also means that all the unspent funds we are going to be pulling together and we as an advisory body will provide recommendations based off what we learned and what we decide to be able to put dollars forward. Does that make sense?

>> VERONICA LEWIS: I think there's four things for me.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Go for it.

>> VERONICA LEWIS: I think a little bit more thought around what may need to be different than last time. Needs to be talked about. We don't have time today.

But one, and this may not be what your question was, Jennifer.

There's four different things. One, on that list there was a decision made about which under spend would be shifted and which would not. Some departments have had the

opportunity to share with us and some have not. That's part of what you were raising. For folks that have wanted to say don't cut my -- they have somebody to share and that's something to consider. Two, I think there should be a community input process for whatever is on the current CEO list that our group wants to decide and consider. The community weighing in on those recommendations makes sense for me instead of just happening in this group. We need to figure out the methodology for that. Three, concept recommendations we need to put parameters around it so that the time is well spent. I don't know the amount spent. Obviously we want an open process but also we understand the time that it takes.

We need some strategy around how to not have to comb through a billion dollars' worth of recommendations because we don't know how long this will take.

The last thing I want to say to Adam, how do we confirm JCOD has the capacity to support this or any of this? Have you all teased that out already? We don't do this without the administrative capacity.

>> ADAM BETTINO: That is an excellent question, Member Lewis and we appreciate the question. Off and on for certain, to be totally honest. And frankly, I know that the motion is up for discussion, currently. On a positive note what the motion does is it clarifies and crystalizes what we have discussed as a body that you all have been asking for, frankly, right? That use puts out, pressure.

Share things on a regular cadence which you all have been asking for. That's all positive and we want to do that. The corralling of programs, TPA is here and we work closely with AMITY. I'm not super concerned about that part of that. The lists within the motion alone are heavy for our team, no doubt.

So we have actually requested an additional position on the analyst side and then also on the data side; however, County budget being what it is, we're not quite exactly sure what we're going to receive. So it is a heavy lift for us. We are here, obviously, to serve as best we can, to push this forward and make sure that you all are meeting the deadlines that you want to meet and understanding that there are specific deadlines because of the budget process. But we're going to do the best we can to make sure you have all the information you need.

>> VERONICA LEWIS: One more thing and I'll be quiet. You reminded me of the fifth thing I wanted to say. We have heard from the grassroots organizations. I think there should be an opportunity to expand on those programs that are not fully resourced.

Because I haven't heard anybody talk about that. Yes we need new stuff but also the amazing outcomes we have heard about from the programs that have been meaningful to the communities still don't have enough resources. Still don't leave them out. To increase existing on the ground work.

>> CHAIR STEELE: I agree with that and to your point, Member Lewis. By no means am I saying that it needs to be exactly what it is before. I think there's definitely is some refinement that needs to take place.

The form it was arduous and lengthy and a whole bunch of jargon that wasn't really feasible. But you're right. There's guardrails that need to be put on it.

I am not opposed to the idea of the community survey so we can be responsive to the community's voice around the recommendations that are already before us.

I understand also to the departments in the room who have not had the ability to present that this is a pivot from what we have been talking about and what you have been preparing for the last several months. This motion does change things. I want to be clear about that.

It gives guidance and gives us say so in how these unspent funds are utilized.

I'll end by saying I do have a timeline that's tight in mind but the beginning part of that which is why it's on the agenda is to make sure you all know we want to reactivate the community engagement subcommittee. You know, when we first created it, we gave it some parameters to be able to do a lion's share of work to bring back to us strategy: I think that can be a space where a lot of the detail refinement can actually take place.

The thing is though the Members of that committee may have shifted over time because people have come and go. And so I know there are still some who are here that were. I know I was. Member Stevens is still here and Member Castillo is still here. Rosa was on it as well. Rosa Soto. So I think we have enough Members to kind of get things going and other Members who want to join to be a part of that to help strategize, would love to have you be a part of it.

But you know, I guess, general consensus, though, this idea of being able to garner recommendations in this way and proposals in this way to be able to know how we want to move dollars, I want to make sure that's something that is generally understood or accepted. If not, I understand that too. And we will probably have to call a Special Meeting to talk about it in more detail since we're running out of time in this meeting.

>> REBA STEVENS: Chair Steele?

>> CHAIR STEELE: Yes.

>> REBA STEVENS: I'm hearing you and I don't know if I'm listening well. But I keep thinking about programs that are not funded -- like, for instance, DPSS. And being creative around be creative around their voucher program to ensure Families don't fallout if there isn't anything available. I have to talk too long to describe did but I'm sure there are providers who are familiar with what I'm talking about.

>> CHAIR STEELE: I follow exactly what you're saying and this is why I want to make sure we have the ability to open it up beyond what has been recommended. To create a space for DPSS to put in a recommendation so we can consider that along with other things that have been brought forward to us.

Right now it's not in our consideration. If we go about what's been recommended so far, we wouldn't be able to consider anything like that.

- >> REBA STEVENS: I think too it would be helpful -- and I'm being very, very creative right now -- with the information that we gathered here today and how could we possibly fund ODR Beds that are not for those who are classified as, if you will, "seriously mentally ill," but have the mild to moderate and it's clear that they could. Being creative and innovative. In whatever we do. I'm going to stop right there.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Any other? Thank you: Yes, please.
- >> VERONICA LEWIS: I'm unclear of your asking of us to approve for the Work Group to move forward. I'm uncomfortable with that and I want to have a conversation around generally what pieces you're going to be helpful. I think it would be helpful from committee Members because we represent different sectors.

I think half of the meeting talking about the landscape of what it actually looks like right now, particularly with the policy shifts and funding reductions to understand what are the core gaps connected to what's happening right now to help inform what we're inviting. I don't want to just continue to yes -- and I agree there. I don't think any of us are saying let's just look at the CEO only. I don't want to leave that out the recommendations and I think a landscape analysis and understand that and form in part what we're inviting makes sense. So just consider that.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: Agreed.
- >> VERONICA LEWIS: Before we just jump into stuff. There's a lot going on and everybody here doesn't understand what's going on and how that will form what we're looking for.
- >> In that vein of not necessarily understanding what's going on and I need to make a comment. Maybe I'm reading it and I'm worried I'm not reading it accurately.

In future, the recommendations made by the CEO now stand as they are unless --

- >> CHAIR STEELE: They changed it. What you're looking at now is not the final version. They made four other items under five in the meeting and so the sixth item that they created says that this year, it has to be done by July 31st, 2025, for us to be able to make recommendations. And if we don't make any recommendations, then the CEO's recommendations start.
- >> I see that but what I'm trying to understand -- the way that we do our budgets, right? The CEO made recommendations. My department is not involved with those recommendations but if it is a department involved with the recommendations, if that changes then that's going to have to not do that program or shift dollars in a different way in order to cover. Something else may cut and there's a potential domino effect and there may be programs that this body would otherwise support. I want to call that out as a dynamic. It seems to me that really evaluating that list as a body to see if there are decisions that recommendations that this body would support, might be a way to sort of carve out and then reduce the number, you know, the dollars that we need to identify, additional programming, and then the recommendation could go NICU that way.

Anyway, that was just a thought I wanted to share.

>> CHAIR STEELE: With a I would like to do is call a Special Meeting for next week for us to go further here. I think we can also add to the agenda what you mentioned earlier, Member Lewis. You know, to make sure that we can take a look at the landscape and even, you know, to what you're saying Member Contreras, even think about the ways that we would want to look at what a committee could be doing if we would decide to activate it and make an action out of it for us to activate a committee or not.

We'll put together an agenda to be able to make that movement take place. Because time is also of the essence if we are actually going to do something, if we're going to actually make recommendations. Does that make sense?

- >> REBA STEVENS: We're running out of time.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I'm going to go to Public Comment. I appreciate you all's time and conversation on this.

Be on the lookout for the email on the Special Meeting. And if you are available, I would really love for you to be there.

- >> I'm sorry. Before we go. I apologize. Chair Steele, I think we need to sort this out in another conversation.
- >> ADAM BETTINO: I don't know, I don't know if the motion allows us to go back and review the recommendations that have already been made by CEO and I really don't know. And I don't know if that was the intention of the motion and we didn't write it. That's a question maybe for Second District.

I just want -- we should get some clarity on that before we launch into this effort, one.

Two, there will be additional one-time funding available. In what they have moved arrested and programmed they have agreed to fund moving forward, that's there. There's funding from the current fiscal year that will go unspent and end up in the same pot of funding.

There's additional funding and I don't know the amount. We haven't closed the books yet. Obviously, we haven't reached the end of the fiscal year.

There's additional funding. I think it's that pot of money that you all will make the recommendations on. Meaning if, for example, JCOD has had some funding taken in this

exercise. So we can come to the committee Advisory Committee and make a proposal and ask for funding so that those programs aren't cut, to Dr. Contreras's point. And you all would make a recommendation to similar to the way we have done this every time.

Except for this one which is, I think, has created a lot of confusion. You make the recommendations and CEO would recommend and the Board would approve. I just want to be clear on -- and, again, I don't know but I think we should clarify that and if, you know, if we need to do that and have that discussion over the next couple of days and then in the next meeting, we should do that. We do need clarity on that point for sure.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: Let's definite really seek to get the clarity because I'm reading it differently from what you're specifying, at least my understanding of the process of it and let's get the clarity on it, for sure. Member Stevens?
- >> VERONICA LEWIS: If Adam's interpretation is correct what you're saying is we basically don't have any say so. Steele, in what moves forward? That's basically what I'm talking about. For the existing one-time allocation that Adam is referring to which means we wouldn't need a Special Meeting.

We're not weighing in or changing anything that the CEO has already recommended, right now. That's what you're suggesting?

- >> ADAM BETTINO: Yeah and I do think quickly there should be some process about moving forward for unspent one-time funding.
- >> VERONICA LEWIS: [off mic]
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Let's get the clarity because I'm reading this differently. Fiscal year 25, 26 and any year after that any recommendation for redistributing unspent funds and encumbered funds should be consistent with what the CEO and CFCI committee recommends. And we'll find out the clarity.
- >> ADAM BETTINO: Honestly, the reason I raise it is because the letter is scheduled to go to the Board June 24th and it's not in the timeline spelled out in the motion.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: That happened prior to the motion being approved, so do you see what I'm saying? So the game changed on Tuesday of last week. That's why it was so critical, do you know what I mean? Sorry, y'all.

- >> ROSA SOTO: Chair Steele, I agree with you, when is lens and looking at the opportunity on future funds I don't think is lost time. If we still going to get clarification it makes sense to move forward. If you learn something different over the next week or so, you can decide if you want to cancel the meeting.
- >> ADAM BETTINO: I don't think all parties agree the Board letter is going to be pulled and health with supplemental budget. That's the part we need absolute clarity on.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: For sure. I'll get on the horn after this call. To be honest. Can we please go to Public Comment? Thank you all for the extra time. I know that was a lot.
- >> CFCI: Thank you we will now open the general Public Comment period. The general Public Comment is limited to the matter raised by the Advisory Committee. The Public Comment already is one minute per person. Telephone users please dial star nine to us the raise hand feature and star six to unmute yourself. Computer and smartphone users, locate your raise hand feature to be placed in the queue. General Public Comment on limited to the matters within the subject matter jurisdiction -- any Public Comments in the room? Seeing none we will go online.
- >> Thank you. Currently we have no hands raised on Zoom. And that concludes the Public Comment period for online.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I do apologize, you all. For my absence today. Some who do know and some who do not, my father has been in the hospital for the last month and I had to deal with the hospital trying to discharge him without permission. So as I was on the road, I had to turn around and head to West Hills.

So I really appreciate the leadership for continuing on in my absence. I appreciate you all and your continued support in this work. I know what is being suggested completely changes some of the understanding and it might be out of the blue. I do apologize for that. But I also just want to let you know, like, uh, there was a doubling down on the care first agenda by way of things like this motion being passed. And so there's a renewed energy around what we do and we have a momentum behind us and I want to make sure that we are very thoughtful about how we are moving forward; okay?

So I really appreciate your time and your energy. We will follow up. Have a great rest of your day. And we'll talk to you soon. Meeting adjourned.

[Meeting adjourned 6:13 p.m.]