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: We're going to wait a few more minutes. If you are online and you do not have your control of your mic, just raise your hand and they will set you up. We're going to get started momentarily. We do not have quorum in the room I want to say that. But in the way that today's meeting is set up we don't have any voting things it's really informational for the most part and planning. Hey Julie, when we do the timeline, can you pull up the timeline slide from the presentation? You did, okay, cool, thank you.
- >> MEMBER EAKINS: Chair Steele this is member Eakins, I'm going to be late but I'm headed there.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Thank you very much for the heads up, appreciate you being on. We are at Jesse Owens don't go to Magic Johnson.
- >> MEMBER EAKINS: I'm at Culver city in terms of proximity.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: All right. Thank you. Shout out to Ms. Debra, amazing chicken. .
 - >> CART PROVIDER: We can't hear anything. I see Chair Steele talking.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Can you hear us now. Of.
- >> Press star 9 to raise your hand press star 6 to unmute. For Spanish interpretation please click the globe icon and select Spanish. When written public comments are to be submitted to JCOD at LA County.gov. For written public comments to be reviewed by the committee members 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 prior to the meeting and will be reflected in the meeting minutes. Written comments received after 5 p.m. the day before the meeting through the end of the meeting will be made part of the public record for the meeting. However, advisory committee members may not have the opportunity to review these comments prior to acting on an agenda item. This concludes the meeting disclosures. Chair Steele I'll pass it over to you.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: Can you please take the role.
- >> We will now the conduct the roll call to ex-pi kite 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 are unable to unmute yourself please raise your hand so we can assign cohost privileges to you. If you are calling in on your phone you can unmute yourself by pressing star 6. You can raise your hand with star 9. If you are participating remotely by indicate 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 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 to confirm your participation under emergency circumstances. We will now begin the roll by by call last alphabetically. Please say present or present remotely. Member Armstead or alternate.
 - >> Alternate present.
 - >> Member Carbajal or alternate.
 - >> Alternate present.
 - >> Member Castillo or alternate. Member Contreras or alternate.
 - >> Present.
 - >> Member Crunk or alternate.
 - >> You said Crunk.
 - >> Member Crunk or alternate.
 - >> Present.
 - >> Member Cyrus-Franklin or alternate.
 - >> Present remotely.
 - >> Hope you get better brother I heard about the injury.
 - >> Much appreciation I had to be here anyway though for sure.
 - >> Member Eakin.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: She's on her way she mentioned she is coming from corporate city. Should be online. She was talking.
 - >> Member Tsai or alt.

- >> MEMBER EAKINS: Sorry to be disrupt active I'm headed there.
 - >> Member Tsai or alternate.
 - >> I'll be there in about 15. Present.
 - >> Member Fuentes-Miranda or alternate.
 - >> I'm here en route 20 minutes.
 - >> Member Garcia or alternate.
 - >> Member Hong or alternate.
 - >> Present participating remotely I believe it's under just cause.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I just saw your text.
- >> MEMBER HONG: Did you hear me.
 - >> Noted, thank you. Member Lewis or alternate.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: She had absent she's absent.
 - >> Member Lobianco or alternate.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: You got her email, okay.
 - >> Member Knight or alternate.
 - >> Present.
 - >> Member Scorza or alternate.
 - >> Member Soto or alternate.
 - >> Present.
 - >> Member Steele or alternate.
 - >> Present.
 - >> Member Stevens.
 - >> Present.
 - >> Member Williams or alternate.
 - >> Which one?
 - >> Member Joey Williams.
 - >> Here remote just cause.
 - >> Member Myk'l Williams. Member Wong or alternate.
 - >> Alternate present.
 - >> Thank you this meeting has not reached a quorum.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: That's what I said, all good. I want to review the CFCI committee land acknowledgement. The Rand beneath our feet is the ancestral lands of people who lived in

Los Angeles County and surrounding areas for thousands of years. I would like for us to acknowledge the Gabrieleno Tongva people, the Fernandeno Tatavium tribe and the Ventureno Chumash people. These native people understood and respected the land connected and respected our four legged creatures who once roamed the earth freely. Their hearts told them never to take more than they could use 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, to you our ancestors. Labor acknowledgement. Most modern day U.S. institutions have benefitted from the unaddressed legacy of stolen labor at the foundation of this nation and vast wealth. We owe our debt to those labor whose and suffering grew the infrastructure of a nation that refused to recognize their humanity. While the 13th Amendment of the institution technically ended slavery in the U.S. we know slavery's ongoing impacts are felt by people forced to work in the United States. Please we recognize our debt to exploited workers past and present whose labor was and continues to be stole Epp through unjust practices. We acknowledge our collective debt to indigenous peoples of this land whose labor was forced and exploited, railroads that allowed for western development, Japanese Americans whose priorities and livelihoods were taken away while incarcerated during world war 2 and migrate workers who worked Pacific Northwest farms and can Reese. We recognize the those whose labor remains hidden in the shadows but still contributes to the well-being of our collective community. We recognize that our economies continues to rely on the exploited labor of incarcerated people largely people of color largely pennies an hour while generating billions and billions and billions in goods and services every year. And we know that many, there are many people too numerous to mention who are by unjust systems and cruel practices. We mourn their loss of life, liberty and opportunity. We acknowledge that the theft of labor is a theft of generational progress nearly all people of color have been robbed of the opportunity and wealth that their ancestors might have otherwise passed onto them.

Let's read together the advisory committee community agreements.

- >> Be respectful of diverse voices being represented and remain open-minded.
- >> Be mindful of power dynamics in the space as well as the historical disenfranchisement of Black and indigenous communities, defer to community throughout this process.
 - >> Be mindful of the diverse audience you are presenting to and make sure you speak

with clarity.

- >> Be collaborative.
- >> Assume best intentions.
- >> Challenge the idea not the person.
- >> Remember why we are 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 succinct in your thoughts and contributions.
 - >> Let equity lead the way.
 - >> Make spaces for youth voices.
- >> As much as possible, allow community members to finish their sentence, thought during public comment.
 - >> Review community agreements before every meeting and amend them as needed.
- >> Begin CFCI advisory committee meetings with a land acknowledgement statement respecting the indigenous peoples of the land we now call Los Angeles County. Thank you you all.

We will come back to item 7100% we have quorum in the room. Currently we have eight and we need ten.

>> 12

>> CHAIR STEELE: We need 12. That's nine we are almost there. We will move onto item 8 a discussion of CFCI program proposal selection criteria and the timeline. Okay. Friends, this has been a year, let me tell you. And we have had some highs and lows, wins and some setbacks. May 6 was a win. Yesterday's meeting was a setback. Perspective. If you have not been watching along in the saga that is the board of supervisors meeting, yesterday, I'm sorry Tuesday there was a meeting and on the agenda the board, the CEO's office put forth their recommendations by way the Board letter that they sent and I think we had discussed the board letter because they came to the space to show us what they were going to be representing -- taking to the board of supervisors. I should note in this meeting on Tuesday, it was stated oh, yeah but these recommendations, the CFCI advisory committee vetted these. No we did not these are not ours, don't do that. That's a lie that's not true.

But she said it, she was the one who said it. Fiji said it. I count it as like not knowing because she is not usually in this space so she's not aware. Coming to do a presentation is not us actually vetting your proposals. But nonetheless, there was a good deliberation, a great conversation, a lot of seeking of understanding of how we got to where we are. The ask that we were putting forth was just a pause on your deliberation of those while we did our work by way of the May 6 process. May 6 motion it gives us a chance to be able to put forth our own recommendations. Nonetheless net they had recommendations that they were looking at 219 million that they were put forth -- they were considering for recommendations. They had put forth at least what got approved yesterday was 178 million of recommendations which created, you know, which supported a myriad of different things. Different departments like, for instance, the -- we had the presentation from the attorneys, public defenders, thank you came and did a presentation with us. Their proposal was added into this. There's a fund for the fire victims that was added to it. There's a myriad of different things and we can go over the board motion at a different times if you want to see what the recommendations were.

So it leaves roughly about, after it was all said and done left about 49 and some change million left for us to continue to allocate. It was an interesting space. The whole time we've been telling CEO like this was going to set a different precedent for what we're trying to do and by no -- next week's meeting there's another motion from one fortunate board offices that didn't come to this committee that didn't go to CEO that go to cluster that they are putting forth and saying CFCI funds should phi this. So now we have this whole like free-for-all that is going on and that we're going to continue to work to try to like hold everybody's horses. With that being said, we still have our work to do because there's still money to allocate funding for and we have begun our process. The concept recommendation form if you are not aware, many of you should have received an email from JCOD is open and it will be open until the 7th of July. We have had community listening sessions that have taken place already. We did one on Tuesday, with he did one this morning. There's one more tomorrow. I think on average we've had about 50 to almost 60 people who are participating in the meeting so the community knows what's going on and there's a lot of energy and questions about this.

And as you can see from the timeline that's up, on for us in this space we are going to be busy in the month of July. Because on the 10th we will kind of work through the first set, we'll take the first look at all of the recommendations, game plan how we want to divvy it

up. Today's conversation is going to help us determine how we want to do the process for iteration and decision-making, we'll come up with game plan and execute the game plan but we'll have the first look at the recommendations on the 10th. The 17th will be the second look and also like the first draft decision-making that we'll make on the recommendations that we want to put forth. The 24th will be the meeting where we finalize and vote on the recommendations and between the 24th and the 31st we'll be writing the board letter and then on the 31st we will approve the letter that will be sent to the board of supervisors by the 31st.

So there's going to be some homework to do, a lot of things to look through. A lot of it we've had a a cheat sheet before because we've had some of the county departments putting forth recommendations who have come before us and we've gotten a chance to vet some of that. In the meetings, the listening sessions I've been letting people know like this is not an RFP, this is not a grant so just putting forth the concept recommendation form does not mean you are automatically going to get [indiscernible]. I also want to be transparent this is going to be more so for those types of programs, departments or opportunities that are turnkey and ready to Rock n' Roll come October 1st. If this is going to be a new program that's going to need ramp up time and it's not able to be executed within the year, this -- you may not get selected.

So I just want to be very clear about that. For those programs that are ready to Rock n' Roll so like, for instance, if there was a UBI program that was piloted and like the relationships, the contracts and all that stuff was already in place and it all is just needs the infusion of resources to go in that direction that might be something that can be considered. If it is vI think you all get the point we've talked about this ad nauseam. The last thing I want to say to you all as far as like a operationalized, I see you Reba, I've got you, the July 10th and July 17th meetings will be virtual. But because we have to vote the 24th and the 31st ones will be in person. Okay.

So I think logistically they are still determining where those meetings are going to be but I want to give you all a heads up that you can expect July 10th and 17th to be online on Zoom and then we'll come together on the 24th and the 31st. So I'll pause there. Acknowledge member Stevens first if anybody else has any questions please ask.

>> REBA STEVENS: Thank you for your update and advocacy for CFCI funds, appreciate you. Today I listened to the board deputies meeting and I know that this will be one time

funds but I think in all fairness, it's really important for us to think about where the needs are. Please where are the immediate needs. And per the meeting today, it was very clear that they will not be able to house our support, our, you know, folks that are not already currently in the system. So we're talking about bids. I think I keep saying bids, bids, bids, bids, bids. So I think it's really important that we look at a couple of things. One is DPSS program although they are not currently receiving any CFCI funds. But also beds are necessary because people are going to die outside that is the reality of right now so if you don't know what I'm talking about I would encourage all of us to pay attention to what's going on with the, our unhoused neighbors. This new county department all these different groups, and particularly measure A funding stream and the cuts. There are so many cuts. I'll say this and be quiet.

What's devastating is how our ta youth are being bunched into every, this, you know, like size fits all and it doesn't so I think there should be a focus on our young people. I think too that we should be very thoughtful and considerate around access centers that are going to, that will close. And I'm not saying these are things that we should be funding but I think it's important if those doors shut, that means that there is not an access point and so it's really important for us to do our due diligence and understanding what is in front of us right now. Because no matter what we do, if we are not focused on the people who are less fortunate and who are outside, I don't believe that we've tone a great job.

At least that would be me speaking for myself

>> CHAIR STEELE: I hear you. So two things to that. The first thing is this is also why, I'm glad you mentioned that because it triggered in my mind to, popped in my mind to say along with the concept recommendation form there's also a community survey. So that we can update the information for us to understand what the needs are in our communities, right. For all the folks who are listening, for everybody who is in the room, it is really important to help to get the word out about folks filling out the survey. Because as we did in the year 3 if you remember, we utilized a lot of the learnings from that survey to help us understand how we wanted to elevate some of the proposals, I'm sorry, the recommendations to kind of tag into what the community is saying is important.

So, you know, to the conversation we were having earlier, we want to make sure that folks from that community is also adding context to what's going on in the field, to folks in the AV I know we have raised the importance of that, like making sure that folks from those

areas are bringing their voice to the table. And to those who are doing the work for those in in our houseless communities as well Reba, we want to make sure that understanding is there so it will help us determine the best strategies to go about this.

Second thing I will say on this is, this is also the reason why I am recommending for us that in our selection process, that we're not just considering the 50 million, but that we also consider the full 219 million, right. Because yes the CEO's office may have put forth whatever recommendations they have, but their recommendations are not going to have as much context behind the selection process as ours will, right.

The open policy for community members to come in and lend their voice to tell us what's going on, not only just the recommendation form but the survey, all the inputs that we're going to take to be able to make our deliberations will have more of a robust understanding of what's happening on the ground than anything else that is actually taking place.

So you know, if you remember ouree three process we had a two tier thing the first tier was the 88 million, 88.3 and then the second tier of like if the funding is there for full 100 million this is also what we want to add on I'm suggest that go we probably do the same thing here where we prioritize the conversation around the 49 million dollars and the second tier in the idea of the full 219 million if you take that into consideration here are the things and priorities that we say should actually be funded.

So there's a lot of work in front of us but to your question I wanted to throw that in. We need the input so we can make sure we make the deliberation in the appropriate way. Pause. Questions, anyone else, thoughts.

>> Yeah, Chair Steele, I love the framing that you're giving to our conversation because I think what we are taking back is sort of the credibility and the effort that has been placed at this table, right. I did hear, though, from the supervisors their desire to align with the priorities of the advisory committee, so I'm heartened by that and, you know, really believe that we can get there.

Doing business at the county is tough, I feel like everyone is sort of working against the clock. Those that we have become good partners with, there's gaps so I'm hoping maybe that is some of what we're experiencing here and that it can be fixed as we continue this process and future processes. Alignment with the CEO's office I think is essential to a process like this be effective and for the community to know their voice is being heard. I do think that we need to look at the emerging needs because right now many of our

communities as we know and have heard and have seen are under attack, there is a need out there for people to be able to access resources that they could probably go out and get on their own but because of the fear, because of the terror that is out there, there are people that are going out food, that are not going to work that need to be reached.

There's also as you were saying, just this horrible crisis of housing that we're facing and who -- and the spirit of the work that we're doing here needs to be the priority, right. And so I feel like that's, you know, that's part of the opportunity and so what you're describing is let's look at the priorities of the committee, the process that we're going through and let's split it up in case there's only the 53 million, however much that is and we can go to the next I think that's extremely smart and we should support that approach

- >> CHAIR STEELE: Thank you if I was on Zoom I would put a heart to that. I hear you and I'm with you 100% on that. Anyone else, member Crunk.
- >> MEMBER CRUNK: Making sure we're giving our input on what we're looking at going forward is that what we're doing.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Right now we're talking about I wanted to make sure the timeline is there over the next several weeks but also talking about our selection process criteria like thinking about how we want to go about our selection process but yeah.
- >> MEMBER CRUNK: When I entered this space during I think it was during COVID, one of our leadership brought me in. I don't know at the time I didn't know why he wanted me a part of the meeting he was. And then he told me he had started using words like lived experience and all of this so once I got in here, 60-year-old white guy, right, and then I heard all the conversations I understood why he wanted me in here. Based on that with lived experience I spent from 17 to 26 incarcerated. I was in LA County jail as a young man. I know how horrible that was. I've since turned my life around and I would like to say everybody's struggles are different. But for me, given the opportunity to be able to sustain myself financially, I would say that that is one of the reasons I've stayed out of prison for 26 years. And I believe since it changed my life if people had an opportunity to, I had a mother that had mental issues, so I understand that, can't speak to that because it hasn't arised in me yet but my brother touched it but I do feel anything that gives people a chance to be self-sufficient and self-defended, I think there has to be some space to offer that to male because ultimately that's what can change lives. Men's central jail can't continue to function if they don't have a product and if you can financially sustain yourself it stops you

from doing some criminal acts, hence it stops people from going to prison. For me, that's something that I hope that we keep in mind to bring to the community.

- >> Chair Steele, member Williams has his hand up.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Please member Williams. Thank you Member Crunk.
- >> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: Thank you very much. Just want to put a pin back in our conversation we had last year when we were allocating the 12 million dollars and we hopefully have gotten the 3.5 already down payment on the native piece that was funded as supposed to be funded as 7 million of that would consider a part of that I think 4 million left of being considered whether it be 2 million this year or next year to make good on that promise that we made for the native community.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: To that end, that was part of the motion that got passed this past Tuesday. So they were calling this their year for funding plan and so the 12.3 million that we had discussed months ago finally went before the board on Tuesday so it got approved already.
- >> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: That's ridiculous.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Say that again.
- >> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: That is ridiculous. That we talked [indiscernible] And we're already in July it's a whole year. Going back to what we're talking about is I think Member Stevens mentioned folks would have worked with and are always up against this timeline and, you know, yeah, just feel like we should be in a better place when we look at the county and the city where it's at, we know exactly where we're at.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I hear you. I had a good, I'll characterize it as a melting the ice conversation with CEO and having the discussion about the importance of us working together in that regard rather than working separately, I think the conversation lent itself to the right direction but I think what you were talking about is a part of that Member Williams look not only just transparency about what the expectations are from a timeline standpoint of what these things will be but also just, you know, the transparency about how those things will be rolled out and making sure the partners who are supposed to be engaged in that can continue to understand and know how they should show up.

So but yeah I'm glad you're raising it back up because I think it's important to note that it is on the books and so there is an expectation about that part actually getting started fairly soon. So I will find out for you about what the follow-up process is for that because even in our recommendation if there's like, you know, if we are putting forth what the fullness will look like that 12.3 million can and should be in that as a part of the work, right.

And to that, I just want to be clear about what I'm saying, there was 219 million dollar and that was a snapshot the basis of what net, what the CEO's office put into the board letter. They were looking at 258 but there was a set of it that was going to already be spent down by the time the end of the fiscal year came about so they netted 219 of what they were looking at and their recommendation took all but 49 million of it. Right.

So in that recommendation was included of the 12.3. So for us if we put forth a 2 tier piece and we're looking at that 49 million and saying hey, this is tier 1 these are our priorities that means that it will be our tier 1 with the CEO's recommendations together that will make the full 219. You see what I'm saying. By no means at all will any of the resources that are supposed to go toward this item be taken away like this is ironclad is moving forward one way or the other. I want to make sure you understand that Member Williams

>> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: I do and thank you for that. Also just noting that disheartening to hear that the county is thinking we're the back stop for folks to, you know, fund their projects what we're set to do under CFCI guidelines and this feels like we've been in these presentations and I'm talking to the choir right now where that funding unrestricted they are building the plane and it's considered unrestricted or unrestricted there is no set formula and disheartening to see the number get smaller and smaller whether it be 100 million, 88 million and then now 49 million. It just feels pretty soon we're going to be allocating 1.50. That's just not -- I just see it getting smaller and smaller and the needs getting greater and greater.

>> CHAIR STEELE: I've been working on trying to find the silver lining and the bright side of this what I'll add to what you just said, I had to remind myself this is just the unspent funds part that we're allocating this is not the ongoing. So we have won in the idea of the ongoing funding aspect of this and what they don't -- have not even considered yet and I think it's starting to waking up, I heard somebody yesterday realize, oh, yeah Measure J is law so the allocations of this is going to be happening every year. What does that mean I don't think people knows had a what that means. A conversation we have to have about the real

conversation. We're going to deal with the unspent first and get to the ongoing conversations secondarily but the fight is definitely not over my brother. We still got more work to do.

- >> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: I'm here for all of it.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Anyone else? Yes.

>> I just have a question. So what you're saying is that in October we made a recommendation of CEO for the 12.3 million that we found out that from the previous fiscal year-ending June 2024 there was that additional funds that we could spend down one time. That's when the CEO discovered this 12.3 million. We made a recommendation in October. It took the CEO's office eight months to then get it approved by the board. And I'm just thinking like timeline, right. Because one thing I love about CFCI is it's different. I think the thing that's frustrating about where I'm sitting is that, you know, I speak for others, is that we've talked about like this is, this is Measure J, Measure J is law like you just said, right. It's about decisions for where our tax paying dollars go. The communities at the table we have community online, we have a portal open where community can make recommendations for projects. Through advocacy like and the support of supervisor Mitchell's office there was that motion on May 6 and really trying to align things. CFCI is still new, trying to realign, bring transparency, make sure that process follows suit. That in the process is community, community is part of that process. So they make the motion May 6 approve that, wonderful we've kind of realigned back CFCI to where it's intended in the way that Measure J intended it to be.

And the last Tuesday's meeting it's decisions were made, approved, you know, CEO's recommendations to approve funding. The community did not have an opportunity to weigh-in it was approved, okay. You've brought up when I was in commute up around the other motion is going to come up before the supervisors next week of, you know, want to go utilize additional funds for something else that I think we all believe will be needed but it's not about the need, it's about the process and it's about community sitting at the table, that's it. I don't think anybody will disagree on their so many needs within our community and they are very diverse it's just about involving community with their dollars. These are not like they belong to the community.

So I've just have that thank you for allowing me to vent my frustration because I'm really at a point of like how do we fix this? Is it that every time the supervisors are going to meet

there's another recommendation to utilize and tie up more CFCI dollars that the community is not going to have an opportunity to be able to weigh-in on or make recommendations? So I don't know, I'm thinking from a solution based, right.

Also looking at when recommendations are made like the timeline in which a recommendation gets made, brought before CEO and then it actually comes before the board of supervisors for approval because even eight months we're talking more time of money just sitting and not going out to the community.

So I feel like and I know it's still new, CFCI is still new, and things to fix but I want to keep the momentum and keep the, keep my engine going to continue to address what are the gaps so that we can resolve them. Yeah but I wanted clarity on that and thank you for, you know, allowing me to weigh-in

>> CHAIR STEELE: To your question, I want to bring in another voice on this if you don't mind to kind of help. So you thought, brother. Because I want to make sure I'm saying it right. My assumption is that when they found that there was an additional 12.3 in one time funds they brought us forward to that it can actually be taken but it was going to be in the budget cycle process which technically doesn't necessarily like end until like May anyway. Is that correct or am I saying something wrong?

>> Right so this week, was that Monday this week? They did, they approved.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Tuesday.

>> ADAM BETTINO: It was Monday, that was this week, wow. So that, that was done so you're right so part of it had to do with thele budget cycle in taking it up. I think hence the delays it also gave them time to go through this other part of the process of all the things that landed on the board letter I think. But yes, I think that was the delay. Now, there's ways and we can work with CEO on this, to sort of work out of cycle but that would take some work between the committee and CEO to do that. So to your point about the urgency, right, to have us -- you all voted was that October, yeah, that's wild that's a really long time to wait. So I do think that we should pursue figuring out how to do budget adjustments and things like that where appropriate so we can get the money out because that absolutely is the spirit of setting the entire process in motion is to move to push dollars out.

>> CHAIR STEELE: I think we had talked about it then there was the question then of why this couldn't be a part of year three versus -- it was no, no, no, this is not an additional amount of year three funds this is a whole other years worth of -- all right guys and it's just a coincidence it was just a coincidence that it was the rest of that, it's cool. Just replaying this stuff in my mind all the time. I feel you figuring out if we can do budget adjustments and I know again one of those feasible things that can happen because it already is something that different departments already do as far as working with their funded partners and stuff like that. I wonder if the CEO could work with us to make sure at least from the funding allocation standpoint there could be an adjustment in the years work. I think Kieu-Ahn might be on the call if you want to add in public comment we would love to hear your point of view.

So I got you. Heard. I also want to acknowledge the departments, and department representatives in the space too. It's always a precarious space for you all when we're having these conversations. And I know you probably have your points of view and I heard you Reba, I'm going to come back to you.

- >> MEMBER STEVENS: I'm glad you're going in the direction you're going keep going.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: It can be difficult to speak on it so I appreciate the moments when you do. Many of you have, you know, taken the work to actually identify how you would utilize the additional funds. And so like where we are in this process, you know, curious if you have any thoughts on process and procedurally any points of view on the selection criteria. You know I'm interested to get your point of view too I don't want to get a one-sided conversation because we are in this space together and have to figure out how we want to move forward with all these things. Because the urgency you all hear too. I know that people call your offices, folks are trying to figure out how to get access to your programs and, you know, trying to identify how to address needs.

So, you know, if you -- I would love to hear any context you want to a add to the conversation.

>> I can add something. Well, I appreciate the conversation and actually agree with the comments I've heard so far and how we look at the 50 million or more if we're looking at the full amount, you know, pending actions at the CEO and board around looking at the environment that we exist in today. Now, we've had a really tough year in LA County, really tough budget constraints, different federal environment there's a lot of things that are

impacting our communities and we need to be cognizant of real time need and I appreciate your perspective also in this moment of trying to identify turnkey opportunities for pushing money out the door faster based on just the situations that we're in both budget wise and community need wise.

I'll just say from a department that has received some CFCI, we have leveraged the opportunity to do pretty deep community engagement and sort of ideate and cocreate programming that did take a little bit longer to mobilize and push out the door because of that cocreation process. But as we're thinking about these additional pots of money, I think it's smart to think about what's working now and does it meet the need for housing, you know, access points and immediate economic security and future planning to mobility and things like that. I also recognize this is a tough moment. I think CFCI is new and trying to do something in a different way. I would be lying if I said it wasn't a little confusing to me sometimes, how we're doing this in real time. But I'm along for the journey and I appreciate that it's different. And that we're all at the table together

- >> CHAIR STEELE: Are those new glasses?
 - >> I'm trying out glasses these days.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I like the look.

[CAPTIONER CHANGE 5:00 PM]

>> ADAM BETTINO: I think it bears mentioning again, and this is something that Dr. Tsai raises often and we talked a lot about County comment, I mean, even at JCOD we do very little direct service. Most of what we do is through our contracted providers. I spent most of the day with our contracted providers today celebrating all of the work that we do and there's, you know, over a hundred people in the room and those are folks providing almost every service in our portfolio.

You know, I think these are very interesting times, to say the least. And I think given the budget outlook, there's some ways that we can be really targeted and specific here.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: Mmm hmm.
- >> ADAM BETTINO: And this goes to Member Stevens' point. Like, really figuring out the highest level need. One thing that I would recommend -- and I may be misspeaking and I'm trying to understand history here in a little bit. We've had program areas defined for the

third party administrator, less well defined for County. It was more that they were funding particular programs. Some of them read programs and some of them actual programs. You had jail closure that fits and then specific JCOD programs.

I wonder if there's a way to better align both County and community into these programs so some County departments may fit in there along with some of the grantees may fit in there as well. We have an opportunity to reimagine some of that a little bit. There's a way to consolidate and clarify some of the program areas in the process that I think would be really helpful. Yeah. That's just a recommendation.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: Let me ask the question now. To your question, Member Lobianco, about the pro-creation process and to the point that you're raising, Adam --
- >> ADAM BETTINO: All good. Adam is my name.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Member Battino, which would go where in this perspective? Is it better for the department to have something better adjusted to a program area or something that is actually direct and very specific do you know what I mean?
- >> ADAM BETTINO: Mmm hmm.
- >> I was only here for part of program Year one, two. Some were program specific versus concept. I do feel like year two and year three were more concept specific and then there was the negotiation in conversation to get to consensus about like what went to a third party administrator or a County department and who were the subject matter experts that weighed in on what the final delivery channel was and then everyone either one through the process of applying through the amity or RFP pitching their proposals based on the concept or the department's designing programs getting the concept and approval through JCOD. I think year two got us closer to saying these are the kinds of areas that we want it prioritize spending.

And I do think there was a variety in the mix, at least from my perspective, and departments and community programs that were just a concept. Like, we had some of those too. Like, some of our worker ownership programs we spent a year engaging in advisory group round table outside what the solution should be to design the program that we're now just rolling out. Some of them we with already had like a very solid community endorsed evidence-based program in a vehicle that we were able to push faster. I think

there's a mix. I don't think there's a judgment either way. I do think there's an urgency now identifying the highest and best use and getting money out the door.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Thank you. I guess I'll change my question into: For County departments, which one is easier to quickly execute? Is it more of a concept that gives you the freedom to kind of put out an RFP toward your -- of course, using the guidelines from the concept itself to put out an RP for that.

Or if it's already very specific, straight up put out an RFP for something specific?

- >> I thought it was easier for us to put in sessions from the outreach and land on areas for funding and people through various methods identify programs that achieved the spirit of those concepts. I thought that was easier to have a conversation about than trying to evaluate individual programs on the spot.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Mmm hmm.
- >> But that's just me.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I got you. Anyone else want to answer that?
- >> ADAM BETTINO: Just that I agree. And I think, and we have talked about this before, to that end, what really needs to be considered that likely wasn't when we started. So you had, you had ARPA money coming in, there was other relief money coming in. I think departments were deciding what money to spend first. We're in a different space. And you have mentioned this, Chair Steele, and others have as well about focusing primarily on programs that are in existence where there may be a lack of funding for sustaining that program rather than hey, let's get someone time money. We got to ramp up through some RFP process or some other competitive long process and, right? As we review concepts and recommendations here, there's a way that I think we can propose things that are a little bit further along, given a sense of urgency and a need to move as quickly as possible so that we don't get ourselves in the same situation. So we don't want to award a bunch of one-time dollars and have a bunch of can you know, time dollars after the fact because they were unspent.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I understand that. Member Stevens and then Member Soto?
- >> REBA STEVENS: As the conversation was going, I started thinking about the process, the initial process and some of the comments about funding County departments. And a lot of

push back. I remember that. I for you to for ODR and a host of other things. This is just my opinion but what's missing is cohesion. The County departments and I really appreciate you talking about the struggles in the very beginning but also the community input sessions were really important.

And I always had believed that the County departments would receive these dollars to fill gaps and to address the underserved communities. And that it was an opportunity to do something, to do more in our underserved communities. So I'm not sure that that is what has happened but I think that it's really important as we move forward to have quarterly updates from the County, to know in advance if there are challenges or struggles with spending down those dollars so that we can establish that, you know, a better relationship, better understanding so that we can have conversation about it instead of being surprised.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Mmm hmm.

>> REBA STEVENS: So I go back to the word "cohesion," but I do want to compliment the Department of Public Health. I read around article where there was a sharp decline in overdose and to me there has to be something being done correctly and I would like to encourage and applaud and say hey, do more of that. It's really about understanding and really seeing the successes.

I don't really have a dog in the race. I can bark and I can bite and I've barked and bit.

>> CHAIR STEELE: [Laughs]

>> REBA STEVENS: [Laughs] but I really think it's really important that we begin there. If we don't have a connection with each other and to be able to support one another. My purpose, my primary purpose is around our under-served communities. And I want you to be successful. I want every County department to be successful. Because when you're successful us and our communities are successful. Do you know what I'm saying?

>> CHAIR STEELE: Yeah.

>> REBA STEVENS: So that's all I have.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Thank you. I want to come to Member Soto.

>> ROSA SOTO: So, you know, we've been, I think in the universe of solutions, which I'm excited about.

I was listening to the Board of Supervisors meeting and wanted to dig a little bit deeper into the supervisor [name]'s request funding that she understands is unspent dollars in DHS that was for the Permanent Supportive Housing, vouchers being given in skid row which is the recently released, formerly incarcerated individuals.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: Mmm hmm.
- >> ROSA SOTO: As we dug into that deeper, the responses, that is a bureaucratic process delaying funding. It goes back to your question, when we make a recommendation, when does it actually become available and I think we need to understand it better. I think it was JCOD in the middle and the time JCOD has and I don't want to go into detail because I don't know where the information is coming from exactly but I believe it's important for us to align. When we look at the bucket of unspent dollars as unspent dollars alone, that's a huge problem for all of us around the table. We don't want money to stay on the table, especially because of the high priority of the populations we're trying to represent.

That being said there is a bureaucratic challenge of how long it takes for money to become available. Does it take nine months for money to get out the door? Then are we impeding programs from moving forward that are turnkey or stuck in the process that's almost ready and we're starting a whole new process making new recommendations thinking they just didn't do a good job.

I really want to understand that. Here we are going forward into an idea that there's unspent dollars and we need to reassign them. At least what I heard in the meeting that really concerned me were the Permanent Supportive Housing money which was about \$15.5 million. Folks that came to present to us, the Public Defender's Office and some of the positions there.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: Mmm hmm.
- >> ROSA SOTO: Right, because again, if you look at those as individual programs, those are the programs that align to our priorities.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Right. I don't disagree with that.
- >> ROSA SOTO: The challenge is, why are there unspent drawers on the table? And I want to better understand that and so we can better align with our partners and see how we can

vehicle internally for the challenges and we can't create a vicious cycle and pointing fingers at each other and not solving the problems.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: I agree.
- >> ROSA SOTO: Some of the work I've been doing on the ground, these are some of the opportunities with work with our partners, understanding the bureaucratic layers they have to go tom get this dollar out and understanding that helps us to be a little bit better in our recommendation and in development of any recommendations we make and in pushing for stronger process that aligns better with our communities and that we don't leave people out.

The third thing is the urgent and emerging programs and that is right now we have urgent need in communities for food access that had not been there a month ago.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: Mmm hmm. Voters. Chop r.
- >> ROSA SOTO: And it is the possibilities to provide a resource. The dollars were small and I'm not sure exactly what we're going to do. This is the time, if we're going to have a short based process is to uplift the needs that we need to address.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I'm with you. I guess, as an acknowledgment to the Board office -- I'm sorry, not Board office. Department representative here, like, the presentations that we were getting helped us -- that's the other thing.

Like, no one would know the answer to that question. All of these conversations that have been having, the CO's offices and if we were not having the conversation in this space and providing the context behind all of it, I feel like a lot of people wouldn't know what the heck was going on. The questions that come up here and the answers we get in this space, no one would have a clue as to what's happening. What we learned that process was yes, the bureaucracy was a problem. Trying to figure out as was just explained. Concepts trying to come up with new ideas and making sure it's inclusive and some of the priorities that Measure J/CFCI requires in terms of an equity standpoint and there's ways you have to go about doing that and a lot of the departments didn't have that process and they had to develop that at the same time as the other processes.

We found out also that limited partnership other funding priorities to utilize funds. There was also a perception out there, some not all but some departments, this money will be here. We will get to it when we get to it. No.

This whole process we have created this about and the stink that we have, we have made has created a whole new thing that developed a whole motion that dictates how this will go into the future. What we're doing this this space, sometimes it feels really small and sometimes it feels really big but it is revolutionary on how the County does business.

- >> Member Hong has his hand up.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Just a moment. I got you.
- >> You had asked the department's Chair about concept or program. I agree with Member Lobianco and Bettino starting with the concepts from our department makes sense. Appreciate the acknowledgment, Member Stevens, about the overdose numbers going down. I do want to address something that Member Soto mentioned.

Context is incredibly important. One thing to highlight For Departments, there's also context to different departments receive different NCC. Sap C doesn't receive NCC. It gives us a sense of how reliant on certain funding streams departments are.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: Mmm hmm.
- >> And with respect to context on why there were clays. While SAPC spend the majority of our funding there were one or two other DPH programs that got caught up in this process. And I think it all started from the very beginning. And what I mean by that is we've talked about many meetings how long and protracted the contracting process is. And so that first year, once you get, you know, if you can't do it for nine months or you can't get programs launched, obviously, you're going to have under spend that first year. And I think the way we have talked about this is three-year spending cycles for CFCI. There's a mindset that great, we're able to roll this over.

All of these services I'm talking about are contracted out to credit. BOs. From the CBO perspective, they didn't spend all of their funds in Year one. They are trying to spend more funds in year two to catch up and spending the funds requires workforce investments. It doesn't make sense to hire a bunch of Staff and when you have spent funds you have to

constrict the Staff. Now we're in a situation where it's going to be more of a year-by-year consideration. I think all of this is understandable because this is new.

This is all new and this is not a criticism but the change cents in the process,-- like I mentioned previously, we contract all of our services. All of the challenges that we have with the TPA are felt by the CBOs and a little bit of context for DPH's programs.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Member Crunk? Let me go with Member Hong.

We've been trying to figure out how to ramp up her staffing and maintain a staffing and think about the COLA on that as well because they need increases and stuff like that and our grants do not allow for that and now we're talking about year to year. To your point, now we're changing the process, right? Do they get to renegotiate the year? Do you know what I'm saying? There's a whole bunch of things that kind of come along with changing the process mid-way so I definitely feel you on that.

Member Crunk?

>> WESLEY CRUNK: I'm trying not to get confused. I hope I don't shoot the community in the foot because I'm not trying to do that. Sometimes like when you're a child you're a child for a reason. The parents are supposed to make decisions and don't know need. You need not what you think you need and there's somebody there to guide you until you can make decisions on your own. When I first got in this space -- this is when it's going to get ugly.

When I first got in this space I remember hearing and there were argues around, there was a process to even qualify to get it and the something to do with knowing how to set up. Do you remember that? It was like talking about knowing how to set up, something that had to do with what you had to do to get a grant.

And I understand there were arguments will obstacles being put in place to get money and then so now you want the money quicker. You get the money quicker and then you don't know to you to use it and that's what the obstacle was for so that you know how to use it. I could be completely wrong but it's what I remember hearing. I am one of those people who feel that you can't give a fool a million dollars -- excuse my words -- and expect it to turn into ten. It's quicker going to turn into zero. I believe education on finances are important so that they are not put into a position to fail if that makes sense.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Member Hong and then we'll come back to you Member LoBianco.

>> CLEMENS HONG: I'm sorry I'm not able to be there in person. I had an issue pop up. I want to tell a story but first I want to express my support for the recent motion that centers the committee and community role and with regards to the comments on how to think about spend.

I want to echo previous comment that's recenter high priority areas. This is going to be really critical. This is a very different County time as Adam put forward earlier, in terms of the budget and funding that is available and we're really with cuts across the Board and it's raising challenges. I think Reba Stevens put it well, we desperately need the beds.

I think when we go back to -- this is before I started with my role here. When judge Espinosa was on this committee Year one there was money allocated to ODEA housing and we had hit a ceiling in our program. ODEA housing for those in the community not as familiar is a program where we take in those with serious mental illness incarcerated and wrap around courts and move them into the community and over 75% of moving people from the system and keeping them there at least for a year. It was a program successful that over the course of the ten years, this was the tenth year anniversary in existence we've diverted over 13,000 people in the community and we have reached 5,000 housed within our programs and our budgets.

This program was funded in Year one. I think it was around \$43 million by this committee is my understanding. That money was not provided to ODR housing. In the context of that, a shift, ODR had our ceiling and we put sort of requests forward but we had to go through the process of shutting down some of our processes so we shut down courts that were hearing ODR, adversarial hearings to move people out. We shut down partnerships it Interim Housing providers to expand housing and we went into a more dormant stage of our work. We were subsequently funded through AB109 and 'CF' CA dollars and in the course of the subsequent years we have done a lot to ramp up and get the ball rolling. It's taken that long because it's hard to shut down the infrastructure and ramp back up. During the course of the two years we lost the opportunity to expand. And some of the PSH under spend was due to that sort of set of scenarios to expanding beds.

Now where we are is this year we're going to hit our ceiling. We're going to hit the ceiling again that we started with four years ago because we have now ramped up to the standpoint where we can now fill these beds and 5,000 people in the beds at any given time in this diversion process but there are no other County funding sources available. And to

be honest CFCI one time funding and certainly not 50 million is sufficient to solve the issue but this is some of the struggle. I think the story reflects some of the struggle that it is to work within these constructs and really push. I think what we all would agree is a really important, right, sort of opportunity to move some of our most vulnerable folks into a program that we believe has long-term success.

When you look at this program we have really big issues in terms of how we continue to expand now that we're at this place where we have courts in line and we have Interim Housing ready to go and now we're in a crunch again similar to where we were four, five years ago when we hit our ceiling. The County, we were ready to go. We had stuff and it doesn't always work out and no one's specific fault. It's scenarios and context that often leads to these things but some of the story behind what happened in terms of understanding. We're doing everything we can to drive change.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Received. I appreciate the sharing on that. Again, in characterizing the learning of things we have learned into this space, we have been able to listen to the history of how we got here and it helps to set the framing that is necessary with what we do with the resources as we move forward which, again, in my opinion, underscores the need to utilize this space to be able to come up with the recommendations that are the most appropriate, right?

We're not using half information. We're looking at the full picture. And also it gives us a chance to think about how we can create et cohesion necessary to make the markets we need to make. You know? Member Lobianco and then I'm going to come to wrap up this piece so we can move onto the next part.

>> KELLY LOBIANCO: Sure. I'll be quick. I think one of the things and I appreciate the conversation and I appreciate the story told as well. We all know there's nuance around encumbering money and spending money between a County and third party where it's encumbered differently. There's discussion and then there's digging in for us to really understand.

That said, I think from a department standpoint, as I'm looking back on our three years of CFCI so far -- and I think I said this a year ago at a meeting. I do think it's important for the departments as we're putting forth where we're spending the funds knowing that it goes to the organizations. Like JCOD and we don't deliver directly and many who have gotten grants through the TPA.

A lot of times we're talking about programs and services and talking about how fast we can deploy that to community and sometimes County can do that as fast as the third party administrator. We can. But there are sometimes other reasons why it might be a benefit from the County to support some of those funds to Member Tsai's conversation. Whether it's regional impact or filling a gap or offering a flexible funding stream when you have a rigid one that doesn't allow to optimize a program or evaluate impact to operationalize federal finishes. There is a lot of reasons where I think the departments could be clear about bringing the opportunity to leverage this fund as opposed to being a pot of funds to leverage and that's incumbent upon us to bring.

You just heard a story and we haven't had the opportunity For Departments is to come in and share as much detail and I know that's coming in with the program evaluation. I'm thinking about our department. Dollars from this community went to small businesses whose brick and more tar burned down in the Eaton fire. Using funds and dollars to rebuild. I think it's important to uplift the community in the process and what we're able to do with it. I city sometimes we get stuck into the administrative conversation and tight budget times.

There's a lot of value here and I think we all see it and I think this is incumbent upon me and our fellow departments to be able to lift those stories in a clear way and help to communicate the message that the impact is real. The value of not just having the community here at the table but the community and the departments because some of the context we can't see.

I don't know if I work at the County so I don't know if this is true or not but for those who do you know the inner workings of things that might work better or not. And counting on each other to add that context so that we can make the most appropriate decision -- truly phenomenal and unique to where we are here.

So I'm excited to continue to do that work together, particularly in this process, to refine it even further because of this process and do even better as we move into the foreseeable future. So I really appreciate that.

I do want to ask a few questions. This may be to JCOD. One, do we know how many concept recommendations have we received so far. Do we know? We don't have that number yet?

- >> When I checked this afternoon we received 19.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Nineteen. Okay. And do we know how many of the County department -- submitted already? Have you delineated them? Okay. All right. Cool.

Just if it's okay. Any of the departments who are on the table who have put -- for the presentations they have done already? Not yet? Okay. Cool. Perfect. No problem. Member Knight?

>> WENDY KNIGHT: What you raised about context being really important behind the committee evaluating all of the proposals that are going to be coming forward. I know one of the challenges we have discussed in the past is creating a balance between community and department and having that context at the table and in the meetings where we're reviewing all of the concepts and trying to get your vision on how we will improve in that area and context from a community perspective because I think that's critical moving forward.

>> CHAIR STEELE: For sure. It's going to be tough. I'm not going to lie, because of the time constraint of this. But to your question, though, I think, you know, the intentionality in this conversation we're having today I think will set the table for those discussions, I would hope, right?

I'm taking the learnings out of this discussion to deliberate and I'll probably be working with the leadership on our Monday call to prepare for bringing context to the conversation on the tenth. That will give us like a criteria that, you know, that at least a foundation that we can think through. I mean, that gives us a chance to think through what additional added value we need to add. You know, because I'm learning about, I'm hearing cohesion. I'm hearing concepts versus full on programs. I'm hearing, you know, the roll out timelines and taking the challenges in mind and all of this.

Also the needs that are directing. I'm hearing all of these different pieces so that we can create a framework that has it built in and that we can use our lived experiences from whatever role we have to add more value to that. Hopefully it works. I got you on that. Thank you very much for that. Member Eakins. Does that answer your question or thought?

>> That was very helpful.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Member Eakins?

>> When I used to work in the clinic, we would say daily discoveries and I feel like it's monthly discoveries. Sometimes I feel like there's opportunities to double Dutch jump in and sometimes I'm like I'm not sure and it's like playing this game. But what I'm not hearing is the opportunity to meet outside the two and a half hours to detail what it is we want to see as commission.

>> AULERIA EAKINS: I call it timely and consistent procedural guidance. We don't have procedures, seemingly. The timeliness of it is, again, last-minute. And I feel like we need more timely communication on a regular basis so we know exactly where we are and what we need to be doing. It's really hard to think fast in the two months of what we need to be doing. What does the spend down look like?

In my organization we use the past as a prediction for the future. Can't really do that. We look through COVID and we didn't do that. We didn't budget if we didn't use it the year before. What is the spend down for this committee that the Committee is responsible for? Giving \$100,000 while I was driving and 40 million left over - are we supposed to spend down to zero or half of that and what does it look like for us to be truly effective in our role as recommenders as far as how much are spent? Do we leave a little bit there and it rolls over?

The last thing. Opportunities for the commission to connect outside so that we have clear succinct recommendations on how we move forward so that we don't get caught in this again.

I get this is an odd occurrence, maybe, in this time. But as we move forward with the next fiscal year, how do we circumvent these type of things to get on the with the business of JCOD and not stuck in the bureau okay really see that we're feeling like we're stuck in right now. Those are my comments for today.

>> CHAIR STEELE: For the procedural place, I'll give it over to Adam. But I think this is the season we can as ... as [name] would say respect my authority, we got to the energy of oh, they are serious over thereof what they are trying to do. I think the motion on May 6th puts a stamp on that. You need to holler at them before you holler at us.

That being a process in the future, I think that's the first motion since the Board motion that really set CFCI off in the first place. That was the first one to set some guided direction on how timing and everything should actually take place.

And I think there's more of that to do. I don't think May 6th is the end all-be all, but it's a bin beginning about the larger process here. Because we're setting precedent that's how we get trapped into last-minute things because we're asking for data that doesn't exist and they have to create the data structures we're asking for and when we finally get the information we're like what the in the world? We have to create processes. There's paradigms. I think we'll cross the paradigm at some point -- not paradigm. There's a word I want to use -- we'll cross that barrier at some point where we won't have to keep creating things. We'll actually be able to just utilize the systems.

Even in this process where we're utilizing year three's conception recommendation process and selection criteria, we've done this part already. It's a hastened ace because we have more time in the year three process but we're able to lean on some of the processes from prior years to be able to make things happen. So I hope that answers that part of the question.

>> ADAM BETTINO: Yeah, I think to your point, Chair Steele, the motion does a lot of this for us. At least kind of establishes different authorities of who is supposed to be doing what.

Something Member Stevens mentioned earlier is really true. So, like, in the motion, for example, there's a, at least Quarterly Report to you all and to the Board of Supervisors about the spending that's both for the third party administrator and for the County department. There is more of a, there will be more of a record in discussion about how things are going related to spend down and all of that. So you'll be able to see that in better time.

I also think this is a hasty process but one that we should likely follow and spread outline over the course of a year. Once we get to supplemental budget after September 1, our process should mirror what we're doing here. We just get a longer timeline to do it. This is trying to address your question about the spend down.

So there aren't instructions to get it to zero, necessarily. There's ongoing CFCI funding that goes to departments that also goes to the third party administrator. It is very likely that at the end of the year some of that money will be unspent. It goes back into this pot that we

now are making decisions about the one-time pot. The unspent pot. So every year there will be an opportunity to allocate something, somewhere. That's why the process needs to be put in place, right? Over the course of several months proposals will come in. Our team will pull it together, synthesize, bring it up here. You'll go through a deliberative process.

AB109 process we go through the similar process.

The Board has the only authority on the spending. They haven't delegated that authority away. There are processes in the County that are really effective and it gives everybody time to weigh in and respond. This is rushed. It just is because of the way that some of this came together.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Mmm hmm.

>> ADAM BETTINO: So I feel much better about next year. This year is about getting it all together.

The other thing I will say. Generally, our team is bigger, thank God. There's things that I think are going to be helpful in putting together by way of process. A lot of these things have been discussed, like a lot. I don't know how much is codified at this point. Sometimes things are not voted on and sometimes it's hard to get a record of all of the commission things that have happened in this committee over time and we need to be better about that so that the process is the process is the process. New Members come on the committee and department folks leave and go somewhere else. There's a record of what we're doing and why we're doing it and that needs to follow so that we don't find ourselves in the same situation of.

One thing I want to address is there's bureaucracy comment which is fair.

The funding goes to your department and you are awarded funding and funding goes to your department and our team will reach out and asking for a program design form and we will need in hand and somebody pushes a button and the money flows. That's not how it really works. We're going to turn those around to one to three business days and I know before it took months.

>> [Off mic]

>> ADAM BETTINO: As long as there's not a lot of back and forth and what we're being provided is clear, we can turn those things around really quickly. I think the process that we

had in place was very few people trying to do something new, trying to learn how to do it. And so that was definitely part of the delay in getting some of the fund spent, certainly in Year one. I just want to address that. And we have a plan to ensure that doesn't happen moving forward.

>> CHAIR STEELE: It's a shout out to Judge for and the conversations we have had in space of funding if the money is held over into JCOD, it was Miles and Steven and a couple people and now we have Adam and ... please.

I do want to wrap this part up. We have to come back to the meeting minutes. Go ahead. I want you, please, please, please. Member Contreras.

- >> JACKIE CONTRERAS: You can't miss a meeting because things move quickly. I apologize. Some of my questions are just on make sure that I'm clear. I do want to say that we're contemplating whether or not we want to put in anything and make a request.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Mmm hmm.
- >> JACKIE CONTRERAS: We serve this population that CFCI serves right? We are supposed to serve them as are my fellow County departments. This is a brilliant effort to make sure that people get served in the way that we want to see them served incendiary gauging in community and community is leading on it. That doesn't mean we're not supposed to be doing all the other things. I have to be real clear on why I put in an ask for dollars when there is work that I know I need to do and I need to improve because I think that is always a factor.

My question was so on the fact sheet from JCOD it says specifically 25/26. So at no time go to supplemental in September. So three months is already gone. And it has to be spent. I know the CEO when they did their allocation they spread it out over five years. Are we saying that we're only taking proposals that will saying 25/26 and can't go beyond?

- >> CHAIR STEELE: It was in the presentation today 36 month thing and where did this come from?
- >> ADAM BETTINO: One, it's stated in the motion. 36 months to spend. We just saw approval for five-year plans even though it's one-time dollars. I do think it's a deeper conversation that we should have because frankly it's not worthwhile. To Member Contreras's point if it is a year you have to start and stop, the ramp-up time alone, even if

the contract is in place, there are certainly things administratively that our departments have to do to receive the funds. Budget adjustments and documents and our CEO and the amount of time it takes to get it started are we serious about doing a six, eight month program that we would have to potentially ramp down because there's no guarantee for the following year.

>> CHAIR STEELE: It's still one-time funds and no reup. I think 36 months is too long, right?

Because I'm also thinking about, like, evaluation, the tracking. If we also are taking a look at unspent fund dollars every year. Do you see what I'm saying? But if there's unspent funds from the unspent funds, how do we get out of this cycle, do you know what I mean? Do you know what I mean? So there has to be a hard line somewhere to be like Yo. I get your point. 12 months might be too short if you need, especially if you need to do an RFP process. That's going to take three months or more just to, once you get to October 1st, you're going to have to do that and it's going to take some time.

- >> JACKIE CONTRERAS: I don't know that it would be considered unspent if the plan is to spend over a certain period of time so that locks the dollars in for that time. Anything could change, clearly, in this environment.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: You made a point that 36 months is locked into the motion.
- >> ADAM BETTINO: So I think there's a way that you can still view this proposal by proposal. There's a way that you can have the conversations with folks that are submitting if there's follow up questions and ask some of the detail about hey, you put five years on here. Why? I'm curious why you think you need five years of funding for this thing or that thing.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I think you're right. UVI program you can say 12 months but to your point if it is something that needs to be ramped up and ramped down there might be need for additional time. Again, 36 months is locked into the motion so we're kind of tied into the 36 months. I'm not about to argue it and we're not about to vote on anything. I get it. I understand it.

But I should say that I'm encouraging everybody, spend this money. Don't sit on it.

>> JACKIE CONTRERAS: I may have missed it and I thought in the fact sheet said if the fiscal year.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: If it is in the motion it needs to be in the FAQ sheet too.
- >> JACKIE CONTRERAS: Okay. All right.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: But I'm still encouraging people, if you happen to get these resources, spend the money, please. Thank you very much. Take care of the people. Cool.

I'm going to move more quickly. Can we talk briefly about the Program Evaluation Plan? Wait, before we do that,--

- >> We need to address the minutes.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I know. I got you. We started the meeting how many minutes late?
- >> We started the meeting at 4:11.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Can I get 11 minutes? Can I get 11 minutes, can I have 6, if that's okay since we have quorum to do the thing for the minutes? Yeah we got to do the thing for the minutes so before I go onto item nine I want to go back to the minutes so that we can get those approved and then we can moved on. Whatever time we have left we might have to take to the next thing.

Going back to item seven. Can I get a motion to approve the minutes?

- >> REBA STEVENS: I motion to approve the June 12th meeting minutes.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: It's been moved and seconded. Any unreadiness on this? Let me take Public Comment. It's like page three.
- >> CFCI. This commences the Public Comment period inform 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 raised hand future now. We will call you on in the order your hand was raised. 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 nine to raise your hand. We will say your name, the last digits of your phone number when it's your turn. Dial star six to unmute yourself. When accessing Zoom through a computer browse error smartphone Zoom app sole to reactions at the bottom tab and you'll see the raised-hand feature. We will now begin Public Comments for the approval of meeting minutes for June 12th, 2025 Special Meeting. Do we have any Public Comments in the room?

Seeing no hands in the room, we would like to go online.

- >> CFCI: There are no hands raised online.
- >> CFCI: Seeing no more hands raised this concludes the Public Comment period. As a reminder in advance of our next meeting if you would like to submit a written Public Comment send an email to JCOD LA County.gov by 5:00 p.m. the day before the meeting. Passing back to you Member Steele.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Please conduct the vote.
- >> We will conduct the vote for June 2025 meeting minutes. We ask all committee Members for ready before your name is called. When I call your name please indicate yes no or abstain. Member Marianas.
- >> Aye.
- >> Member Castillo or alternate. Member Contreras.
- >> JACKIE CONTRERAS: Abstain.
- >> Member Crunk.
- >> WESLEY CRUNK: Aye.
- >> Member Cyrus-Franklin.
- >> VICTOR CYRUS-FRANKLIN: Abstain.
- >> Member Eakins.
- >> AULERIA EAKINS: Abstain.
- >> Member Tsai.
- >> VICTOR CYRUS-FRANKLIN: Aye.
- >> Member Fuentes Doctor Miranda.
- >> MICHELLE FUENTES-MIRANDA: Aye.
- >> Member Garcia or alternate. Member Hong.
- >> CLEMENS HONG: Aye.

- >> Member LoBianco.
- >> KELLY LOBIANCO: Abstain.
- >> Member Knight.
- >> WENDY KNIGHT: Aye.
- >> Member Scorza. Member Soto.
- >> ROSA SOTO: Aye.
- >> Member Steele.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Aye.
- >> Member Stevens.
- >> REBA STEVENS: Aye.
- >> Member Joey Williams or alternate. Member Myk'l Williams. Member Wong or alternate.
- >> LISA WONG: Aye.
- >> The motion passes.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Thank you. I'm going to start saying my Aye's. Member, I'm sorry, Board Member Polly Mitchell, she has a certain way she does spending the funds. Aye. I'm like Yo.

Thank you very much for the additional time. I did want to make sure that we went over the evaluation piece. As you can see, in our packet there is a summary of the Care First Community Investment Program Evaluation Plan. Am I turning this over to y'all for this? Adam? This is a JCOD thing or no? I just read through this?

- >> ADAM BETTINO: It can be.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Can we, if you don't mind?
- >> ADAM BETTINO: Sure. What's before you is evaluation overview. The evaluator contract has been execute and they are on Board and we are working with them and we had a

meeting with AMITY already our third party administrator to talk through some of the data gathering and some of the data elements.

I know we're up against it and I want to make sure you have time for questions. I want to focus on the research questions, the bottom Section. The evaluation really is the research questions. That's what we're trying to evaluate.

So if you look through these. I'll read quickly because I think we had tile. All questions must be grounded in the North Star Goals and the overall mission of CFCI and will be refines as stakeholders are engaged. What were the outcomes of year one direct community investment in CBOs? For example how did CFCI Care Grants improve and increase partnerships between grass root CBOs and the County? How many CFCI grantees attained County contracts. What factors distributed to who they did or did not get contracted? How many grantees felt confident to apply for the County contracts for the first time? What were the other results of direct engagement between CBOs and the County through CFCI. How did the CFCI Care Grant program contribute to increased capacity among CBO. This question is crucial. How have the different program areas aligned with overall stated goals? What recommendations are there for improving this alignment among and between the overall CFCI program, program areas, and North Star Goals. It gets to the ability to clarify and condense and eliminate and time is shifting and has shifted since this first launched and it really is looking at these things and being looking at do we need to shift or circle and go harder. Trying to make decisions based on what we come back with.

How can the grant making process be improve proved to amine with CFCI goals in the spirits of Measure J. How have CFCI Care Grants impacted program participate engagement, satisfaction, and accessibility of services.

As we thought about n I want to be clear. It was a process to get no these questions and as we start to do interviews there will more likely be things to be born out of these interviews and what does it mean that we made this historic investment? What does capacity building actually look like?

Was there a thing in a neighborhood that wasn't there before or did that thing exist and now there's funding behind it and instead of serving ten we're now serving 500? Those are the types of things that we know are happening. There's going to be equal taillight I have

information that come as long side of this through the interviews with grantees and interviews with some of you all and interviews with other CBOs.

I think we'll get a pretty great picture of what we've been able to accomplish and from there it's about refinement. We didn't want to boil the ocean here, right? This is something, and I know my colleague John frankly Sierra is on Board and he's Chief of Staff and he has a research background and manages our research and development team. He and his team came to us and said if you try to boil the ocean you'll end up with something meaningless, it's too much. When you say evaluate CFCI, what does that mean? We took recommendations from you all that you proposed early on.

Looked at North Star Goals and worked as a team to chisel at this larger picture and get down to what we feel is a pretty good starting point for these research questions. I hope that helps. Obviously, we're available to answer any questions that you may have.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: Any questions on this? Go, please.
- >> So then weary evaluating the investment the County made in CBOs, not evaluating the impact of CFCI dollars in community?
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Impact is the last question. How do CFCI Care Grants affect program participate engagement and satisfaction in services.
- >> Participant engagement.
- >> ADAM BETTINO: I hope I understand your question. It's an impact question.
- >> Yes.
- >> ADAM BETTINO: It's direct community investment for underserved areas throughout the County. I think these questions try to get to that. Decarceration.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Alternatives to Decarceration.
- >> ADAM BETTINO: Did you. This is going to be harder with a limited amount of data. I think we can start to get to it. It's going to take us a long time to really start to hammer down because -- even your programs, right, and we're partners. How do we know that that was the thing that kept somebody out? Right? It's a really challenging question to answer, regardless. And so whether we take on something this large, it's certainly something that we can starlight to get at. And I haven't addressed the County piece that I want to get to. I

understand your question and I'm hoping to get there through the process and this is what we're starting with.

- >> This is good that this is a starting point knowing this goes still a goal.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Thank you. The thing I want to add on top is in three years. Three years is not a long enough arc to be able to effectively say what has or has not been impacted because of CFCI. When we first started creating the North Star Goals it was like when we first do this report, it will be the start of a longer story that we're talking about as far as the impact of the work that we have done.

And this is only on Year one Programs, right? Because then we have to evaluate the year two, year three. And by the time you get to the end of year three we're now at six years so now we can tell overarching for CFCI in total, here is what the impact has been over the last six years. Do you know what I mean?

So like we get to being able to have a cadence of how we're reporting out about our impact and about the work, how it's changing the landscape, changing the environment, you know, so it's not going to be a snapshot. It's a beginning of a longer process of evaluating a story telling about the impact of CFCI. Please.

- >> [Off mic]
- >> CHAIR STEELE: For sure.
- >> I want to emphasize -- Member Fuentes-Miranda's point. I do think we need to figure out some measures that are really going to tell us that people's lives are better. If we don't do that from the get go, that's ultimately the North Star, as I understand it. And I have seen far too many program that's can look good and have the metrics and it presents well but ultimately the people receiving the services don't experience it positively. [Soto]
- >> REBA STEVENS: And that's who you need to hear from.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Go ahead, Member Crunk.
- >> WESLEY CRUNK: Was that one of the questions to ask the person running the program, how long would this layout take to show results? Is that something that's even asked in because some things may take --

>> CHAIR STEELE: That's a great question. I want to take everybody back to when we were first discussing the North Star goals and we had a data and evaluation team coming back to us, the decision was made then that three years' time was not enough time to talk about impact.

There's a one part of saying the market was incredible but in three years what if the impact has not really rolled out yet? So it's a lackluster story we're able to tell because we're not in a period of time to give you the fullness of the picture. So we wanted to be able to provide more time but we still want to actually talk about, like, even in the beginning of the conversation -- not to say that this won't have any data but that's where the dashboards come into place. That's where so people can actively see what that can look like in real time and evaluation is actually evaluating the fullness of the program it was. That was kind of where we left off. Do you know what I mean? With that conversation. Go ahead.

>> ADAM BETTINO: It's a critical point. It's also determining what data we actually have available to tell that story. And so through the TPA I think we're better positioned. You'll see there's a huge focus on the TPA throughout this. And that was part of, again, trying to be iteral five. For Year one I don't know how many County programs there are because I can't remember. All three years is 67 programs total. For us to do an impact evaluation of 67 County programs would take us I don't know how many millions of dollars and how many years and there's a data gathering issue amongst County partners and maybe they have the data and they don't have the types of things that we would want to look at in the way we want to look at them.

Sending each County department a list of questions. Many of them come from the program presentations that we have already been through. And start to ask County departments like you need to start sending us this data on a regular basis and that goes into dashboards and we start to look at what we're gathering to see how we can better tell that story. The other thing that's going to come from here are recommendations from the evaluator about how to better get to the drill down of the County departments and the drill down to the third party administrator.

So I think this is a start, as we get better at our data gathering and analysis we're going to be able to shape this thing together, quite honestly.

And I would like now that we have an evaluator on Board, I would like them to come and present to you all and answer some questions.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: I will also say to this -- I'm having a visceral, like, memory, of looking at all the data sets that are being collected and how they are not congruent across the Board. There is baseline information but when you start to look at effectiveness, we're not asking the same questions. The development of the North Star Goals was to go able to get to what Adam is saying and to be able to say this is how we want to collect data from here on out. I remember and it was so -- I was like as a person who deals with data, I don't even know where to begin with that. It was a lot. Member Contreras?
- >> JACKIE CONTRERAS: And I wasn't here in the initial conversation and I'm always mindful.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: All good. All good.
- >> JACKIE CONTRERAS: So you used; Member Bettino, you used the words program evaluation and that is what I see outlines here, program evaluation. I think what I'm struggling with and it's not what the expectations were. In our measure A we identified metrics in terms of what we wanted to impact and achieve LASA leadership and RD leadership came in and ensured we were addressing the disparity and portion although. I think that's what I was thinking about more than a program evaluation. I do see it as a both/and because if the numbers are not shifting I think we need to evaluate our approach and what we're doing.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Like Member Eakins said, this helps to set the baseline. The work done prior to before the work started, that did not happen with this. We immediately went into the work of getting money out of the door to get to the community and we'll get to the evaluation later. Literally, if you go back in the tapes, we'll get to the evaluation and figure it out and by the time we got to the evaluation, oh DPH is tracking one thing over here.

There's housing information tracked here that's not being tracked the same way inhousing information here and the Community-based Organizations -- it's all over the place.

So the North Star Goals like moving forward, if you like at like year three's, the way that we're tracking information, it changes significantly from the questions we were asking in Year one Programs. And even Year one Programs had to get a new set of how they were tracking information once we game into year three as well. I see the shaking of the head for TPA over here. It's been a challenge. So I hear your point and I'm glad that we're revisiting

this and I'm glad that we'll have the presentation because we'll be able to see it a lot more clearly about why we got to the places we got to.

- >> ADAM BETTINO: Excellent point, Member Contreras. And this speaks to the process and as we get into a place of where we're reviewing proposals and recommendations, we should, as a result of this evaluation, how we look forward, all this have should be pushed through that evaluation filter. Right? So departments, community, whoever, should come and say this is how I'm going to measure the five things and how it has the actual impact and it starts to align all of the data gathering and all of those metrics. I think we can get to a place. That's just not how we started. All of the Year one, two, three, were all things of how the programs were aligned with the North Star Goals but it wasn't specific to metrics is my understanding. I think we can shuffle things with the evaluation in mind and it makes the process much more cyclical and easy, I think.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I'm going to move to general Public Comment. Thank you very much for that conversation and we'll circle back.
- >> ADAM BETTINO: Yep.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Circle back to that. General Public Comment. Yeah. He was telling me five-minutes. With the hand.
- >> CFCI: We will now open the general Public Comment period. Please note that general Public Comments are 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 please dial star nine to use 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. We will call you on in the order that your hand was raised. Please Republican remember to state your full name. We will now begin the general Public Comment period.
- >> Deborah from PDD and the comments I had is what I heard within the rooms is that training needs to be provided for CBO. Grantee for Year one through three there's raining through the Incubation Academy. Just to put that on the floor. I'm one of them that's there. Mandatory. And then I want to bring up also that TPA -- ... [reading] okay. Also CBOs can reach out to both agencies JCOD, TPA, AMITY, and Incubation Academy and they still provide support and I mean into year three as well.

I would like to comment as a grantee, I recommend the County departments collect data monthly like the CBOs do. Thank you.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: Thank you Ms. Deborah.
- >> Please state your name for the record.
- >> Christian Green. First of all, thank y'all for the work. I think the last three years has been pivotal and urgent and necessary. So thank y'all so much. I guess my comments is in regards to really just giving yourself grace because over the last three years you guys did -- I was one of the trusted messengers in Antelope Valley and getting folks and getting the word out and getting people signed up and see be that we're at the evaluation phase is phenomenal but being transparent, people knowing what is the impact that's going on. I do like the fact that someone mentioned urgent needs but I want to think about urgent needs and this goes back to the funding not being spent and your urgent needs may not be my urgent needs. The we have food necessity or mine might be HIV cuts or homeless youth and Medicaid and we need to figure out where do the urgent needs fit and getting it into the community. Knowledge into hands. I'm glad to be here with you and thank you.
- >> We will now go online.
- >> CFCI: There are no hands raised online.
- >> As a reminder, if you would like to submit a written Public Comment for a future meeting please email JCOD.LACOUNTY.gov up to 24-hours trier to the meeting. Please include the meeting date in your correspondence as well as any agenda items on which you are commenting. This concludes the Public Comment period. I will now pass it to you Chair Steele.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I just want to say thank you again for today's very, very robust conversation. I think it's an indication of how much care and thoughtfulness goes into the process of not only this space but how you all see and do your work.

I also want to note like, yes, we, we get a nominal stipend. But man, you all put a lot of time and energy into this. And I lot of lives are impacted because of the decisions we make in this space. And so I am 100% sure, I mean, we may not have all the data to be able to tell it but man, there's a lot of lives that are for the better because of what we're doing.

And probably one of the hardest times in the history of this country and also the history of this County, the austerity that is facing us, we're a bright spot in all of this. And I just want to make sure that we continue to be so. So thank you for your openness. Like, we got these Community Agreements and you all kind of like leading and like engaging by way of Community Agreements. We have a lot of work in front of us and I hope you're ready for the road and the journey and I know we will meet the expectation because we always do. Enjoy the rest of your day and the upcoming fourth of July weekend and I'll see you all soon. Meeting adjourned.

[Meeting adjourned at 6:17 p.m.]