Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) captioning is provided to facilitate communication accessibility. CART captioning and this realtime file may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. The real-time human captioning you are about to view is provided by a Nationally Board Certified stenographic captioner.

>>

>>

>> CHAIR STEELE: Mic check. Mic check. We're going to work through 12 in person. We can go through the beginning of the thing. I think we'll be there. Hello everyone. Before we get started with today's meeting, I first want to say thank you to HOPICS for hosting us today, thank you member Lewis for having us to your home and a chance to share space with you all. I also would be remiss if I did not mention the times that we were going through here in Los Angeles with the ICE raids and the National Guard and the Marines and all this stuff that has been brought to the city and the county as if, you know, our First Amendment rights are not our rights and the ability to be able to convene with each other to speak up against tyranny in this way is not something that we should and are able to do.

But I think more importantly, the families and the children and the mothers and the grandmothers and the grandfather's and the fathers who, and I was driving down Slauson. The car wash that we normally go to closed. Because of the fear of the possibility of the pull-up from the ICE pulling up on anybody at any given time. The round the clock text messages for all the different graduations that are taking place and trying to figure out how we can navigate that with our young people and their families to make sure people can stay safe. This is not a way to live. I was just telling Michelle too, and I think it's a conversation to maybe go further in and navigate with families and peers of other cultures and creeds. As a Black man in America any time the police pull up behind me or in the vicinity I tighten up on the wheel I adjust my hands, I have that innate fear in us. And so I empathize and understand the fear that people are living in right now and it may be new to them but I think there's something that we can provide as context on how to figure out a way to still find a way forward. In all of this.

I think it underscores the conversation that those who have been talking about abolishing the state, the carceral state all together and moving forward with a CareFirst

agenda the way we have been talking about why this is so necessary. People should not have to live in fear and the way that folks are living in fear right now.

So I say that in this space, one, to ask for a moment of silence for those who have had families being broken up and trying to find a way forward. But then also to underscore the importance of the work that we're doing here together as a collective.

Thank you. Can we move forward with the meeting disclosures. I'm sorry, please. Welcome from member Lewis please

- >> MEMBER LEWIS: I want to say this campus serves a lot of folks and the same folks that are scared to even come out of their homes right now but even some of the CFCI dollars are at work in this campus of the building immediately to the right of where we are in the same campus is one of the first three harm reduction drop in centers and largely funded by CFCI in partnership between the Department of Public health, SAPSE and DHS. There's a lot of work happening right next door and next to that is a food fan electric we are taking food to folks who are afraid to come out of the house and the largest building that you see is literally where families with children, this region has the highest numbers of families with homeless families with children. So families with children or singles and couples in crisis, unhoused come to that center, eviction prevention happens there and all kinds of stuff happens there. The main campus of HOPICS but CFCI is actually at work here in addition to the drop in center, the harm reduction teams that is largely funded by CFCI that's here so you're at a space where some of the dollars are at work I wanted to tell you that so thank you and welcome.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I love that. That's what I'm talking about. Way to go on the other side of what I was saying member Lewis to let it be known the work for the care first agenda is alive and moving in a way buzzes off the walls in this space. Can we please go to the meeting disclosures.
- >> Thank you I will now read the meeting disclosures. This meeting is being recorded by remaining in this meeting you con sent to he can recorded this is a public meeting and subject to the Brown act. Since conversations and statements on the chat are not visible to people on the telephone and who are unable to participate the chat function is limited to technical assistance. There will be no response nor forwarding any public comments to the advisory committee members. 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 click on the Streamtext listening that will be provided in the chat after the reading of these disclosures. When accessing Zoom through a computer browser or app scroll to reactions and you will see the raise hand feature. When accessing Zoom through the smartphone browse he shall scroll to more at the bottom and you will see a drop down menu. Telephone dial in information will be provided in the chat. During public comment telephone participants may press star 9 to raise your hand and star 6 to unmute. Spanish interpretation please click on the globe icon and select Spanish. Written public comments are to be submitted at JCOD@lacounty.gov. To be reviewed prior to the meeting it should be submitted by 5 p.m. the day before the meeting. These public comments will be shared with the advisory committee members prior to the meeting and flecked in the meeting minutes. Written comments received after 5 p.m. through the end of the meeting will be made part of the public record for the meeting however advisory committee members may want have the opportunity to review those comments prior to acting on an agenda item. This concludes the meeting disclosures. Chair Steele passing it back to you.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Thank you very much. Can we please move to the land acknowledgement. Most modern day U.S. institutions. Land the land beneath our feet is the land of the people who lived in Los Angeles County. We would like to acknowledge the Gabrieleno Tongva, the Fernandeno Tatavium tribe and the Ventureno Chumash people. These native people understood and respected the land connected and respected the four legged creatures who once roamed the earth freely and the winged ones and everything in the ocean. Their hearts told them never to take more than they could Hughes and always give back to mother earth. These amazing people are still here today living and breathing amongst us and still giving back to the community that surrounds us, Aheehe thank you to the ancestors.

>> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: Hello everyone. Good afternoon I want to make the connection you stated earlier around ICE is the history of removal of indigenous people what is now called Los Angeles the United States and condemning the kidnapping and removal of people and families without -- with a complete lack of due process. ICE has done with our union brethren and the center today who was released injuring and arresting for police is unacceptable and calling for the release of all arrested and for due process to be installed then. It starts with indigenous people and those are indigenous people being removed from indigenous lands but the indigenous peoples start with the tribal

communities removed from the Gabrielle, Chumash were removed from their lands by similar forces whether it was Mexican government, whether it was the U.S. government or the California militia. Wanted to bring that into the space and statement of solidarity and make that statement. Thank you for letting me do that.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: For sure. And that's extended to today. To the now as well. I was reading just yesterday about for some reason the raids going to protect the lands now, right. So you're completely spot on and thank you very much, Member Williams for uplifting that. We've got to get ICE out of here. For sure.
- >> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: Thank you.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Most modern day U.S. institutions have benefitted from the unaddressed legacy of stolen labor at this foundation of this nation and it's vast and inequitable wealth. We respectfully remember our debt to the enslaved people primarily of African descent whose labor and suffering built and grew the economy of a infrastructure of a nation who refused to recognize their humanity F while the 13th Amendment ended slavery slavery ongoing impacts are still felt to work in the of the U.S. We recognize our debt to the exploited workers past and present whose labor was and continues to be stolen through unjust practices. We acknowledge our collective debt to the indigenous peoples of this land whose labor was forced and exploited, the Chinese immigrants who built the records and allowed for westward American development Japanese American whose properties and livelihoods were taken from them and migrate workers from the Philippines Mexico and central and South America who have worked Pacific Northwest farms and canner Reese. We recognize the immigrant and American born workers of African Asian central and south American descent who contributes to the well-being of our collective community. We recognize that the economy continues to rely on the exploited labor of incarcerated people largely people of color who earn pennies an hour while generating billions of goods and services each year and we know that there are many people too numerous to mention who are prevented from reaping the true value of the labor by unjust systems and cruel practices. We mourn their loss of life, liberty and opportunity. We acknowledge that the theft of the labor is the theft of generational progress. Nearly all people of color have been robbed of the opportunity -- I'm sorry nearly all of the -- nearly all people of color have been robbed of the opportunity and wealth that their ancestors might otherwise have passed onto them. Thank you.

Review the community agreements. I'll start. Be respectful of the diverse voices being represented and remain open-minded. It's on the back the land acknowledgement.

- >> Be mindful of power dynamics in this space as well as the historical disenfranchisement of Black and indigenous communities. Accordingly prioritize and defer to community throughout this process.
- >> Be mindful of the diverse audience you're representing to and make sure you speak with clarity.
  - >> Be collaborative.
  - >> Assume best intentions.
  - >> Challenge the idea, not the person.
- >> Remember why we're here to center the Black, Brown and indigenous communities and other communities that have been most impacted by the carceral system. Low income communities, trans and gender nonconforming folks, et cetera.
  - >> Defer to community.
  - >> Transparency and follow-through.
  - >> Be intentional about hearing and allowing space for additional voices to be uplifted.
  - >> Be an active participant and try to be succinct in your thoughts and contributions.
  - >> Let equity lead the way.
  - >> Make space for youth voice.
- >> As much as possible, allow community members to finish their sentence or thought during the public comment.
  - >> Review community agreements before every meeting and amend them as needed.
- >> Begin CFCI advisory committee meetings with a land acknowledgement statement recognizing and respecting the education peoples of the land we now call Los Angeles County.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Gratitude, everybody. Just taking a moment to review the minutes unfortunately at the moment we can't take action but as other folks filter into the room -- we have quorum. Nice, all right, cool. Fantastic. Let's review and take appropriate actions on minutes. We need to take roll. Sorry. I'm bugging my bad take roll.
- >> Thank you Chair Steele we will conduct the roll call to expedite this process we ask that all advisory committee members be ready with a microphone before your name is called so you can be ready to announce your attendance promptly. If you're unable to unmute yourself be raise your hand on the Zoom platform so we can assign cohost

privileges to you. If you're calling on your phone unmute yourself by pressing star 6 and you can raise your hand with star 9. If you are participating remotely please indicate this by stating present remotely under just cause or present remotely under emergency circumstances when your name is called. After roll call is complete we will review the list of members attend remotely. For those under just cause we will ask you to briefly state your reason. As a reminder no further action is required for those attending under just cause. Those attending under emergency circumstances we will ask you to briefly describe the emergency necessitating your remote attendance. Following these descriptions the committee will have to take a vote to confirm your participation under emergency circumstances. As a note just cause to participate remotely is allowed when there is a child care or caregiving need a contagious illness a need related to physical or mental disability or to travel while on official business for the legislative body. Emergency circumstances is when there's a physical or family medical emergency which prevents you from attending in person. Please note that the committee must take objection on a request to participate remotely due to emergency circumstances per the Brown act. We will begin the roll call. When your name is called please say present or present remotely.

Member Armstead or alternate.

- >> Alternate present.
- >> Mr. Carbajal or alternate. Member Castillo or alternate.
- >> Present.
- >> Member Contrares.
- >> LaShonda Diggs under just cause present virtually.
- >> Member Crunk or alternate.
- >> Present remotely just cause.
- >> Thank you. Member Cyrus-Franklin or alternate. Member Eakins. Member Tsai or alternate.
  - >> Present.
  - >> 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.
- >> Present remote. Thank you.
- >> Thank you member. Lobianco, are you attending under just cause or emergency?
- >> Let me just double-check the rules so I can give you the correct answer and I'll come back.
  - >> Thank you.
  - >> I want to relook.
  - >> Member Knight or alternate.
  - >> Present.
  - >> Member Scorza or alternate. Member Soto or alternate.
  - >> Present.
  - >> Chair Steele or alternate.
  - >> Present.
  - >> Member Stevens.
  - >> Present.
  - >> Member Joey Williams or alternate.
  - >> Here, present.
  - >> Member Myk'l Williams. Member Wong or alternate.
  - >> Present alternate.
  - >> Thank you.
- >> Member Joey Williams, are you attending remotely for just cause or emergency circumstances?
  - >> Just cause emergency circumstances there's a riot in the city.
- >> Thank you. And Ms. Lobianco, are you attending just cause or emergency circumstances?
- >> Apologies I just want to confer with the rules so I can give you the most correct answer so I was looking at it with my secretary. Apologies.
  - >> We will note it as just cause
- >> CHAIR STEELE: For now.
- >> MEMBER LOBIANCO: Thanks I just need a minute, thank you.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Thank you all again just taking a review at the meeting minutes from May 15th. Any changes, any additions, anything that's left out? If not somebody can make a

motion. You said we have quorum. Tell me how. I Count I 1 people around this table. Now 12.

- >> We have 10 we have quorum.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: The numbers change, got it. Vacancies that makes sense. Anyone want to make a motion on the minutes if there's no need.
  - >> I'll make a motion to approve the minutes from May 15th 2025.
  - >> I'll second.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: And seconded. It was made by member Fuentes-Miranda and seconded by Member Lewis. Any readiness? Let's vote on this.
  - >> Comment.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Yeah, public comment.
- >> This commences the public comment period for this agenda item. The public comment period will be one minute per person. For those online who would like to provide public comment please use the raise hand feature now. When you are called upon please state your full name for the minutes before beginning your public comment. Your hand will be lowered once you have completed your public comment. For those on the telephone please dial star the to raise your hand. We will say your name or last digits. Style star 6 to unmute. When accessing Zoom through a computer browser scroll to reactions and you will see the raise hand feature. We will begin public comment. Do any public comments in the room for approval of the meeting minutes? Seeing none we will go online. Do we have any public comments online? There are no public comments online either. Thank you.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Let's move to the vote.
- >> We will now conduct the vote for the motion to approve the May 15th 2025 meeting minutes. We will ask that all committee members to be ready with a microphone before your name is called. When I call on your name please indicate your vote of yes, no, or abstain. We will begin the vote now. Mr. Carbajal or alternate. Member Castillo or alternate.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Real quick, sorry there is a correction. Sorry about this, guys or everyone. Member Castillo's name is spelled wrong in the special notes. We're in the middle of the vote it's been approved and seconded. We finished the vote and then make corrections is that how that works? We're in the middle of the vote.
  - >> How many people voted?

- >> CHAIR STEELE: Nobody yet okay cool. I'm going to pull it with a friendly amendment of making grammatical corrections as well that are needed. That accepted?
  - >> I accept that from the amendment.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Seconded cool. Amendment made the new motion is to accept the minutes with grammatical corrections. We can move to the vote.
- >> Thank you, Member Steele, we will proceed with the vote. Please remember when I call on your name indicate your vote of yes, no or abstain and be ready in a microphone. Member Carbajal or alternate? Member Castillo or alternate.
  - >> Ave.
  - >> Member Contreras or alternate.
  - >> Abstain.
  - >> Member Crunk or alternate.
  - >> Yes.
  - >> Member Cyrus-Franklin or alternate. Member Eakins. Member Tsai or alternate.
  - >> Ave.
  - >> Member Fuentes-Miranda.
  - >> Aye.
  - >> Member Garcia or alternate. Member Hong or alternate.
  - >> Aye.
  - >> Member Lewis or alternate.
  - >> Aye.
  - >> Member Lobianco or alternate.
  - >> Aye. And thank you for your patience. Remote with just cause.
  - >> Thank you member Lobianco. Member Knight or alternate.
  - >> Abstain.
  - >> Member Scorza or alternate. Member Soto or alternate.
  - >> Aye.
  - >> Chair Steele.
  - >> Ave.
  - >> Member Stevens.
  - >> Aye.
  - >> Member Joey Williams or alternate.
  - >> Ave.

- >> Member Myk'l Williams. And Member Wong or alternate.
- >> Abstain.
- >> This motion passes. Thank you.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Thank you very much. Okay. Two major things, three major conversations today. And item 8 goes into item 9. So it was brought to my attention that though we have been having ongoing conversations about how we wanted to approach the evaluation aspect of our work, particularly for year one funds and how that would impact year one contracts and grants I think ongoing we have been saying and you all correct me if I'm wrong, ongoing we have been saying we want to make sure there is a continuance of the resources those currently funded until we're able to evaluate and recommend anything different.

Am I correct or am I incorrect on that, do you all know what I'm talking about? >> [Indiscernible]

>> CHAIR STEELE: Thank you Reba, I appreciate that. The reason I'm bringing this is up is the CEO's office along with -- there has not been a directive provided of moving forward with a continuing of current contracts and grants for people who are currently funded. I'm talking about all of them, county departments and the TPA. There has not been a, not a contract renewal, a contract extension or grant extension approved to any of the folks who are receiving CFCI fundings from year one.

So those contracts, those grants come to an end in less than 30 days, right.

- >> They started at different times
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Correct me, correct me.
  - >> The grants are scheduled to terminate February 28th 2026.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: 26.
  - >> All of them regardless of when they started.
- >> All year one grants. All year one grants started March 1st, 2023. The three year cycle ends February 282026.
  - >> And there's a different time for third party administrator grants.
- >> I'm just speaking of the grants. So what I'll say county funded, any time we talk about grants I'm speaking specifically to those grants that are administered through the third party administrator because there is a distinction that's important.

- >> MEMBER LEWIS: I wasn't listening to that nuance which one.
- >> ADAM BETTINO: What about the funding through the grants.
  - >> When did those expire.
  - >> The ongoing funds.
  - >> Year one.
- >> Year one there's no conversation about termination of those funds to county departments that I'm aware of.
  - >> That's not --.
  - >> Don't answer.
  - >> There's a conversation, I mean,.
  - >> Hold on.
  - >> CEO is online.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Hold on everybody. Hold on. Hold on.
- >> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: It's not the right time bro, it's not the right time.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: All right. So here is the question, the question I'm asking is for those who have been tracking this conversation, did we, we agreed that the way we wanted to move forward was for the grants to be continued is that correct?
- >> MEMBER LEWIS: When you refer to grants you're talking about the third party administrator. I don't know that we ever made a decision but I'm going to take some license with the historical perspective. The only time that this body recommended that contracts or programs we funded in perpetuity was in year two when we were funding permanent housing subsidies through the Department of Health services. Year two or three I think -- it might have been.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: It was year two.
- >> MEMBER LEWIS: There has not been any other conversation at any point in the last four and a half years about ongoing funding without any type of renewal time frame. The only one we said were the housing related ones for obvious reasons we were powering into the subsidy pools. This body has never said any other contract continues in perpetuity.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Can I reframe it then. Because I'm not saying in perpetuity. It is the three year.

>> MEMBER LEWIS: I'm not responding to you I'm responding to him there's no end to the contract. That's what I'm referring to, the only recommendation from this body to, the only contracts to not follow the three year cycle unless there was an extension that we approved was for the permanent housing ones. So there is no basis, we didn't even have discussions about things going beyond three years in the year one discussions which obviously was the most robust process, the most community engagement. So I'm go responding to this and understand when that decision was made because it was not made here and want to understand what type of recourse we have to challenge that because it's inequitable. To your question, and we didn't say that that was okay and nobody ever brought that up and I've never heard that before about the county departments just going on forever we didn't say forever but with no time limit that's what it implies. I don't think we voted because there's been so much confusion to your actual question because we kept getting here, there and you know information that wasn't completely clear around the start and stop of those things so I don't think we actually took an action to say we want to extend those grants that the third party administrator is responsible for.

### >> CHAIR STEELE: Member Castillo and Stevens.

>> Plus plus to member Lewis and the importance of having the evaluation as well prior to any changes we made.

### >> CHAIR STEELE: Member Stevens.

>> It's important for me to share and it's thank you Member Lewis and Castillo. It's important for me to rewind this back. When we approved the funding, it included both counties and TPA's. And to me that's fair. There was no big eyes no little U's. But now that they have the funding there are differences that are being made and as a member of the community speaking for the community, that's not what fairness and equity looks like. It was enough, and I pushed up against a lot of us members, you know, wanting to fund a lot of the county departments. Only to arrive here and it's uncomfortable for me, I have to be honest about that, but it's not fair. And so whatever is going on we need to be really clear and make sure that we are very clear about the processes. But I do think that we have to level the playing field. It has to be fair. Not to mention I'm not hearing a lot of noise about what's happening with the TPAs. I'm not hearing Amity, I'm not hearing about CBO's what we're hearing is unspent ridiculously is the county departments. And there's something wrong with this picture.

So how do we balance this? How do we make this fair? And it needs to be made fair so are we writing a letter what's the action part.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: Part of the action part is that we're working together to level set the unspent funds so we're going to do that together.
- >> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: I have a hand up over here.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Say that again. I got you. We're going to level set on that front. I got you, member Williams. And I hear you, member Lewis and member Castillo about us not voting on the idea of continuance of dollars for the grants. The ending of the three year grant with a year to year renewal unless or like it goes to a year to year renewal unless we change what's supposed to happen was something that I remember having a conversation about. But at the very least even if that's not the case, we do need to make an action I guess is the point I'm making but I'll pause for a second and member Williams then you as well. Go ahead member Williams.
- >> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: I think some of the conversations I remember is that we wanted to make sure that those year one grants that they were the evaluation process that they were working, you know, but never about stopping them just making sure that we're funding the ones that are working and evaluating the ones that may not or about the right sizing. I want to 100% agree with member Stevens on what she was saying about the county unspent and that, you know, it feels like there's a double standard, you know, like how conveniently the county continues and TPA don't, that's not good, that's not right, that's not the spirit of CFCI and that's not what our community needs right now.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Yes, member Soto.
- >> So at the risk of putting a target on my chest which was not my desire, I'm not defending anything I just want to highlight that for some of the departments that contract out all of our services like, I mean, all of our CFCI for harm reduction help to fund the building that Commissioner had mentioned here. It's not a county versus community. I don't view it that way. I just want to highlight that. Again I'm not defending the process I'm just saying like it's not -- if the money from the county department is going, you know, entirely to the community CBO's some of whom are represented here, it is important to keep that in mind.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Received. Member Lewis.

>> MEMBER LEWIS: So I think at the core of what I'm going to say I fought for behind the scenes sometimes in public in the first two years of this was transparency, thoughtfulness about how decisions are being made and equity, right. Equity in terms of considering every entity, public or private that would be administering these dollars and I think that some of the frustrations that have continued to bubble up for the last several months is because we seem to be going the opposite direction.

And so my next, you know, few questions are related to that because that's where I'm going to come back to not even necessarily it may not make sense to continue things where all the infrastructure has been put in. It's about decision-making, it's about us continuing to be surprised and it's about transparency, seemingly, to continue to reduce as decisions are made. So I have a few questions member Bottino who is on the call

- >> CHAIR STEELE: Kieu-Ahn is here.
- >> MEMBER LEWIS: Number one how Evers the decision made to come up with the February 28th deadline and who made that decision? Or not deadline but termination date.
- >> ADAM BETTINO: That's just in alignment with the 36 months that was established. So I don't have that on that exactly but there's 36 months of sort of grant agreement that was established and then there absolutely was discussion about evaluation and when all of that was happening. And so I think the language in the spending plans is somewhat like, you know, we need three years of data, we need three years of program in order to adequately evaluate what has happened with these various programs.
- >> MEMBER LEWIS: We know some of those were delayed. I hear you. We know they didn't start March 1st and there's lots of hand holding from any of those providers. So I want to know where you all with JCOD is with the evaluation consulting because I don't know what that looks like. I would appreciate that and it's related to this conversation. Secondly was there consideration for extensions even if there were no cost extensions, that's separate than just actually extending. So where are you with the evaluation consulting and us actually starting that process and it's related to this. Two, was there any discussion around no cost extensions. Yeah.
- >> ADAM BETTINO: For the first part the evaluation will be signed any day, honestly. So we've been through all the negotiations, we have somebody on board we're already starting

the transition documents to them so they can start that review. There will be a draft report available to you all in November. Final report is due to us for the contract.

- >> MEMBER LEWIS: Report that shows what.
- >> ADAM BETTINO: That's the evaluation report the evaluation will be completed in December.
- >> MEMBER LEWIS: We've seen since the evaluation, I know we did some legwork to inform it but have we seen in this body what the evaluation plan is?
- >> ADAM BETTINO: There is.
- >> MEMBER LEWIS: No.
- >> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: No.
- >> ADAM BETTINO: Wait a second hang on I'm sorry. There was a lot of conversation about the evaluation with county counsel and advice to membership about how the communication was to be handled. Perceived conflicts of interest, all of that. So we took that feedback with the feedback that you all had provided previously and went and entered into an agreement with an organization.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: The question is about the evaluation plan itself like we have not seen that plan.
- >> MEMBER LEWIS: And, I mean, the conflict piece we're talking about categorically what they are going to be looking at and methodology that they are going to be using. I don't understand how that's a conflict and I don't understand how something can move forward without this committee having at least high level or asking potentially conflicted members to remove themselves. I don't know how we are on the path where this committee doesn't see it, doesn't get some kind of presentation that's appropriate related to what the plan is. Because we don't want to see something in November and be frustrated because it doesn't necessarily do all of the data analysis that we think is important. Am I missing something.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: You're not missing anything but I think part of the plan was for the contractor to sign the step that I think that we talked about us missing from your description is they need to come here first before we begin their analysis.

- >> ADAM BETTINO: That's fair. We're open to doing that. The evaluation plan has been shared with leadership, we've had those discussions with our team and with you all to discuss this. The leadership.
  - >> This leadership.
- >> ADAM BETTINO: This leadership.
  - >> Member Lewis is asking the question.
- >> ADAM BETTINO: That's correct and is the step has been shared.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Before they get starred they are coming here after they sign. We haven't seen it or shared it, no.
- >> MEMBER LEWIS: That's a request. And it's definitely related to the conversations about making decisions about renewal so the second question again was whether discussions about no cost renewals.
- >> ADAM BETTINO: Not that I'm aware of. My understanding the grants started being disbursed March 1st. If that means services were not started yet a I'm not sure what the grant funds were utilized for.
- >> MEMBER LEWIS: Any of us who have operated grants especially given the requirements that the county still made the TPA put into those contracts, the challenges would actually starting grant, that's a very, that perspective is a little bit troubling given the hand holding that we knew that the TPA had to do with a lot of these folks. Whether you're medium, small or large organization, there are inherent delays and given the fact that some of these folks have this kind of money for the first time we know there's delays so I think there should be an approach with consideration for just the challenges, period, in operating grants for no cost extensions. I don't understand we were supposed to start March 1st I don't understand how that's responsive to can we consider no cost extension.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I would take it a step further.
- >> MEMBER LEWIS: Doing if for the county department I don't understand why can't it be in consideration.
- >> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: Amen.

>> CHAIR STEELE: What has been told to me is that the process of actually doing extension would trigger also a need for an extension of the contract with the TPA as well. There was a thinking that they were going to be able to utilize the resources that would be released from these funds not being renewed. You know being back put in the pot to actually give other organizations an opportunity to get CFCI funds as well.

So there was a whole bunch of different thought processes about how this was going to go. So what I, and my conversation stopping all that,

[CAPTIONER CHANGE 5:00 PM]

>> My conversation stopping all that is like, we have been talking about this. I thought we had game planned what this would look like. I had to go back through the transcripts. Since 2023 to determine what was the nature of the conversation.

To me, the intent of what we were trying to do was clear. This goes into Item Number 9. The memo I sent over. We discussed the year one agreements would allow for impact. Avoid disruption for smaller first-time county contractors. We discussed this. We could extend for 12 months until we got the evaluation done. I remember this. Member Castillo said three years is not enough time. Agree or disagree on that. JCOD was here. A judge. Here is a part of the conversation. It is not as if we had this conversation and JCOD was separate. You brought it up on several occasions.

There was no formal conversation that they were on board. They didn't have full objections to it. Let us not assume we are confirming it. You knew what was going on. I recommend we make a move on it. Is it an extension? Do we need more room and space for people to continue the work.

Do we want to stop and provide a process for space to reapply for those funds?

>> Do we have a report of the projecting underspend from the grants? I haven't seen that information.

- >> The things I have seen is in that spreadsheet -- this was a breakdown. The TPA was a part of it.
- >> I want a direct answer to my direct question.
- >> Do we know that number?
- >> For the grantees, community-based organizations?
- >> Do we understand?
- >> There isn't. The grants are dispersed on a regular basis. Unless there are issues with documentation. As long as they provide documentation and various requirements.
- >> I wanted to say I am available for questions.
- >> You made a comment about the county having to extend their contract with the third-party administrator. Is that doable? Can you extend that contract?
- >> There is a fairly clean way, if we wanted to extend the grands, it is fairly straightforward. There is a desire to look at that contract for JCOD to look at it with the TPA. In terms of on their side of things, to extend the grants, that is a simple task. More complicated is the milestone component. If we push it out, the gathering to set new milestones with the grantees becomes complicated. Many of these are small. All the things they need to do. They are working with them as long as they continue to be responsive. That will take them a few months to get everyone on track. If there is a decision made to extend.
- >> I think you said yes, it is more nuanced. Is it possible to extend the contract. Is that possible without complication?
- >> It depends on what you mean by complication. It is possible to extend. There may be some questions. Mechanically, totally.

MEMBER LEWIS: If we want some of the funds currently accounted for to go to the TPA, you would extend the contract. Maybe the grantees. Is this correct?

>> I am sorry to answer with a question. Additional funds?

MEMBER LEWIS: That is where we pull from. We will make some recommendations. To go to the TPA. All of the existing grants to expire in February. The board approves it. That is all you would need to extend the contract with the TPA.

- >> There are ongoing funds to go to grantees. Your two is 40.5 million. Three is 53. Year over year.
- >> The contract doesn't end until 2027.

MEMBER LEWIS: There are other rounds.

>> Year three would end June 30th.

CHAIR STEELE: Can you walk through the evaluation. The fact of year one will happen first. Because of broken P pieces, the fact that the TPA ends in 27 is problematic. Evaluation happens after the contract ends. There would be a need for more dollars down their route for TPA to continue the work. We get evaluation. We need to extend year 2 and 3 as well.

- >> You must have three years of services before you can evaluate.
- >> All of this. We don't have these processes delineated. I struggle with the timeline. They don't align with calendar or fiscal year for the county. Part of the consideration I want to raise here is to try to get to that point. It is easier for us. We can schedule these things out. It gets us to a place where all of this is set in stone so we don't have to keep coming back. I appreciate the dialogue.
- >> That is why I drafted the memo to have a conversation on what we can actually do. I hear you on the 16th month. I want to make sure we are all on the same page here. What we are talking about. To do the evaluation three years of work is what is being evaluated. One year yes. 16 months. We would have to come back for year 2 and 3 unless we decide not to do it and do it all right now. I want to talk through a few things.
- >> Sequencing and alignment. Not clear across the board. I want to be mindful of equity. Should year two or three get a year? Maybe we don't need that. Once evaluation is done in December, how much time do we need, do you want and need to look at that and consider the program areas. All of that. Determining how much time is needed.

You may end up with bottlenecking. Knowing the re-solicitation for the grants through amity is a seven-month process. A long process. You have to engage the community. The other parts of this that I have received questions, so you are aware, I have received questions about what do the bylaws say about a modification like this to a contract. That part of it is way more murky. Some of my leadership and teammates. What exactly, how will we move this recommendation forward? What is the approval process?

CHAIR STEELE: County departments wouldn't.

- >> Most everyone would have to reduce themselves.
- >> If we were to take an action, we have the county department here. I don't know if there would be enough people to conduct wiz.
- >> I will request we see the tool. It is not an actionable item. I don't know about the TPA. It would be helpful to hear directly from county council.
- >> We asked for that. There is a need for them to come and provide feedback.

MEMBER CRUNK: Do I have permission? Wish I could of been there. I am trying to stay quiet and learn. We have people in the room around since the start. I am hearing a lot of the conversation. They are going back to that. Some stuff. What I heard about the recusal, there are people tied to it. If they do recuse the people. Once they are gone, who will make the ultimate decision then. Who says, I will mediate and say this?

>> This is probably a more artful way to handle it. They should be stepping out to provide people that funding. That is how other committees work. Juvenile justice coordinating council. You step out. Some is happening offline. This is a suggestion. If you are operating within that program area, you probably shouldn't be part of the discussion. You maintain quorum.

MEMBER LEWIS: I understand that. I think the nuances and the clarification. You don't want people to feel there is an unfair advantage. You will lose some going through these things. Contacts asked us to get to a place where we move the 217 million through. The one thing I could say about pushing through is sometimes you have to push to get the options available. There are ways to do things that still respond.

I will request we ask questions about all our options and come to an agreement that makes sense.

CHAIR STEELE: We need county council to give guidance?

MEMBER LEWIS: We can't vote to extend? If not, let us move it forward.

>> This is a question that has been asked we don't have guidance yet. We don't have clear guidance.

MEMBER LEWIS: How many people have grants from the TPA. Can you understand the number? How many people have year one funds. Is anyone online. No act of conflict. The next steps.

CHAIR STEELE: Member LoBianco is that you?

MEMBER LOBIANCO: I was just trying to get help. Thanks.

>> No cost extensions?

MEMBER LEWIS: It was resetting to new grants.

>> A way to think about it is, and this is helpful. This is funding that is dedicated for grants. Right now, it is tied up with the year one recipients. 18.5 that will recur. If we do nothing, it will go to the grantees. The money is tied up right now. We get requests weekly. Is there money coming into the community.

By extended we eliminate the ability to push more money because it is tied up.

>> A question before you make a motion, is this something the committee wants to consider doing across the board or something the committee wants to look at?

CHAIR STEELE: This conversation is built on the original premise that we need an evaluation first.

MEMBER LEWIS: I heard a few references. If we can evaluate, we should move forward. We are not in a position. It will be done in December. There were still some things. There were still moving pieces. That is the basis of it.

- >> A lot is process. How do we work together? How much did that have to learn to be effective?
- >> A point of clarification. Does the evaluation timeline stay the same with extensions? Or does that change?

MEMBER LEWIS: Program evaluation. The outcomes of the programs. What does that look like?

>> A certain amount of people we will interview. Qualitative data from participants. There is a lot of business. We can cite something up. We can draft you something.

CHAIR STEELE: Go ahead.

MEMBER LEWIS: If they will start the evaluation, the sooner the better. They won't start program evaluation right now.

>> The first step is gathering three years. It will take a while to look at that.

>> We should keep funding them. Regardless if there is not money coming back. If we vote on this, I have to do it soon.

MEMBER LEWIS: I would like to move that we, due to the lack of evaluation information for the year one cohort, we extend the contracts to end on June 30, 2027.

CHAIR STEELE: You put the motion on the floor. Contract ends February.

MEMBER LEWIS: Four more months left.

CHAIR STEELE: Year extension plus four.

MEMBER LEWIS: You said it would be help. That is okay. I retract my question.

>> I don't agree with the 16-month extension.

MEMBER LEWIS: We can do 12 months.

>> If we can get to next fiscal year, four-month extension. I don't know.

CHAIR STEELE: If year one comes in December. And we are trying to.

MEMBER LEWIS: I thought you said it won't include the program evaluation data.

>> It will.

>> Wouldn't the timeline be affected? Doesn't the timeline get pushed back? You are trying to evaluate the programs?

MEMBER LEWIS: Will we see grantee by grantee data in December?

>> No.

MEMBER LEWIS: When will it be available? I thought that is what we are talking about here.

>> Me trying to get on some page. You made recommendations for program area. Not specific grantees for funding. We are not getting into the detail. Just reviewing the program areas. It will be at the program level area. Not the grantee level.

MEMBER LEWIS: What is our role in determining? If we extend these, it will give us time to assess to determine which areas to fund.

CHAIR STEELE: And make recommendations.

MEMBER LEWIS: That makes sense. You say that will be completed by December. It will be in advance of the completion of the program area for year one.

>> Part of the reason we pushed timelines was for you to have something. We were told we are late. I think this is the question. if we say you need three full years to do an evaluation, we wouldn't be doing one until after March. Three full years.

We push the other dates for all the other evaluations out. We would do it into. If determination to extend or not is based on evaluation, you would have to extend the grant into the evaluation period. That is 36 months. You would have to build in some evaluation time on the back end. This was the county. County came up with the process. 36-month situation. Board of Supervisors level. How much time is needed for this process.

MEMBER LEWIS: Programs are evaluated annually. I don't agree with extending it by another year to evaluate the entire three years. We have a few different decisions to make here. One is because of the conflicts. Whether or not we want to extend. There are still some question marks and evaluation. My motion would not be for four months. 12 months. We can stay on the march through February calendar. We need to have a conversation about the evaluation piece. Maybe if we see the plan, we can provide input.

>> I want to grasp what is being said how do we know how well or not work is being done, right now. I am extending it blindly? I want to know now how are things going.

CHAIR STEELE: The evaluator will start doing the work. A six-month process to study it. Come up with a report. The effectiveness of the program areas we had. The extension piece of it comes. I want to trust everything is going well. I don't. I don't know as one who utilized services in my life, those who I am aware of, it is not always great. I want more accountability. I get how most of you in this arena operate. It doesn't make sense to someone like me.

I need to know now is everything going okay. Where are the hiccups? There may be challenges with some agencies. People are hurting outside. I need to know there is appropriate resources that is being currently funded too that is out there. What is the impact? If it ain't working, we signed a check and wasted a whole lot of money. This is different. We can't. I don't want to wait three years. I have some stories. We can't wait too long. What is wrong with evaluating what we have now? Is there a way to evaluate what we have now.

CHAIR STEELE: We can't have it both ways. For these smaller based organizations, they need a chance to get things off the ground. It has to be one way or the other. Are we going to be very on top of the head every single year to say, we gave you the money, what are you doing? What are we doing?

- >> I am confused. The split says the county department, they have all kinds of experience. Who are we? What is it that perhaps the county can do?
- >> Does that, the desire to know what is going on now with the work, does that argue for an extension in your mind or not?
- >> Both. If it ain't working, why would we extend it? The concern I have is we can extend something that isn't doing well.

MEMBER LEWIS: There are two levels. The grant administrator. The TPA. They have a responsibility to track and monitor performance. How the contract is supposed to be operation. If the administrator observes a direct agency is not performing, it is addressed.

We are having a conversation about the next level. As an advisory committee, we want to understand the outcomes of each category. How do we do this area? There is built in accountability. We are not going to see that. It is not appropriate. What you are talking about exists. If an agency is not performing, may will lose their contract.

>> I visited several sites. I am pleased. What I cannot see is (inaudible). It gets confusing. We talk about the CEOs. We had a whole lot about some county departments. I need to keep it real. When I am speaking, maybe I need to clarify who I am talking about, because I don't see where, thank you for being here today. Where is the accountability.

MEMBER LEWIS: You heard the audible response to the county directly related to the resources. The three years came from a variety of things. There is data, reports that talk

about the appropriate length of time. We have some departments with five-year master agreements. The realty and importance is important to reassess for other organizations to have access and compete. We need a conversation about what time frame makes sense. The money is there. We need to figure out does three years make sense for what we are trying to do. There are different models. They recognize it doesn't make sense.

We need to have that conversation. We need to agendize. Today, the question is do we want to extend the grants. If we say that I am still unclear, does it have to go through CEO or move forward if we say it? Does that mean it moves forward?

>> I think that is something we need to discuss. I any there needs to be approval.

CHAIR STEELE: Let us make it clear.

>> I think Chair Steele had a question about the 36-month timeline. That came out of the CEO board letters in year 2 through 4. Before any evaluation, there was time for the TPA vendors and county departments and have a block of service delivery time that is substantive enough that it could be evaluated fairly and effectively.

When the CEO came up with 36 months, it was early. The year one TPA had not been fully executed yet. The CEO would rely on the evaluation if there needs to be a shift in the 36-month timeline. I think this is something the board offices would pay attention to.

- >> Are you talking about year two of CFCI or following measure J?
- >> The spending plan. It had a 24-month timeline. Year two, the CEO redrafted to assume 24 to 36 months. Take into accounts time for county departments and TPA grantees to ramp up services and ensure there is fairness when JCOD goes in to evaluate.

CHAIR STEELE: To me, to align it, we are talking about the evaluation. You need the additional six to eight months to do that. 14 months is fine.

MEMBER LEWIS: Thinking about 12 plus more. I think it will be very inciteful to see the plan. I think we need a conversation. I don't know if there is time sensitivity around this decision being made around extensions.

>> If we were to resolicit, we would of needed to start yesterday. 7 to 8 months of gathering data.

CFCI ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

CART Transcript June 12, 2025

Special Meeting

CHAIR STEELE: Current are not under the impression this is coming to an end in February.

We have been talking about this the entire time. This would be the first time if we decided

not to extend that this conversation shifted. Switched from three years to year to year. I

think it has been asked. People have been planning it.

I got an e-mail last week to determine if they would open an in facility or not. The answer I

gave was I can't tell you to get the building or not. What I am saying is the conservations

have been.

>> Thinking about the grantees. If you look at the climate. Funding is being cut. Can they

count on these dollars? Do they need to think about layoffs.

MEMBER LEWIS: I want input. I will move that we vote to extend the year one contracts

administered by 12 months.

>> I will second that motion.

CHAIR STEELE: Any unreadiness.

>> One minute per person. Please use the raise hand feature now. We will call on you in the

order received. Your hand will be lowered. Please dial star nine. Dial star six to unmute

yourself. When accessing Zoom, scroll to reactions. We will now start public comment for

the approval. Any public comments in the room? We will go online. Any comments online?

This concludes public comment.

CHAIR STEELE: Let us vote.

>> We ask all members to be ready.

MEMBER CASTILLO: Aye.

MEMBER CONTRERAS: Question.

MEMBER CRUNK: Yes.

MEMBER TSAI: Abstain.

MEMBER FUENTES-MIRANDA: Yes.

MEMBER GARCIA:

MEMBER HONG: Abstain.

DISCLAIMER: This is NOT a certified or verbatim transcript, but rather represents only the context of the class or meeting, subject to the inherent limitations of realtime captioning. The primary focus of realtime captioning is general communication access and as such this

document is not suitable, acceptable, nor is it intended for use in any type of legal proceeding

MEMBER LEWIS: Aye.

MEMBER KNIGHT: Abstain.

MEMBER LOBIANCO: Aye.

CHAIR STEELE: Aye.

MEMBER STEVENS: Aye.

MEMBER WONG: Aye.

>> This motion carries.

CHAIR STEELE: We started 15 minutes late. Can I get 15? The community engagement committee met on Monday. We had a chance to take a look at the tools we need to move forward. I want to talk about the timeline. Based on approval, the goal is moving forward with the community engagement process on 18th through the 20th. Monday, we will invite the organizations to help us get the word out. A two week period of collecting the recommendations. CEO. To let us know the recommendations. Starting on the 18th, we will go to July 2nd. We will extend to the 7th if we start the 20th. To get as many as we can. We will use the rest of the month in our meetings to come up with a set of recommendations.

Once we get the information, we will have to read through these. Something to respond to. To come up with a synthesized set to fit the criteria. The process for the engagement in collecting the information will happen starting next week into the first week or the Monday of the second week of July.

MEMBER LEWIS: The last conversation was about the strategy. This is one. Will we look at the CEOs? I would like to fully understand the plan. Is this all you will do?

CHAIR STEELE: The goal is to have everything uniform. We can determine how to take the considerations. We have all the information to determine the needs from each department or different community entities.

MEMBER LEWIS: If you are on the list to receive funds, those departments have to submit this. If there is money taken away, they still have to submit this.

CHAIR STEELE: Yes.

MEMBER LEWIS: There are nuances. I think existing programs functioning. The CEO took some money. Some things should not be considered. It needs to be a part of our review process.

CHAIR STEELE: I think the nuance of how we want to approach it. A new project versus expansion. It is in section two.

- >> I love the design form. I love collecting from the organization. I see the question about how will the programs support CFCI. I wonder if when the committee decides how to assess, if we can look at that. We could think about different ways to evaluate that. I think that would be valuable to look at that.
- >> Some feedback from CEO. When we do the communication broadly, ensuring that it is clear that what you are proposing fits into the nine categories. You have to identify it is in this category. If not, we toss it.

MEMBER LEWIS: I asked you this three times. Does JCOD have the capacity to support this?

>> I appreciate this question. We have helped develop the form. I think we can do the work.

CHAIR STEELE: That has been a challenge previously.

>> We will do our best to make sure there are no delays. The community part, that is where this gets unwieldy. If we focus on the list. It we on more broadly, is the thought that this would, because you have made recommendations in the past, would this not go to TPA? You want to spend time on one area. Would it go to TPA?

MEMBER LEWIS: Some of the things may make more sense.

>> If that is the case, the decision we are making based on recommendation that go to funding departments. What I am trying to get my head around is I am thinking about, will community members be submitting us recommendations?

CHAIR STEELE: These have to be ready to rock on October 1st. It is one year funding.

MEMBER LEWIS: I want to make sure you are ready for that. There can be an unlimited number of submissions.

CHAIR STEELE: A way smaller window. It matters. Will they be able to do it. Go ahead. A group project. The XHIET tee would help the staff review the recommendations or just JCOD.

CHAIR STEELE: The synthesizing is the work we are talking about.

MEMBER LEWIS: The work to delete. It will be dropped in. It takes work to filter it.

>> I have a question regarding the report we will receive in November. Are there components of that where we will learn what AS pecks of the program area works. The details. I am curious.

>> I hope so. We will draft you all the evaluation plan. We will do it over e-mail. I hope so. It should. I don't know.

>> That will be instrumental in making recommendations around program areas.

CHAIR STEELE: Anything else?

>> I want to make sure we will have more time to discuss.

CHAIR STEELE: This is about activating to collect the information.

>> Committee members do this. We touched the line a lot.

CHAIR STEELE: General public comment. Do we need to vote to approve this. Take action on the outreach.

MEMBER LEWIS: We need an action. It is being brought back to us for our approval.

CHAIR STEELE: Make a motion to approve the use of the form and activate the committee to collect recommendation.

>> I will second. Any unreadiness?

MEMBER LEWIS: They still have to submit. I want to make sure that everyone is clear they need to submit.

>> Today, I sent something out to departments letting them know this is coming. We will have to send this out when we do it again. I have a question about the window submit by.

CHAIR STEELE: Starting on the 20th going to the 7th. We have the meeting on Monday. I have Reba.

>> I wanted to address Drexler. It was your e-mail. Was it clear? Thank you.

>> I can speak now or during public comment. I want to clarify the county departments funded through the CEO's one-time recommendations. If this committee waited until this process, the board may have decided on those programs. I can't speak to what the board will do on June 24th. I wanted to inform you to have plan to move forward.

CHAIR STEELE: They are aware. Considering the motion a few meetings ago about coming here first, that will be taken into consideration. We will continue on. You should expect to have to come back.

MEMBER LEWIS: If it passes, for this to not be futile, we would need one of the board offices to have an amendment that says, contingent upon recognizing the committee. If not, it just passes. I don't think we have a recourse.

CHAIR STEELE: We have been in communication. General public comment?

>> Items 10 and 11 are separate.

CHAIR STEELE: I combined them.

MEMBER LEWIS: You are taking public comment and general comment.

>> The public comment will be one minute per person. Please use the raise hand future now. When your are called upon, state your full name. Your hand will be lowered. Dial star nine to raise your hand. Star six to unmute. When accessing Zoom, scroll to reactions. You will see the raise hand feature. We will now start public comment. Do we have any in the room? We will go online. Comments online? If you would like to submit a written public comment please e-mail JCOD up to 24 hours prior. Include the meeting date in your correspondence. This concludes the public comment period. We will now go to the vote.

Sounds good. Member Wong.

MEMBER WONG: Aye.

MEMBER STEVENS: Aye.

CHAIR STEELE: Aye.

MEMBER SOTO: Aye.

MEMBER CARBAJAL:

MEMBER CASTILLO: Aye.

MEMBER CONTRERAS: Aye.

MEMBER CRUNK: Yes.

MEMBER FUENTES-MIRANDA: Aye.

MEMBER HONG: Aye.

MEMBER LEWIS: Aye.

MEMBER KNIGHT: Aye. Thank you. The motion carries.

CHAIR STEELE: Meeting adjourned. Have a great day.