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: I'm going to give it three more minutes. I like the tunes. I like the tunes. All right. What's up everybody. How are you doing? Welcome, welcome to the CFCI advisory committee meeting for July 10th, 2025. Can we please read the disclosures.

>> Thank you Chair Steele I will read the meeting disclosures. This meeting is being recorded and by remaining in this meeting you consent to being recorded this is a public meeting and subject to the Brown act since conversations and statements on the chat are not visible to people on the telephone and who are unable to participate, the chat function is limited to technical assistance. There will be no response nor forwarding of any public comments to the advisory committee members. If members of the public would like to provide comment please do so during the general public comment period. For closed caption assistance CART services are available. You may access these services by clicking on the Streamtext link that will be provided after the reading of the disclosures. When accessing Zoom through a computer browser or smartphone Zoom app scroll to the reactions and you will see the raise hand feature. When accessing Zoom through the smartphone browser scroll to more, there should be three buttons and you will see the drop down feature. For anyone experiencing online technical difficulties telephone dial in information will be provided in the chat. Press star 6 to unmute. For Spanish interpretation please click on the globe icon and select Spanish. 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 Schmidt by 5 p.m. the day before the meeting. These public comments will be shared with the advisory committee members prior to the meeting and will be reflected in the meeting minutes. Written comments received after 5 p.m. the day before the meeting enthuse the end of the meeting will be made part of the meeting however advisory committee members may not have the opportunity to review these comments trier prior to acting on an agenda item. Chair Steele passing it back to you.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: All right. Fantastic. Can we do the roll.
- >> Sharing screen here shortly. We will now conduct the roll call to expedite this process we ask all advisory committee members to be ready with the microphone before your name is called. So you can be ready to announce your attendance promptly. If you are unable to unmute yourself please raise your hand on the Zoom platform 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. We will gyp the roll call by last name alphabetically. When your name is called please say present. Member Armstead or alternate.
- >> ADAM BETTINO: Alternate present.
  - >> Member Carbajal or alternate.
  - >> Present.
  - >> Member Castillo or alternate.
  - >> Present.
- >> Member Contreras or alternate? Member Crunk or alternate. Member

Cyrus-Franklin or alternate.

- >> Present.
- >> Member Eakins.
- >> Present.
- >> Member Tsai or alternate.
- >> Alternate present.
- >> Member Fuentes-Miranda or alternate.
- >> Present.
- >> Member Garcia or alternate. Member Hong or alternate.
- >> Alternate present.
- >> Member Lewis or alternate. Member Lobianco or alternate.
- >> Alternate present.
- >> Member Knight or alternate.
- >> Present.
- >> Member Scorza or alternate. Member Soto or alternate.
- >> Present.
- >> Member Steele or alternate.
- >> Present.

- >> Member Stevens.
- >> Present.
- >> Member Joey Williams or alternate.
- >> Present.
- >> Member Myk'l Williams. Member Wong or alternate.
- >> Alternate present.
- >> That concludes roll call. Chair Steele back to you.

>> CHAIR STEELE: All right. Thank you very much everybody for that. Okay. Here we go. We want to move to the land acknowledgement and we'll also do the labor acknowledgement and hop into our body of work as well. Can we bring that up, please. And our communities agreements too, my bad you all. Starting with the land acknowledgement the land 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 to acknowledge the Gabrieleno Tongva people, the Fernandeno Tatavium tribe and the Ventureno Chumash people. These native people understood and respected the landing connected and respected the four legged creatures who once roamed the earth freely and the winged ones and everything in the ocean. Their hearts told them never to take more than they could use and always give back to mother earth. These amazing people are still here today living and breathing among us and still giving back to the community that surrounds us. Aheehe. Thank you to our ancestors and thank you to our partners. To the labor acknowledgement. Most modern day U.S. Constitutions have bend from the unaddressed legacy of stolen labor at the foundation of this nation and vast and inequitable wealth. We respectfully acknowledge our debt to the enslaved people primarily of African descent who is labor and suffering built and grew the economy. While the 13th Amendment of the Constitution technically ended slavery in the U.S. we know that slavery's ongoing impacts are still felt today by countless people through violence threat and coercion to work in the United States. We recognize our debt to exploited workers past and present whose labor was and continues to be stolen through unjust practices. We acknowledge our collective debt to the indigenous peoples of this land whose labor was forced and exploited the Chinese immigrants whose built related to allow for westward American development, Japanese Americans who properties and livelihoods were taken from them while incarcerated in World War II and migrate workers from the Philippines Mexico and south and central America. We recognize the immigrant and American born

workers of African, Asian, central and south American descent who is labor remains hidden in the shadows but still contributes to the well-being of our collective community. We recognize that our economy continues to rely on the exploited labor of incarcerated people largely people of color who earn pennies an hour while generating billions and billions in goods and services each year. And we know there are many other people too numerous to mention who are prevented from reaping the true value of their labor by unjust systems and cruel practices. We mourn their loss of life, liberty and opportunity. We acknowledge that the theft of labor is the theft of generational progress. Nearly all people of color have been robbed of the opportunity and wealth that their ancestors might otherwise have passed onto them. I think it's important to acknowledge that too and as we go into the conversation over the next four weeks everyone and we do these acknowledgements and also the agreements, I think it's really, really critical to lean into them. You know, we have done the due diligence and the amazing work of allocating these resources in the most equitable way possible that we can together in these spaces and that is taking into consideration all of the things that are happening with people and their lived experiences in our community. From several different walks of life.

So the times that we are in today are not lost on us. And I think in our decision-making and our thoughtfulness, we have to be mindful of all things, that all communities are going through like we always have and I think the community agreements speak to that and that's the reason why we do them on a meeting by meeting basis and I appreciate you doing it with me as we go through them. On this one I hope that you take them to heart and rely on them and keep them close nearby and keep them in your mind as we go through this process and work together to make sure these resources can go and touch from a Care First point of view for the people who need them and need them dearly. I'll start be respectful of the diverse voices being represented and remain open-minded.

- >> Be mindful of power dynamics in this space as well as the historical disenfranchisement of black and indigenous communities. Accordingly prioritize and defer to community throughout the process.
- >> Be mindful of the diverse audience you're presenting to and make sure you speak with clarity.
  - >> Be collaborative.
  - >> Assume best intentions.
  - >> Challenge the idea, and 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 try to be 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 the land acknowledgement statement recognizing and respecting the indigenous peoples of the land we now call Los Angeles County. Okay. Here we are. Review of the submitted CFCI program proposals and community surveys.

I just want to start and in the long arc of this work this year, starting with finding out that, you know, finally getting the answer to the question how money is being spent and finding out that unspent funds even existed and holding space for that conversation while at the same time quickly determining what we do about it to organizing together to get a motion passed that the board of supervisors, you know, got behind. To make sure there is guidance on how these types of resources should be allocated in the future and the now and in the future. To the ongoing discussions that have come about to make sure that people are implementing the guidance of the motion that was passed. Like we've been busy. Making sure that we are not only protecting the people's money but also making sure that there is space and place for community voice in the allocation and the setup of how these resources need to go back into community as well.

I think fundamentally we're also showing the county a different way of doing business. And transforming the business as usual. And making sure the community voice continues to be part of that process as well. And so when we did the, when we did the, got to the point of finding and determining some of the concept recommendations and leaning into the process that we have helped to kind of refine and get better at each and every time we get a chance to allocate resources and getting input from the community, you know, even

though it was only two weeks, man, I want JCOD to bring up the presentation, we got 264 inputs from the -- from that two weeks. Right. Many of the county departments, the community members who, community organizations who continue to listen in with us. Folks attending the listening sessions that we did. I think we averaged about 50 people each session. You know 40 to 50 people each session. The questions were really on point. And, you know, people wanting to give input and also be a part of this process has been amazing.

So I'm just thankful for your contributions, for the contribution from community on this. For people not shying away but leaning in to making sure that we can take care of each other. And so we do have a process of which we will outline of how we want to move forward but we want to at least go over the submitted CFCI program proposals and the surveys themselves. Hold on a second. Yeah, that's cool. Brother Crunk has let us know his alternate will be standing in for him today. Be on the lookout for Corey Crockerham if he hasn't already been added to the mix in this, he's standing in for Member Crunk. Thank you very much.

All right. So Julie, can you help me out? Or Ruth, I'm sorry.

>> Julie: Yes, Ruth is managing the PowerPoint.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Cool. We've got a total number of recommendations received it says 259, I've said 264 but there were some duplicates in that. After taking out the duplicates and also the blank applications, we ended up at 259. 58 of them are county departments, 201 of them were from community CBO's as well. And the other 259 submissions, 162 are to expand existing programs with 97 recommendations for new directions of how funding can actually be utilized. I am really excited about that because, again, the people who are listening in, understood the assignment. Right.

How do we make sure that we can support things that we are already supported and make sure we can refine and make them better. But even in the ideas of how we get to new programs, you know, there are things that actually fit within the realms of possibility because we were very, very specific about what types of things we could do with these concept recommendation forms this go around. Go to the next slide.

So breaking it down a bit, when you look at the five different area, strategy areas being diversion, behavioral health and wellness, economic opportunity and sustainability, education access and youth development, housing stability and also reentry in community

reintegration you see the breakdown of how the ones that we receive, the strategies -- I'm sorry. Come on Derek.

The concept recommendations we received breaks down across the different strategies. Of course reentry and community reintegration is the one that came in the most. I want to also acknowledge that folks when they were putting in their concept recommendations selected multiple entries, right. So like their programs may have an emphasis, say, in youth but they also do reentry, so it's youth reentry. If I'm saying this correctly and Julie or Cassandra you can correct me if I'm wrong, this graph is reflective of the many times that each of the strategy areas were selected regardless if it was multiple for an entry is that correct.

>> Cassandra: Yes, that's correct

>> CHAIR STEELE: All right. So we're hitting the mark on several spaces of this for sure, right. Across the board. Like and it's not disparate, like I know the graph may look like it is but we're talking about 50 to 58. There's at least 50 in each category, times it was touched, 58 being the most it was touched in any of the concepts coming up. Can you move to the next slide.

This last slide and this slide also add up to more than 259 because, again, folks had the opportunity to select multiple areas, right. So in the question of well which SPA are you impacting, you can see that the work that we are asking -- that is being asked of us to embarks on is actually touching several different SPAs across the county.

So, again, this is bodies of work that are already taking place we may potentially be helping to expand upon or -- and bodies of work that may be new but a lot of this work is also touching various parts of our community. Now SPA 6 per usual of how this usually plays out, comes in as one of the areas that gets touched the most.

But, again, you know, you're not seeing a significant disparity of one area over the others you know what I mean. So yeah. And if there's any questions along the way, please feel free to ask. You do enter have to wait until the end of the presentation, you can go ahead to the next slide.

When we look at the different supervisor districts, again this adds up to more than 259 because people had the ability to say the fullness of what parts of the county they were impacting. When we get to the point of looking at the information that was submitted you'll

see how they broke it down. But, again, we're touching all parts of the county with the body of work that was submitted.

Keep going. And when you do the breakdown of anticipated outcomes, right, the ones that were selected the most, there were anticipated outcomes that were kind of one offs. There was many of them that were one offs. But there were those that actually were outcomes that are selected more than others, right. And these, this set here that you're looking at decrease justice system involvement and so when you think about what's happening during the times, I think it is also reflective of and also the way that these things are being input into like how we want to support our communities.

So healing and wellness being matched up all the way down to youth development or civic engagement. Stable or supportive housing on the other side being at 78. Improved educational access and retainment being at 86. Increased access to physical or mental health care at 98 and decreased justice system involvement being 127 healing and well-being, 127 and employment outcomes at 104. This is indicative of what's going on in our communities. People need resources so job training and employment outcomes being some of the things how we can support that. But also the decarceration efforts needing to have as much support as possible with also making sure that there are ways to take care of ourselves, healing and well-being, the next highest as well.

Keep going. So what is our timeline, you all. Today is a special meeting and we're reviewing the recommendation forms and we're going to get to that in a second. You had those actually sent in advance thanks to member Castillo who made sure that the right amount of pressure was put on making sure that we got this information out to you all as soon as possible so you could start to review yourselves in preparation for today's conversation but today we're going to be focusing on strategy and game planning for the recommendation process.

I have something for you all to respond to and we can start the discussion from there. Then next week the way that we will, the game plan we decide upon today, we'll be doing the work from today until the 17th which is next Thursday of reviewing all of the strategies that are committed to us individually. And be ready to come to a process next week to narrow down or the focus in on how we want to elevate our recommendations to the Board of Supervisors.

So there will be a rubric for you to utilize and help make that a more straightforward process. And you will also my idea I'll present to you in a second and you will be able to work in groups so that is not an overwhelming amount of work that we need to do on this. The decisions that we make next week, Thursday, I'm sorry we'll be elevating the things we think are important in the meeting next Thursday but we're not making any decisions on that day. We're going to take that information from next Thursday into our July 24th meeting and that was an in person meeting where we will actually be making decisions and voting on the recommendations for the one time funding. Based on our decisions out of that meeting, the JCOD team and the leadership team will work to draft our board letter that we will bring forth to you all in person again on July 31st for us to review, to edit and based on those edits and that review, approve so that we can actually submit our letter of recommendations to the Board of Supervisors that evening. Because our deadline is Thursday July 31st. Okay.

Any questions about any of that? Thoughts, needs?

- >> If I could ask a question and maybe I missed it, so if I did my apologies, I was looking at the outcomes and I saw mental and physical health. Was there a reason why maybe substance use disorders were not identified as a potential need of the population?
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I think you're referring to the outcome slide is that what you're talking about.
  - >> Ms. Lima: I think you had a bar chart and it referred to it physical or mental health.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Can you go back one slide if you don't mind, Ruth. It should be one slide. Is this slide you're talking about.
  - >> Ms. Lima: That's correct, this is it.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: So these are intended outcomes that the folks selected. This is not the exhaustive list because there are other intended outcomes because I think they were also able to add outcomes that they wanted -- that they are looking to impact as well. And they were literally like ones in the graph. Shout out to the JCOD team because they did a pivot table to make this accessible for us to be able to review. But these are the intended outcomes that folks selected the most out of. Does that make sense?
- >> Ms. Lima: It makes sense we just now that SGD needs are sometimes, sometimes prevalent I think in certain populations so just interested in kind of like understanding whether it was in kind of identified as an actual need.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: Let me see real quick. I'll have to go back to the data to be more specific online on that. But again as people are reading through the recommendations themselves, you will find that folks have several different ways that they are actually approaching these issues.
  - >> Ms. Lima: All right. That's helpful, thank you.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Thank you for the question. You can go back to the next slide, Ruth. Any other thoughts, questions in the review?
- >> MEMBER STEVENS: I have one I'm trying to raise my hand.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: We are waiting on Zoom, go ahead Reba, Member Stevens.
- >> MEMBER STEVENS: If you could go back to I think number 3 is healing and well-being. And then it goes to the job training and then it goes to increased access to mental and physical. So could you just speak to the healing and well-being piece?
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Hey, Cassandra if you don't mind, can you speak to how we came about this section, right? Is that okay? And again I want to lift up the JCOD team because the, the period closed on Monday so not only just the graphical representation of what we selected but also the analysis of the information in preparation for today's conversation were all done in the last couple of days to make sure that we are ready to Rock n' Roll today so thank you very much to the team for your preparation. Thank you also to the leaders, you know,. Member Fuentes-Miranda as well as Member Castillo who were on the calls making sure that we were as close to ready as possible going into today's conversation and doing it in a way that made sense and holds true to the values. So thank you all. Go ahead, Cassie.
- >> Cassie: Yeah, hi this is Cassie I'm the CFCI team here at JCOD. Yes, I titled this overarching outcomes because these were the ones that were recommended to go onto the proposal form, the one that you helped us create, Derek, the recommendation form on Microsoft forms. These were the ones that you had come up with. I just called them overarching because these were the ones that were on the form. However like you mentioned previously, folks had an option, an other option on the recommendation form to include other outcomes that they necessarily -- that weren't necessarily included in these how many, seven that we're seeing here. When you were saying there were those one offs we did get quite a few one off outcomes that they typed in themselves but these seven were the outcomes that you had selected to be on the recommendation form. Of so that's why we just highlighted these but in the spreadsheet that we emailed earlier to the committee,

you'll see the other outcomes that were listed by folks who submitted recommendation forms so this is just an overview of the overarching ones but all the one offs are also reflected in the spreadsheet the committee received earlier this afternoon. I hope that makes sense and helps.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: That's very helpful. Member Stevens does that answer your question.
- >> MEMBER STEVENS: Yes, it does. I have one more. I am -- I appreciate where we are and what we're doing and I too want to say thank you for all the work that JCOD has done to get us to this moment. But I'm also wondering about you know how will measure G affect Measure J. With everything else that's going on with the government, you know, does anyone know, you know, what could possibly happen as a result of Measure G?
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I will say --
- >> MEMBER STEVENS: I'm not trying to be negative but I'm watching, I'm watching and we're constantly being surprised.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I want to make sure that we have an opportunity for a more robust discussion about this, Member Stevens because I don't want to rush it off. Because I think the question that you're asking needs to have the arc of history and the nuance built into it as well. So if you would oblige me, can we, when we get toward the end of this session on our decision about how we want to move forward as far as breaking up the teams and stuff like that, and my proposal, can we come back to this if that's okay? Because I know in the way that we operate, it might be new news to some people, we will end up spending all of our time talking about that and not necessarily getting to the finish line.
- >> MEMBER STEVENS: I just want to make sure it's on the record that it was raised, that it is a concern, and that as you stated, we will address.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I will definitely address it as a member of the Measure G Task Force you've got my commitment to address that.
- >> MEMBER STEVENS: Thank you.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Any homeowner questions about the timeline or the needs? Okay. Give me one second everybody, I've got somebody at the door.

>>.

- >> ADAM BETTINO: Member Williams I see your hand, go ahead.
- >> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: All right I just need to be unmuted. I have a question, thank you.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Sorry about that, you all. Am organizers, I'm multifaceted here organization sitting in the front. Member Williams do you have any questions or are you trying to get unmuted.
- >> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: I switched over from my phone to the computer so I needed to be unmuted. Thank you.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Member Lewis.
- >> MEMBER LEWIS: Good afternoon sorry I'm so late. I was doing something I couldn't leave early. But the timeline looks fine there. I heard you, I thought I heard you say do you have any input on the timeline and needs is that what you said or I'm sorry what did you say.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I was asking if anybody had any questions about the content or anything about the timeline of what I provided. I'm about to actually outline how, for this week and next week, how this will go as well. So that we can actually work through the content that we need to work through but doing it in a way that works to like break up the work. So we can get through in this shortened timeline that we have.
- >> MEMBER LEWIS: Thank you.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: You got it. All right seeing no other questions I'm going to go ahead and move forward. Did you all get a slide or is it on me on this? Okay cool it's on me, great.

So go ahead, Adam, you got it.

- >> ADAM BETTINO: Sorry, I just want to quickly note on the previous matter that was discussed, I actually want to punt to county counsel quickly who is listening in he wants to weigh-in on the discussion that [indiscernible].
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I want to do that. I want to and I will provide the space and time for us to have the robust discussion on it but I don't want to derail because we've got to get to.
- >> ADAM BETTINO: Tight timeline I'm with you.

>> CHAIR STEELE: I am going to create space I'm looking at the clock and I'm going to make sure we have enough time and do it in a robust way, I got you. County counsel just hold tight just give me a second.

All right here is what I have in mind with this, Cassandra did you do a slide on this part too or is it on me.

>> Cassie: I was about to chime in that we have the spreadsheet that we emailed to the committee, we have it ready to screen share all of the tabs that you are recommending so we can pull that up right now and this is the spreadsheet that the committee has access to from the email earlier this afternoon so you all should have that on your end but ease of access we can screen share, I think Ruth is going to do that

>> CHAIR STEELE: Thank you very much, please do. Appreciate you. Okay.

So you'll see at the bottom of this document that you all have access to, that there are five strategy groups. Okay. Two things to note that I think are important to raise, and mind you this is my recommendation but for you all to respond to, to see if we want to move in this direction. If there is an alternative out of this discussion that you want to have, cool, I'm not saying that we have to do it this way but I wanted to make sure I came into this conversation with a process that I'm recommending.

Two things to take into consideration, the first thing is there is a growing conversation that started, you know, probably like summer last year when we had our last county council about the conflict of interest issue and now we have resources that are going out the door, different departments, and also community-based organizations that are receiving resources, we want to make sure that being very thoughtful around how we avoid the conflict of interest conversation as we do this work together to make sure the dollars go out the door. And there are other commissions and committee spaces that deal with this issue as well that we've kind of had the ability to learn from to be able to provide a path forward, right. So we're taking that into consideration.

The second thing is it's 259 different recommendations, and I -- you know you have access to you will a of them, but, you know, the work of trying to come up with a process and also doing rubrics for all of them would probably be a Herculean task to try to do it in a week.

So the proposal in this, knowing what our strategy areas are, making sure that you all as committee members have the ability to pick a strategy that avoids the conflict of interest based off of the work you are doing and using the grouping process for us to be able to work together to review the strategies and also come up with our recommendations as a team in each of these groups to bring back to the main space.

This is also the reason why we're doing it in our special meetings, the virtual meetings because we're not making any decisions, we're having discussion and concerted effort working together to review and also determine what we want to lift up, but the decision-making process will be at the behest of the entire body when we come together on the 24th. So let me restate what I'm saying.

Today we will take the time to divvy up into five different groups. We will work within those groups to strategize, you know, how we want to divvy up the work so who will be responsible for each, for a certain amount of recommendations to go over to get ready for next week's meeting. Based on that, do our work over the next week, and when we come back next week, the breakout groups will happen again but in that space, you all will be going through your rubrics, having discussions robustly about the different recommendations that you want to bring forward, coming up with a game plan together that we will share out in a group together next week.

So each group will have a responsibility of elevating the recommendations that they want to bring forward and based off of that collective set of recommendations, we will take that information into the next meeting and actually on the 24th decide on the final version of recommendations. Does that make sense? How do you all feel about that? Questions?

>> MEMBER LEWIS: Chair Steele that's fine I think obviously I appreciate the thankfulness around the bandwidth of the full body and having a delegation of us willing to take that on. I just and tell me if this is coming or I missed it since I was late but that's fine I just definitely want to know and want this body to weigh-in on like the process of elimination or determination as to what moves forward, that the subcommittee or workgroup is going to use who though make those decision toss bring them back to the group. If you've already talked about it, tell me that. If it's coming next, but definitely want to have the body to have eyes on that for the delegation of folks that are going to do the work.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Thank you for asking that, and that is the next part of this conversation. The first step is the process and then we were going to, then I wanted to have a discussion

together about how we, you know -- how we actually want to decide so it's congruent across all groups, does that make sense? So I have a piece on that next but the first step is just the process itself.

- >> MEMBER LEWIS: Yes, I agree as long as this body weighs in on what the process looks like.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: You got it. Member Williams.
- >> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: Hi everybody, I just wanted to ask because I've been a part of some, there's this LA jobs first so current jobs first and here are similar what do you call it, proposals on how we look at things like this. Is this something that originated from you, member Castillo and member Fuentes-Miranda, if so I'm like hey let's try it out or was this something introduced from an outside body on how we should tackle this. Because that's just my concern is like I want to be able to weigh-in on everything that has to do with native folks and give input on it but also making decisions on it. But that factors unless you want to put all the native ones in one group I would be happy to look at those but understand why I'm here, what I was elected to do you know. LA city native communication. I love my Black and transgender folks and I'm going to fight for all of us but the key purpose why I'm here.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I want to lift up Member Castillo because she was adamant about that part, right. This -- I want to be clear in saying that this is my recommendation for this process in this, you know, I should also mention that how the strategies were grouped into these areas as I mentioned earlier folks have the ability to choose multiple strategies for what their recommendations are going to cover so I did the work once this was finished on Tuesday and Wednesday of actually reading the descriptions and also the intended outcomes and determining the best fit of the strategy. The one strategy so we could actually group them the way they needed to be grouped. And being able to do that.

Also knowing that we were going to have a conversation together about how we want to look at these recommendations and what thoughtfulness we have to each, in our thinking, utilizing rubric 2 as a guide. But yeah, like to your point, Member Castillo was like people need to have access to everything too, though. Because like you're saying Member Williams when we get to the point of making our final decisions, you should have the ability to say I know I wasn't in this group but what about this, this, this and this. That might have been in the other groups and let you know or have the conversation with you about what the thinking was on that part and giving you a chance to lift up you know what I mean. I think

this process gives us the ability to avoid the conflict piece but give us a chance to still look at it all and engage with each other about the decision-making process.

- >> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: I've seen these happen two ways. I've seen the breakout being everyone has access to some of them but not all of them to have a discussion about it, people don't have the background to be able to do it. I would prefer to have access to everything but if there's a limited group that I'm responsible for presenting or sharing out I would be happy to do that. But I want to be able to see all of them.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Yeah, so everybody has access to all, to the full document.
- >> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: Do we have access to this being shown right now.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Yeah, it was sent to you via email.
- >> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: Cool, thank you.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Everybody has access to the full document but what I'm suggesting is we break up into groups and so the group has a responsible for one section of the document to come up with recommendations for.
  - >> Member Gorman has her hand up.
- >> Anna Gorman: Can you remind us Chairman Steele of the total amount that we are going to recommend that is available for and then also the total amount of money that is in these 200 plus proposals.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Got it. The first question is nuanced but I'm saying 219 million, right. That's after the ending of the fiscal year and basing it off of what the last analysis of the funding was done by the CEO's office and their proposal to the board first set of recommendations and about two meetings ago. And it was a full 219 million but they also recommended a whole set and there was only about 50 million left. So like we ever the responsibility of in my mind doing similar to what we did with the year three funds where we did tier 1 and 2. For the full 219 million this is what it looks like but if we're responsible for just doing 50 million of it, here is what we're recommending for that 50 million. I'm also in a posture and we will need to work together on this that we really, really push on the full 219 million dollars because the reason I'm saying that is because this robust process that we're going through, no one else has gone through.

So, for instance, the resources that may be needed for the fire victims and the fund that was actually put together, we may determine by the recommendations that were given to us that there might be more that is needed for that, right. For, you know, the represent LA conversation came up last week. And there's a certain amount that was thought about or what is needed for that. We may, from our set of recommendations not just represent LA but there's also some in here from Los Angeles, from LAFLA. There's some information in here from other institutions and want to be supportive of the immigrants rights issues by ICE raids and everything there might be more needed for that. There was a state of Black languages report put out on Tuesday and there are several aspects for that body of work. So we're able to kind of look at this in a way that no one else in the county has been able to do.

And so my thinking on the 219 is to say to the Board of Supervisors, hey, I know what the CEO's office said but here is what we have come together with as a way of looking at the robust needs of our community and being able to use these one time funds in the most effective way possible.

So that's a long winded answer to your question but.

- >> Member Gorman: That's generally what I understood but it's good to hear I understand we're going to make the recommendation for the full 219, not just the 4950. Did you guys calculate the amount of money in the requests?
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Cassie do you have the number?
- >> Cassie: We don't have that op the top of our heads but we can definitely calculate and get that to you in a follow-up email.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Cool, I appreciate that. That's on me, you all. In my mind I definitely thought about that and I can calculate that while we're talking. In fact, Cassie, if you don't mind, if you just go to column P and for groups 1 through 5 just give me a total on each of the column P's and whenever you get to that, just let me know what the number is and we can let everybody know.
  - >> Cassie: Okay, will do.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Member Lewis.
- >> MEMBER LEWIS: Okay I'm going to restate what I think I heard because I want to make sure I'm crystal clear, be if that's okay, Chair Steele.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Yes, please.

>> MEMBER LEWIS: Although there's technically in terms of the budget process and approval that happened a few weeks ago only 50 million dollar left for us to make a recommendation on, your intention is to make a recommendation on the full 219 million dollars. The question is what, if any, recourse is there to reverse the decision that was made on the, what is it 169 million dollar by the Board of Supervisors? Or is it just the principle of the thing as to why you want to make recommendations for the full amount. Can you help me understand a little bit whether or not our recommendation on that remaining 169 that's already been approved technically will do anything or is there a recourse or is it just the principle of the thing.

>> CHAIR STEELE: That's a great question. So to the first part of your recap, I am recommending a two tier where it's the 50 million and the 219. Right. So that if the Board of Supervisors say no, then we have already done the work to say well here is the 50 million that we want to elevate.

But yes, to the second part of your answer, the principle and there's also, the way that they made the decision about the CEO agency recommendations is not final. Right. Because they know, they knew that our recommendations were coming as well so there's the ability to wait and see what we provide and then make the decision about what the supplemental budget is going to look like. You see what I'm saying. There's still space for us to make our recommendations. Yes let's utilize that space.

[CAPTIONER CHANGE 5:00 PM]

>> CHAIR STEELE: That's a great question. So to the first part of your recap.

I'm recommending a two-tier where it's the 50 million and the 219 right so that if the Board of Supervisors are saying no, then we have already done the work to say well, here is the \$50 million that we want to elevate.

But, yes. To the second part of your answer, the principle and there's also, the way that they made the decision about the CEO's recommendations is not final. Right? Because they knew that our recommendations were coming as well so there's the ability to wait and

see what we provide and then make the decision about what the supplemental budget is going to look like. Do you see what I'm saying? So there's still space for us to make our recommendation. I'm saying, let's utilize that space to definitely make a very strong case for the full 219 in our Assessment.

- >> MEMBER LEWIS: I'm going to ask a delicate question. What is the probability and I understand the nuance of not being a final decision on the 219 but what is the likely hoot that the Board will reverse or change course from the preliminary approval? I'm going to call it that for lack of a better term.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I think before today the probability might have been lower but because of the measure G and Measure J situation the probability might be a lot higher and I'll explain what I mean about that as well once we get to that part of the conversation.

But I would say at this point based off of things playing out the way that it is that the probability of that -- I mean, and I don't know. I don't want to -- let me answer the question: I don't know. Let me just say it that way. I don't know. I don't know.

>> MEMBER LEWIS: I appreciate your honesty. And I get all of it, right? And I'm going to support you and rock with you no matter what. So whatever you want to do, I'm going to do it with you. And, though, just giving all that's happening. The probability question I think is prudent, right? In terms of how the time is spent, how our time is spent, on something that may not yield anything in terms of the actual programming of the dollars. That's why I said when I started it's a delicate question. I'm requesting to rock with you no matter what but we should have the discussions and the Committee is our time. During the summer season while all of the other things are happening in our system and so thanks for your honesty in responding to that.

>> CHAIR STEELE: You got it. I will also add this last color to it.

Folks who were added into the CEO's recommendation also provided their recommendation forms into our process too. Do you see what I'm saying? So it's not like it's just a set aside and that's it. The.

We are also taking into consideration many of the things that are in that too and I am eyeing that. That's why the 50 million piece matters as well, right? So it was like, you know -- but to me, it's secondary, not primary.

Like, you know, here is our \$50 million and the probability of them taking the \$50 million and calling it a day is a lot higher than them actually taking on the whole 219 million the in the realistic terms. But I said at the top we're going to have to work together to advocate and to push, getting the Board offices engages in understanding what we're trying to do and understanding what we're asking for.

I've already been engaging the JCOD team as well as some of the Board offices was to us to be on the diocese to explain and talk about our recommendations so that it's not the CEO trying to speak on our behalf.

So there's a couple different things that I feel like we can do that can make our case a lot stronger. Anyone else? Okay.

So there's in push back on this. The step I want to take next to determine the groups, and then I also want to have the discussion about, you know, you all's response to some of the priorities that we have here. Okay? Cool. So the first step here, we have ...

Give me a second. One second. I'm sorry about that. Sorry about this.

Okay. Can you take the presentation off real quick? Because we're going to need the raise hand function and I'm going to need to be able to see everybody on the screen for this. Okay. To the members, all right?

We'll probably are a follow-up with those who are absent today so that they can participate in this. We're going to start with group one. Diversion, Behavioral Health, and wellness. Right? So please raise your hand if you want to participate in the group that's going over the recommendations for diversion Behavioral Health and wellness. The strategy one.

- >> MEMBER GORMAN: I'm sorry. We can put our name on more than one?
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Pick one group.
- >> MEMBER LEWIS: Excuse me. I'm driving and I don't want to keep looking at my phone before I raise my hand. Can you go over all of them so we know what they are when you're saying pick one?
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Yes.
- >> MEMBER CRUNK: Do we have access to the spread sheet or the PDF they sent us?

>> CHAIR STEELE: PDF and spread sheet. PDF to read one at a time or you can use the spread sheet that has the same in there. It's just smaller font. Some people have issues with the font. The information is in the spread sheet.

Strategy one: Diversion, Behavioral Health, and wellness. Strategy one: Diversion, Behavioral Health, and wellness.

Strategy two: Economic opportunity and sustainability.

Strategy three: Education access in youth development.

Strategy four: Housing stability.

Strategy five: Reentry and community reintegration.

So diversion, Behavioral Health, and wellness is strategy one. Economic opportunity and sustainability. Education access in youth development. Housing stability. Reentry and economic reintegration. Cool? Those are the five categories.

So if you can do me, Kassy or -- yeah. Kassy or Julie, we want to make sure we keep track of the folks who are in certain groups; okay? I'm writing it down too but I just want to make sure you all see it as well.

- >> CFCI: Members and participants can choose which groups they want to join in. We don't have to assign them individually.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Look that. Because we have the breakout rooms. But we're not activating the breakout rooms yet, though.
- >> CFCI: I have not activated them yet.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Okay. Cool. Thank you. I'm still going through this process. I appreciate that, Noah. If you're interested in strategy one, please put your hand up. Diversion, Behavioral Health, and wellness.

Connie, Reba, and Anna.

- >> MEMBER LIMA: I can't see to put my hand up but I would like to be here.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Thank you. You can put your hands down. Strategy two which is economic opportunity and sustainability. Please raise your hand. All right. We got

Michelle Fuentes-Miranda. Hina Sheikh. Hina, can you tell me which department you're representing?

- >> MEMBER SHEIKH: Department of economic opportunity.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Here is the thing. You want to be thoughtful of your [audio bleep]
- >> CHAIR STEELE: You want to pick one that is not your body of work.
- >> MEMBER SHEIKH: Can I go into the first one, please?
- >> CHAIR STEELE: You got it. Thank you very much. The reason why I'm saying that, you all, is because I want to make sure that no questions are asked about nobody laying a finger on the scale or like none of that. Like, this is a straightforward process that we did together that folks were able to focus on the bodies of work that matter to them and not necessarily the ones that they work in. So I got Megan Castillo.

I got Michelle Fuentes-Miranda. Anyone else? You can put your hand down, Megan. Thank you. Member Carbajal.

- >> MEMBER CARBAJAL: Chair Steele, it's more of a question just for clarity. The conflict of interest piece, does that only matter if you have a proposal included? Like, for example, I don't know if DEL has one included and if they don't, it would be helpful to have them present because of their level of expertise in the work.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Hmm.
- >> MEMBER CARBAJAL: Or if they do have one present maybe they are prevented from weighing their proposal but providing expertise. I don't want to overcome reply indicate it but I'm thinking out loud.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: When it gets to the conversation where we're finalizing --
- >> MEMBER CARBAJAL: That's where it comes in? Gotcha.
- >> MEMBER LEWIS: The conversations that are going to be happening in the workgroups in the respective bodies of work and you have those not -- you're going to lose some. Some of the recommendations coming out of the workgroup might not necessarily be as informed as they need to be. I'll say it that way. So I don't know what the answer is. I hate to offer an issue without a solution and I don't know what the answer is but it's important.

And because of so many shifting things across these sectors, if there's nobody in the room that fully understands what's going on, it can be problematic. And extended time that the information comes back to the full group because those things are having to be introduced in that space. So I don't know the answer but it's important, especially in this climate, to make sure the process is fully informed and we don't have a lot of time.

One of the thing that's popped up is even if folks on the commit that have expertise and understanding of what's going on in the respective 5 areas and maybe join in to layout the landscape and policies, maybe that's how to get at it and then they are not part of the meeting and discussion. There is so many going on, I'm afraid we're going to have recommendations that don't make sense for the current landscape for our respective strategies.

>> CHAIR STEELE: I hear what you're saying. I hear what you're saying.

My thinking of this is because of that context and having access to all of the data by way of the spread sheet, if that is the level of interest and need, you have the ability.

Like Member Williams was saying is I'm going to do my part but I'm going is to make sure to look through the rest that sewn have anything to do with the community I represent so that the input we have in our decision making on what we're lifting up can also be provided in that space.

You but I hear your space. There may be more context needed in the decision making process as well.

- >> MEMBER LEWIS: And I think everybody, we want all of our time well spent.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Yeah, for you are should.
- >> MEMBER LEWIS: And so I wish we had time even to have an hour wherefore each of the five areas we have conversation about landscape in the full group so at least there's some level setting. But if we can't do that, if they can join the first 20 minutes of the five meets to not have a direct conflict, share what's going on for context. We all want our time to be well spent and I want to caution you that someone has gone through this twice and just free style of people bringing and dropping other recommendations in the five areas for the large setting. There has to be some parameters around that too. And, again, we don't want

people having spent all of this time and it looks completely different because they didn't have the information they needed.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: You're spot on. You're spot on. Wooo. Okay. Member Draxler?
- >> MEMBER DRAXLER: I work for the Department of Mental Health and I would be best suited to the group I just put myself into but there is one DMH proposal coming through that will need to be addressed but there could be a lot of proposals that are contractors of our department that our department is making decisions on for funding and does that become a conflict for me. And if you look at other things that I'm working on, I have the housing programs in DMH under me and I have the reentry program.

So then I end up being in a strategy that I probably don't have a lot of expertise that I could bring to the workgroup. So at this point I'm not sure. Do I stay in strategy one or do I pull myself out because of a potential conflict?

- >> CHAIR STEELE: Let me take a moment real quick because County Counsel is here too, correct? County Counsel, can you be brought off mute.?
- >> MEMBER GORMAN: I'm going to jump in before County Counsel does their thing. I struggle with that and I know Dr. Hong and I have expertise in diversion and contractor and don't want to have conflict but we'll definitely have more input there than say, youth development.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Let me be more specific. Conflict is those of us receiving CFCI funds for a specific thing that we would be adding context insofar as the deliberation around the one-time funds.

But I want to ask County Counsel, does the conflict come in the decision making or in the deliberation?

- >> MEMBER BETTINO: Robert, do we still have you?
- >> CFCI: Robert has been given host privileges so he can unmute himself.
- >> MEMBER BETTINO: Thanks, Noah.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Somebody send him a text. He might not be listening in effectively.

>> COUNSEL BAILEY: It took a long time to get through that. I do believe the best practice is wall yourself off. For instance, if I was going to receive funds or program receiving funds from the CFCI program and I were to receive those funds, I think it's a better course of action not to be involved in the conversations because it could be looked upon as if you're trying to sway an opinion left offer right and you have an invested interest in that. I can go further and talk to some of the people in my office about that.

That's the way I look at it. I can definitely get more clarification between now and the next meeting but that's my two cents in terms of giving advice or anything like that in terms of what would be spoken in the meetings or these sessions.

- >> MEMBER LEWIS: So if somebody is a strategy group and their department as one proposal and they reaccuse themselves for discussion or deliberation related to that proposal, would they be able to be a part of the conversation around the rest of the proposals or concepts?
- >> COUNSEL BAILEY: That's one of the wrinkles. Perhaps they may be but I don't want to give you a definitive answer saying yes. If you wall yourself off properly I think it can be done that way and I want to give you a definitive answer and I don't think I'm in the space to do that right now without going more into it.
- >> MEMBER LEWIS: What's your time frame for that?
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Go ahead, Member Lewis.
- >> COUNSEL BAILEY: Today is Thursday and so next week.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Say they are you accused from talking about a particular item but when we get to the voting on what the last recommendations are, the way I plan on doing that is group by group so if they reaccuse themselves from conversation -- I'm sorry, about the voting on the item.
- >> COUNSEL BAILEY: Right.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: That does avoid the conflict, correct?
- >> COUNSEL BAILEY: I believe it does, yes.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Cool. With that said, in the idea of time while we're working on getting your answer -- thank you very much Robert, I appreciate you. What I would recommend is

that you do not fill out a rubric for the program that is yours in that space. And you also do not participate in the conversation around your program in that space. But, you know, you're right about the expertise piece being able to bring that context to that space.

You know, but to your best of the ability, let's make sure that we're walling off ourselves from putting our finger on the scale for things we are putting in the resources for. Does that work? Does that help?

- >> COUNSEL BAILEY: I appreciate that, chair Steele.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Okay. Member Crockerham.
- >> MEMBER CROCKERHAM: Thank you brother and thank you to everybody for having this conversation and it helps me to decide. My expertise is in job training and work opportunity so I feel like group two is where I wanted to be and so either that or with the youth development. But my compass is always going to be geared toward work opportunity. So if you could, please put me in group two, my brother.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: I got it. I'm going to add you know. Let's go back to the top real quick. Thank you for the excess and for the folks that spoke up to get us here.

Strategy one, please put your hand up so that I can write you down to be added to that group. I got Connie. I have Yanira. I have Reba. And I have Anna.

- >> MEMBER LIMA: That's correct. I can't raise my hand.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: And Tolu, you want to be added to that too?
- >> MEMBER WURAOLA: Yes, sir.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Got it. You can put your hand down. Very, very, much. Moving onto strategy two. Economic sustainability. Fuentes-Miranda, Castillo, Crocker night. Member Fuentes-Miranda?
- >> MEMBER FUENTES-MIRANDA: I'm good with staying with Strategy 2.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Alan Shea? That's not one of our members?
- >> CFCI: No, it is not.

- >> CHAIR STEELE: Strategy area three which is education access and youth development. Education access and youth development. Eakins.
- >> MEMBER EAKINS: Member Eakins.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Member Eakins and I'm going to add myself to this one. We don't have a proposal in so I'm good to go. Anyone else on this one? Thank you. You can put your hands down. Housing instability. Strategy four?

Member Lewis. Member Victor Cyrus-Franklin.

- >> MEMBER STEVENS: You can only be in one group?
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Unfortunately. I'm trying to make it easy for you man.
- >> MEMBER STEVENS: I like difficult.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: [Laughs] anyone else for this group? Housing instability? Everybody can't be in reentry; okay? 123-45-6789. You can put your hand down Cyrus Franklin.

Strategy five, reentry and community reintegration. Please raise your hand. There we go. Great.

- >> CFCI: That's not a Member.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: That's not a Member. We got you on the community side. You want to be able to choose your breakout room to follow along.
- >> CFCI: Community will be able to choose their own breakout room and move within them as they see fit.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Member Williams? Reentry?
- >> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: Yes. Reentry.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Anyone else? Hey, Adam.

In the body of work in this from JCOD's standpoint, where are you all at? I'm only asking that because you're here instead of the judge.

>> MEMBER BETTINO: Not exactly sure. We cut across a lot of these. Hang on one second. Probably reentry as well.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Okay. Cool. All right. Anyone else? Can you do me a favor, Ruth or whoever is in charge of the roll, can you bring up the roll for today? Go ahead, Member Lewis.

>> MEMBER LEWIS: You know, just question and you may be able to answer it or maybe JCOD can.

But one of the things that I know is that these proposals don't fit neatly into these five categories and I'm certain there are housing related in strategy one and so can somebody talk Brit about how those decisions were made or did you all literally just keep them separate? I know some cases previously they showed up in different strategies so how did you all make that decision? It's not that many or that simple about what went into what strategy. I know for a fact there's housing stuff in strategy one.

>> CHAIR STEELE: That's a great question. There are literally 86 different combinations of selections on this, right?

And so what I did was I went to the description, into the outcomes, and the target population so term using those three categories and reading each and every one of them which one was the primary that sat with, who they were representing and what they were trying to do.

But you'll see when you go through it. We didn't eliminate the ones that were select and when you are reading through them you'll see the multiple were selected and you'll see reading through the descriptions. Just noting that that was the case but in order to help us do the grouping. All this is divvying up the work to be able to elevate it when we get to work next week. Does this make sense? I'm asking to pull up the roll so I can see that everyone is put into a group.

Megan. Jackie is absent. Cyrus-Franklin. Wendy. Rosa, what are you trying to do?

- >> MEMBER SOTO: Housing.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Housing? Thank you, Rosa. I appreciate that. Thank you very much. Hina? Yes?
- >> MEMBER SHEIKH: Just confirming, Chair Steele, that I am able to join number two if I'm just, I'm not waying in on the department's proposals?

- >> CHAIR STEELE: That's correct.
- >> MEMBER SHEIKH: Wonderful. May I be added to number two?
- >> CHAIR STEELE: And you said you are?
- >> MEMBER SHEIKH: Department of economic opportunity.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Got you. Done and done. Okay. Okay. Okay. Anna Gorman added. Yes. I'm coming back around. Making sure everybody in here.
- >> MEMBER GORMAN: I should be in one.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: You're in one. We're good. We are all now accounted for. Okay. Thank you very much, everything.

Now here is what I want to do. Some of the framework -- as I was mentioning earlier at the top of the conversation and you know, we can respond to this and we're going to spend the next 15 minutes talking about this. Actually, the next ten minutes talking about this. Um, we have a lot that's happen not guilty our communities. So when you look at these recommendations, you'll see that it is actually reflective of that. What the needs are, what folks are going through, what communities are impacted. So as you are going through this, I want to make sure that those considerations are lifted up.

In your packet that you're going to get via email, it will have the rubric and guide us on how to use it. It will also have the breakdown of the service we have. We actually received by the end of Monday -- how many servers? Eighty-eight? Kassy?

- >> KASSY ANGEL: Yeah. Let me get that number real quick. Give me one second while it loads.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Okay.
- >> KASSY ANGEL: For community surveys, 93.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: You'll be able to use those as a reference and the 93 surveyed and the levels of the bodies of work that we're doing. And I just, you know, just having an honest conversation you all. Like what's happening with these ICE raid -- deplorable and there's some responses to that as well. There's at least three to four direct responses of how we can actually address those needs for our immigrant communities.

There's also, you know, when you think about the housing front, the reentry. But also the needs of Black folks definitely come up very clearly in this. I want to lift up the team for their presentation yesterday and identifying directly what the need right side and how we can address them, even having a few recommendations that came out of that report. Basile some of those responses that came by way of our process in this as well.

I am making, I am bringing this up because, you know, when we look at our Community Agreements, you know, the remembering why we're here and the communities that we're elevating and why we're here, you know? You know, as Joe was mentioning earlier, there are several instances in here for our [name] and Indigenous folks who are lifted up in this too. TGI community and LGBTQI+ community as well and impacted people across the sphere of influence. We have our biases individually. I know that.

But one of the beautiful piece that's we have that we wring to the table when it comes to this space is our ways of looking out for each other. So I'll end by saying that I want you all to harken back to even the conversation that we had when we were asked about the \$12.3 million and how we wanted to allocate that and taking ourselves back to the commitment that we made to the Indigenous communities about what resources we had if the money actually came back around and the commitment to being able to move forward with the strategy that's we had and as soon as the resources come back around, the first is being able to come through on the commitment. Being able to have those types of conversations with each other to be able to address the needs that we can with the \$219 million.

As you're going through this, keep the Community Agreements in mind. And utilize the tools, for sure, but in our robust discussions on how we want to lift up things, let's work together. I'll pause on this. And if there are some specificity to the strategy work on this that you want to add and how we actually engage with each other in the space, we can talk about that as well. No? All right. I killed it. All right. That's what I'm talking about. Yeah. All right. Heard? That's what I'm getting from this? Heard? All right.

So how we divvy up the workload. That is what I want to do right now for the next -- what we got? I got five-minutes. I want you to take a look at the breakout. Noah, can you make the breakout rooms available, please? I want you to take a look at your breakout group that you have been assigned. And I want you all to kind of go into those spaces. Now when you go into the space the goal is to connect with each other about the purpose. Getting a chance to take a look here. The document you all should have access to. I don't want to

put the spread sheet in the chat. Everybody has access to -- somebody bring it up. And let's determine with each other how we want to make sure that we breakup the work. Now for each of these groups, as you may or may not know, for group one there's 60, for group there's 46, for group three there's 62, for group four, there's 40; and for group five there's 56. Right?

We have one, two, three, four, five people in two. Three in three and three in four and three in five. We may need to move from strategy two into another group to make it a little bit more -- let's go into our groups and talk through how we want to divvy up the work and then I'll call everybody back together after that to answer any questions about what steps we need to take and we'll go into general comment at that point. Okay?

>> MEMBER LEWIS: Just as a reminder real quick, our groups have to be ready by when? What's the date?

>> CHAIR STEELE: What?

>> MEMBER LEWIS: We will have to be ready with recommendations by what date?

>> CHAIR STEELE: Next week, Thursday.

>> MEMBER LEWIS: Ugh.

>> CHAIR STEELE: I know. That's why the spread sheet for me is going to make this a little bit easier. When you're actually doing your read through, having all of them already grouped together makes this a little bit more straightforward. Do you know what I'm saying? For me at least. But yeah. Any other questions? All right. Then go ahead and choose your group now. I'll see you all in five.

[Break-out groups]

>> CFCI: Members of the Committee are welcome to join any group that they like to listen in and know what is being spoken about within each strategy and to move within the strategies and bounce around as the conversation is taking place.

>> CHAIR STEELE: We're right back. Almost. Almost. The rooms are closing. The rooms are closing. Thank you very much, everybody. That's pretty straightforward, right? Pretty straightforward conversation? We have 15 seconds in the room and folks are on the way and finding the button is sometimes kind of tough so you have to just wait for folks. Welcome back, everybody.

Can I get an ask? I have an ask. Can I get someone from either strategy one or strategy two -- let me ask this question first. Strategy five Joey and Adam that was in that space, are you all good or do you need some help?

- >> MEMBER BETTINO: Curious to hear how many other folk -- to review. I think we're probably okay because there's only 56. We had to divvy up a couple because some of ours and Member Williams can take those and I took some of his so I think we're okay.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Okay. Okay. Because we're heavy in strategy one and strategy two, particularly from my County friends. I know you want to be in the space where you're at.
- >> MEMBER BETTINO: Happy to take some help if there's help to be offered.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Anyone open to offering their happy to the reentry space?
- >> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: I told them 28 didn't sound so bad each when we have run 150 before.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: We have run the whole gamut before and that was a doozey. A lot of work. If y'all feel comfortable, I'm cool with it. I'm with you as well. Strategy three.

Here is the last framing on this and I want you all to remember, you will get the email with the rubric and also the version of the -- I mean, you already have the spread sheet and you have the PDFs too and you will get the rubric with guidance in your email tomorrow morning; okay? Because that's based off of some of the conversation here and I want to make comments and work with the JCOD team before it goes out.

These are concept recommendations. When you start reading through this you'll see how specific some of these program descriptions are. When we get to the conversation next week, you'll see part of the questions in the rook Rick is, if there are items that you would combine, what would they be? You can make suggestions as a note for yourself so that when we come back to the group discussion on this, you have the ability to have that conversation with each other about how we can make the more specific ones that actually

can be combined with each other into abrader concept, right? What we have found over in no time doing this work is the broader concepts are easier for us to write our briefs for or were grants for. We have to set this up for success on the back end. So the broader we can make the concept recommendations, the better. Right?

Am I right, JCOD team? Anybody can answer.

>> RUTH: Yes.

>> Yes.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Got it. We can tackle that as we get to it next week but as you're reading through it I wanted to make sure you have that as part of your recommendations. Concept recommendations. Any questions about the guidance that we're doing here together? All right man. I appreciate you all. Thank you for rocking, rocking with me on this.

I want to go to general Public Comment and then after that for those who, you know, I want to also -- I got you Reba. I was about to say it. I want to circle back to the conversation around the measure G piece and if you all can oblige me additional minutes. Let's go to Public Comment first.

>> KASSY ANGEL: Thank you Chair Steele and we are opening to the public mental. As a reminder the Public Comment period is # minute per person. Telephone users please dial star nine to use the raise hand future and star six to unmute yourself. Computer and smartphone users locate your raise and feature to be laced in queue. General Public Comment are limited to the matters within the subject matter jurisdiction of the CFCI Advisory Committee and we will call you in the order that you have been.

>> CFCI: Dima?

>> DIMA SHAH: I wanted to know just curiosity out of the proposals submitted, that were the totals for those. If all were to be funded in the perfect world, wondering what the total was.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Mmm hmm. Got it. Thank you, Dipa. We'll make sure we can respond to that on the back end. Next. Noah?

>> CFCI: Next hand raised is Alan Shea, please state first and last name for the record. Alan Shea, I believe you've been unmuted.

>> CHAIR STEELE: No?

>> CFCI: Maybe not. You're unmuted, Alam Shea. Please state your first and last name for the record if you wish to make a comment. Okay.

>> CHAIR STEELE: All right.

>> CFCI: There are no more hands raise dollars.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Thank you for the question. We will circle back. \$565 million. That's rounding up. So it's like 564 and some change. 565 rounding up. Right?

So as you all can see, we got some work to do to get that 565 to 219. Okay?

Thank you very much. All right.

Move being on to this, really quickly, to the measure G/Measure J situation. All right. Context. As you all know measure G was passed in this last election.

By the vote of the people and also the initiative that was brought forward by the people, Measure J was also passed several years ago. And then there was also Measure A based on the work with the sheriff and I can't remember the name of the title. The problem that actually existed here is that what you look at the chart ear, the County Charter, when the measures are passed, the charter is supposed to be updated. And the County Charter that is available online has been updated as of 2016.

The writing being based on 2006, I do believe. Right? So with all of these measures that have taken place that have impact on the charter, the way the charter was written, and not having them updated when you have something that is changing the governance of the County by way of measure G, when the writers are looking at these things, they were not being looking at the most up to date version and had these aspect inside it and there were things that were missed. So part of measure G and the adding on of the CEO as an elected office in 2028, also eliminates a particular article in the charter where Measure J actually sits. And based on that and I'll let County Counsel speak to it from the County perspective but I'll speak to it based on findings of my colleagues in the governance reform taskforce. We found that the removing of that particular article, actually article three and several of the sections that Measure J sits in, it's -- by 2028. Article that came out.

- >> COUNSEL BAILEY: Pardon me. I'm trying to raise my hand. Pursuant to the Brown Act this is a Special Meeting called today and so items should be agendized and I would say there should be no talks of measure G and J because it has not been properly agendized and I would table until the next meeting. Government Code section code section 95946 and no other business can be considered at the meeting unless it's been agendized. So I would definitely caution the Committee in going forward with discussions today. To agendize, I think it's not a problem.
- >> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: If we want to talk about the weather, we can't?
- >> COUNSEL BAILEY: I'm not going to get into semantics with you.
- >> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: Who are you?
- >> COUNSEL BAILEY: County Counsel.
- >> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: I'm Joey Williams, Board Member, and I can say what I like.
- >> COUNSEL BAILEY: I'm advising.
- >> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: I think we can talk about it. We're not making decisions. It's a current event. [indiscernible] is not agendized and we're talking about them.
- >> COUNSEL BAILEY: I gave you the government code. You can accept that or not. I'm not going to get into an argument.
- >> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: [Overlapping speakers].
- >> COUNSEL BAILEY: I'm not going to get into an argument, Chair Steele.
- >> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: You're doing it according to your bias.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Heard, Robert. I got you. Your point of view is given. Understood. To Member William's standpoint, in the idea of general Public Comment moment which we haven't moved from because I haven't say we were moving onto item ten, the ability -- the ability to talk through some of the general things that are going on, I got you. We didn't agendize this and we're not making votes or decisions and to that point. What I will ask you, Robert. In the idea of having this conversation, what happens? Because this is a Special Meeting and we're not necessarily doing anything. So what is the recourse in this? In us having this discussion?

>> COUNSEL BAILEY: The recourse basically is that the Brown Act still applies here and you will still be in violation of the Brown Act. That's what I say to you. That's my answer to you right now. Nothing would be harmful if you want to agendize this at a later date. I've given you the legal aspects of it and that's all I can do.

>> CHAIR STEELE: I got you. Appreciate it. Heard.

So basically, what we're dealing with here and there's actually been articles that have been already written about this and you know, it can be goes to the times. I'll just say that and I won't share anything and I don't want to violate the Brown Act in sharing things with the rest of the members but we have work to do to protect Measure J and that's what I'll say. The County owned up to the administrator mistake and public as far as the article is concerned.

If you think about Measure J if you remember the sheriff union was the one who took it to court and took it to the next step all the way to the Supreme Court which Measure J and shout out for the work they did in helping to get it there and all of our supporters and that. It passed and so it is law. So even in the measure G space, Derek Sahi who was a part of the union. Measure J is law. Period point blank. Our job is to make sure we help to defend on that way. We have work to do to making sure would your allocating resources appropriately in our community and making sure that happens the way it needs to and making sure we can take care of each other by way of how we allocate those funds but know there's another fight on the horizon that we're going to have to tackle when it comes to the Measure J and G.

So if you're interested more in that, you can join the measure G taskforce -- I'm sorry the taskforce meeting coming up because it is agendized to discuss in more detail and Rasa and I sit on that Advisory Committee or I'm sorry taskforce as well. Rosa, I see your hand up as busy. Please.

>> MEMBER SOTO: Thank you. So you know, just want to thank everyone for the thoughtfulness around these issues. It is unfortunate most difficult situation that we are facing, especially when we're looking at an environment that requires us to truly respond to a gap that existed for our voters to have a voice at the table and to me, both measures were really that response in wanting change and wanting community representation. And so my hope is that in the process, right, of learning more and learning what can be done, we can have more fruitful and engaged conversations that help us get to the root of what each of

these measures was trying to achieve and move the work forward so that the communities most vulnerable are uplifted until the work that we're doing. I feel privileged, Chair Steele, to sit with you in both spaces. I know we will move this forward.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Thank you Rosa. I really appreciate that. And you know, we have to defend the house, y'all. Because lives are literal really in the balance. There are lively hoods and lives being impacted by the resources that we have already been able to be a part of allocating and have also gotten on the ground and you know, the amplification of that is happening in this process that we're in together right now. And as was talked about earlier. Like, there are things really happening in the community as Rosa just amplified that we have to make sure we lock arms together to support. But we also got to lock arms and support the work that is in front of us when it comes to protecting the resources that we fought so hard for in the first place. I want to reiterate the Board, you know, .....

The Board is doubling down on this and I want to make sure that the sunset piece, the way I read it -- and I have documentation on this too. If you're interested, let me know, reach out to me independently and I can send it over to you. But yeah, man, that's one of those things where you think you got it all together but you still got to do the work to implement and also protect the success that you have gotten. So I want to get ready to end but for Member Stevens who brought this up initially, did you get what you are looking for from this? Is there anything more that you want to lift up?

- >> MEMBER STEVENS: No. Not necessarily but I do think that it should be agendized so that we can at some point have a full discussion.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Got it. Thank you very much. I really appreciate it.
- >> MEMBER STEVENS: And I also want to acknowledge you, Chair Steele. This was not -- I didn't expect it to this point. My intentions were good when you raised it.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: Yeah.

Member Williams. He's a starch defender of speaking truth to power. So when power tries to speak to us in a certain way, he's going is to stand up and say what he needs to say. So I'm not mad at that at all. [Laughs]

- >> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: One hundred. You can take that to the bank.
- >> CHAIR STEELE: And Robert is just doing his job so not mad at that either.

>> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: The only difference is I don't get paid.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Yeah. That part. So you're good, Member Stevens. No worries and thank you for bringing it up. Again, assuming best intentions and I got your back on that. Thank you everyone for your time and attention. Be on the lookout for the rubric and see you all next week as we take the next steps. Our coming immediate meeting is July 17th and we'll be virtual and you won't have anywhere else to go. Same bat time and same bat channel. Thank you for sticking it out with us. Meeting adjourned.

[Meeting adjourned 6:10 p.m.]