

JCOD: CFCI:CEO

Thursday, August 21, 2025

3:45 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

>> DEREK STEELE: Looking at the row, it doesn't look like we have quorum. Is that the case?

>> Hey, Darren. I'm online. But I'm not there. You see people are not enough there for quorum today or no?

>> DEREK STEELE: I'm asking. All right. Thank you. No worries. Yeah, it's good to hear your voice. I'm 5 minutes out and stuck in traffic. Kassy, are you guys there?

>> I will be there in a moment. I apologize.

>> I'm a South Carolina man but.

>> I grew up in Spring Valley.

>> DEREK STEELE: Hi, everyone. I'm sorry I'm late. I'm literally on El Segundo right now. If we have a quorum, we can get started. Can you all hear me in the room?

>> Yes, we can hear you, Derek.

>> DEREK STEELE: Okay. Just checking.

>> DEREK STEELE: How are you all doing? Let's go ahead and call this meeting to order. We're going to get to the disclosures and some of the other stuff out of the way. Can we go ahead and do the meeting disclosures?

>> Thank you. I will now read the meeting disclosures. This meeting is being recorded for the purposes of the meeting minutes. By remaining in this meeting you consent to being recorded. This is a public meeting and subject to the Brown Act. Since conversation and statements on the chat are not visible to the people on the telephone 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 the members of the public would like to provide a comment, please do so during the public comment period for the specific agenda item or during the general public comment period. For closed-captioning assistance, C.A.R.T. services are available. You may access these services by clicking on the StreamText link that will be provided in the chat after the reading of the disclosures. When accessing Zoom through the computer browser or Smartphone Zoom act, scroll to the reactions in the bottom of the Zoom and raise hand feature. Scroll to more, at the bottom tab, there should be 3 buttons above more. And you will see a drop-down menu with the raise hand feature. For anyone experiencing online technical difficulties, telephone dial-in information will also be provided in the chat.

During public comment, telephone participants may press *9 to raise your hand or press *6 to unmute. For Spanish interpretation, please click on the globe icon and select Spanish. Written public comments are to be submitted to JCOD@LACounty.gov.

DISCLAIMER: This is NOT a certified or verbatim transcript, but rather represents only the context of the class or meeting, subject to the inherent limitations of realtime captioning. The primary focus of realtime captioning is general communication access and as such this document is not suitable, acceptable, nor is it intended for use in any type of legal proceeding.

And these public will be shared on the advisory -- will be shared with the Advisory Committee members prior to the meeting and will be reflected in the meeting minutes. Written comments received after 5:00 p.m. the day before the meeting through end of the meeting will be made part of the public record for the meeting. However, Advisory Committee members Ray not have the opportunity to review those comments prior to acting on an agenda item. This concludes the meeting disclosure. Chair Steele, I'll pass it over to you.

>> DEREK STEELE: I appreciate that. Thank you very much. I'm going to go ahead with the Land Acknowledgment.

The land beneath our feet
Is the ancestral land 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
The four-legged creatures who once
Roamed the earth freely;
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.
Labor acknowledgement.

Most modern-day U.S.

Institutions have benefited
From the unaddressed legacy
Of stolen labor at the
Foundation of this nation
And its vast and inequitable wealth.
We respectfully acknowledge
Our debt to the enslaved people,
Primarily of African descent,
Whose labor and suffering built
And grew the economy
And infrastructure of a nation
That refused to recognize their humanity.
While the 13th Amendment
To the Constitution technically ended
“slavery” in the U.S.,
we know that slavery’s
ongoing impacts are still felt
by countless people forced –
through violence, threats,
and coercion –
to work in the U.S.
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
who built railroads that allowed for
westward American development,
Japanese Americans whose properties
and livelihoods were taken from them while
incarcerated during World War II,
and migrant workers from the Philippines,
Mexico, and Central and
South America who have worked
Pacific Northwest farms and canneries.

We recognize the immigrant
and American-born workers of African,
Asian,
and Central and South
American descent whose labor
remains hidden in the shadows
but still contributes to the wellbeing 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 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
on to them.

Together, can we read the community agreement and then we'll go ahead with
roll call. I'll start.

1. Be respectful of the diverse voices being represented and remain open-minded.
 2. Be mindful of power dynamics in this space, as well as of the historical disenfranchisement of Black and Indigenous communities accordingly, prioritize and defer to community throughout this process.
- >>

3. Be mindful of the diverse audience you're presenting to and make sure you speak with clarity.

4. Be collaborative.

5. Assume best intentions.

6. Challenge the idea, not the person.

7. Remember why we're here – to center the Black, Brown, and Indigenous communities and other communities that have been most impacted by the carceral system – low-income communities, trans and gender nonconforming folks, etc.

8. Defer to community.

9. Transparency and follow-through.

10. Be intentional about hearing and allowing space for additional voices to be uplifted.

11. Be an active participant and try to be succinct in your thoughts and contributions.

12. Let equity lead the way.

13. Make spaces for youth voices.

14. As much as possible, allow community members to finish their sentence / thought during public comment.

15. Review community agreements before every meeting and amend them as needed.

16. Begin CFCI Advisory Committee meetings with a land acknowledgment statement recognizing and respecting the indigenous peoples of the land we now call Los Angeles County.

Can we please do the row? I know we don't have quorum, but it's okay.

>> We will now conduct the roll call to expedite the process, we ask all advisory members to be ready with the microphone before your name is called so you can be ready to announce your attendance promptly. If you're unable to raise your hand, please raise your hand so we can assign co-host privileges to you. If you're calling on the phone, you can unmute yourself by pressing *6. You raise your hand with *9. If you're participating remotely, please indicate this by stating "presently, remotely under just cause or present remotely under circumstances" after your name is called. After roll call is complete we review the attending members. For those attending just cause, we will ask you to briefly state your reason for the 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 the remote attendance. And then we'll confirm your participation under emergency circumstances. We will now begin the roll call by last name. Please say present or present remotely.

[Roll Call]

Member Songhai or alternate present.

>> Alternate present.

Member Carbajal alternate. Meg Castillo alternate. Member Contreras or alternate. Alternate, present, remotely. Emergency childcare issues.

Member Crunk or alternate. Member Franklin or alternate. Member Eakins or alternate. Present.

Member Tsai or alternate.

Member Fuentes-Miranda or although. Member Garcia or alternate. Member Hong or alternate. Present. Member Lewis or alternate.

>> I am en route, I should be there in 15 minutes.

>> Member LoBianco or alternate. Present. Remotely. Alternate. Emergency, do not have childcare.

>> Member Knight or alternate. Present. Member Scorza or alternate. Present. Member Soto or alternate. Present. Remote. I'm about 10 minutes out.

Member Steele or alternate.

>> DEREK STEELE: I'm here. I am here.

>> Member Stevens or alternate. Present. Member Williams or alternate. Present. Member Richmond or alternate. Member Wong or alternate. Alternate, present.

This meeting has not reached quorum.

>> DEREK STEELE: It's cool. We just won't be able to do item 7. So we'll circle back when folks come in. We're going to -- yeah. We're going to go ahead and move on to item 8. Yes. Okay, cool. So what I notice in the packet, there are the letters. The letters are not in here. Do we have those printed out or not? The letter to the CEO and the Board of Supervisors? No? We didn't print them out -- the letters?

>> The letters we sent?

>> DEREK STEELE: Okay. Can we send them? Are they available on the link? No? Okay, cool. Yes, I can do that. Why don't I make sure it's available to everybody. I saw it. Sweet. Okay, so we'll start with item 8 as a debrief, says July debrief, but to be honest, this entire process to kind of check back in with everybody, umm, I got a chance to really sit back and think it through. Even as I was editing the final version of the letter, which is being sent to you all now. And I'll get to what is it in, and what is the substance of it and read through it.

But thinking about the history of this all, like how we got here from starting with asking the question and finally getting the answer of kind of an audit of the furnishing that have been utilized by way of CFCI to getting that answer, and immediately coming up with a strategy to figure out what to do about the large sum of money that was sitting unspent to advocating to the Board of Supervisors about the responsibility and the importance of having community voice in the process of determining what the unspent funds should look like, getting a motion passed that helped to establish some precedent, or at least an opportunity to establish a precedent with the May 6 motion.

And immediately getting to work over about 7 week's worth of week after week work of talking with community, getting feedback from them, and then coming up with the recommendations together with a collaborative effort using ad hoc committees along with the deliberation in this space.

Each of your contributions, it doesn't matter if you are representing a department, if you are representing community, if you are representing lived experience, if you are representing community-based organizations, each of the community members who showed up week after week to be a part of this, community members that, yes, representing CBOs, but those who are doing work on the ground day-to-day that advocated for the different concepts, we were able to take into consideration some things with our process and a very real way that I know that through the county's status quo of doing business would not have been able to be considered.

And I think there is something to be said about that and applause that is definitely worth giving for the tenacity of that and the thoughtfulness in it, and the impact that it potentially has. And I say "potentially" because the work is not done yet. Board of Supervisors still has to approve our recommendations.

As we speak, you know, there are conversations across the county in community spaces, the gatherings of peoples who want to see some of these recommendations come to life are trying to determine what steps they need to take on September 18, and also on September 30th, which is the cluster meeting as well as the board of supervisor meeting will take place. There are already steps that should be honest saying from the CEO office. Their preliminary look at our recommendations, and left to their own devices, I am 100% sure they will be looking at 50 million, not the 219 million. 50 million, not the 219 million left to their own devices.

So it's important that we also do not just let the process go as is. We have to make sure that the voices are heard. But we'll get to that part. I just wanted to, first, as a debrief, just kind of like recap where we've been in all of this. And say thank you for all of your energy, your thoughtfulness, and your contribution to what I will say is a moment, maybe it is a small moment in history, like maybe a pointed one, but a moment in history nonetheless, in a way that L.A. County does business.

It was a big moment when measure J passed in the first place. It's a very important aspect to actually making sure the implementation of it has the tenets and the values that was the original set intention when the motion was passed in the first place. I think the work we continue to do together gives us the opportunity to make sure that comes to life. So, thank you, pretty much.

[Applause]

So, yes, please. I was about to open the floor to see if anybody needed or had anything they wanted to address or bring up.

>> Thank you, for sharing that overview and acknowledging all of the work that the committee has done. But even if we're looking at the \$50 million, I think it's

important to acknowledge the process and how those and where that unspent money actually came from, which I did not hear mentioned. And so being that we're talking about the \$219 million that were unspent by the county. Is that correct?

>> DEREK STEELE: Pretty far.

>> Member Steven: While the \$50 million is concerned, should we be more thoughtful about community and look at where or if there are any of the county concepts that were also a part of that \$50 million? Because it's concerning to me that they, the county would not allow us to make recommendations if that would be the case for the \$219 million. I think we should be really thoughtful about how and where that \$50 million was being spent.

>> DEREK STEELE: Can I interject real quick, if you don't mind, Reba? When we made our decisions, we did two things. We had tier 1 and tier 2, right? Tier 1 is the breakdown of the \$207.5 million. And it has been 3 weeks since we regularly been in this conversation. It was broken down to \$50 million because the CEO had already put forth a set of recommendations to the Board of Supervisors back in June for the other amount outside of the \$50 million, of the total 219 though, right? So they had their own version of the recommendations for the 219, which only left us 50 million to provide some recommendations for them. But we do both. We didn't just rest on that. It's not, nah, we want the full conversation around the full 219. So it's both. We have identified how we want these resources to be utilized.

And it is a mixture of both county, as well as community-based and community-identified set of concepts. Ones that kind of aggregate all of those things. Just want to be clear about that. It's not destined to go the county and just one way. Even the ones we identified out of the 50 million that is supposed to do that, it is an aggregate of concepts that we collected that are from county and from community is how the resources should be utilized. Does that make sense? Or is that not answering the question you're asking?

>> Member Steven: Certainly, it makes sense, but there's a game change. And I can only speak for myself, but from a broader community, that hoped that there would be a true opportunity to make recommendations for those dollars. And it just brings back to mind the question I had raised in our last meeting where is this cue on? From the CEO's office.

>> DEREK STEELE: Yeah, from the CEO.

>> Member Stevens: Basically, the amount that's allocated, is the word you guys used.

>> DEREK STEELE: Allocated. Is Kieu here? Quick question. The recommendation that you put forth, have you already set out to encumber those funds? Are those recommendations still encumbered? Are they being poised to get started?

>> Kieu: CEO is not the project administrator so we're not part of the encumbering process so I'll defer to JCOD to talk about the encumbrance and day-to-day nuts and bolts about how the project gets rolled out.

>> DEREK STEELE: Let me fix the question then. Have you all green-lit the encumbrance process for the recommendations that you all put forth in June?

>> Kieu: CEO is not in the roll to green light the encumbrance process for those projects. And I'm saying this because we need to be very clear what CEO's role is versus what JCOD's role is as project administrator for CFCI overall. So, again, I would defer to JCOD to provide that detail because they are more involved in the day-to-day with the department that receive the 15 project allocations on June 24.

>> DEREK STEELE: All right, cool. So the last question then. For the set of recommendations, you put forth to the Board of Supervisors, have the conversations you all have been having with the Board office about the CFCI funds and the recommendation, and our recommendation process, even since you've gotten our letter, like, what has been the conversations that you are having about this process?

>> Kieu: CEO is continuing to review the package that JCOD transmitted to us on July 31st. We received JCOD's memo and the committee's memo I believe on Monday morning or Monday afternoon of this week. And so we are still reviewing that. In the context of the supplemental changes budget process which is currently underway and for which we're reviewing the budgets for all the departments, including CFCI.

>> STUDENT: So the room for the 219 that we recommended being the strategy coming out of supplemental is still a possibility, and it's up to the Board of Supervisors, is that correct?

>> Kieu: The 219 is up to the Board. The Board can choose to alter any of the recommendations they have made on June 24. And that would be at the board's discretion. But as I mentioned last time, which I think member Stevens brought up, I know that departments have already started administering some of the 15 projects. And so it would seem difficult for a department that's already in the stream in administering some of the projects, like the Board already approved to stop midpoint. But I can't speak to what departments would do, and I can't speak to what the board would do.

>> DEREK STEELE: Um-hum, got it. Did you want to mention anything on this?

>> MEMBER BETTINO: Not especially, but I will clarify or seek to clarify. As of July 31 meeting when the question was asked. The department has submitted programs sort of descriptions in summaries to JCOD staff. We've been reviewing those and having conversations with departments. When we looked at encumbrances, last look at encumbrance, no county has that. So there's planning for the funds, but to my knowledge, none of those funds have been encumbered yet.

>> DEREK STEELE: Can we make sure in your conversation with CEO as well as the Board offices as far as this is concerned, as we approach September 18 and

September 30, that is the case? That, yeah, there may be some planning but none of the dollars have been encumbered yet, right? What are you thinking?

>> Member Bettino: Again, this is would not move past the Board since they approved the projects since June 24. There has to be subsequent action to cause this sort of slowdown or the stopping of that. And that action has to be taken by the Board. They haven't delegated that authority to JCOD or CEO. And so while it's unlikely that a huge amount of funds are being encumbered by then, some of the projects have a fair amount of ramp uptime, in other words, right? Contracting, hiring, things like that. It wouldn't be JCOD's responsibility to stop because the Board has already taken action on June 24, nor would the CEO do that. And I don't want to speak for Kieu-Ahn. And of course, as often happens, my team is correcting me live here or offering me some support. And it sounds like DHS did a small encumbrance already.

>> DEREK STEELE: For what project do we know?

>> Member Bettino: I can find out.

>> DEREK STEELE: Okay.

>> I always like the history major. So the context of history of measure J. But 2 million voters voted to measure J and funds to go back to the community. And these funds that the county has decided to start allocating slowly or however fast they're allocating are CFCI funds, and it's not within their obligation to allocate these funds. It's something that's upon this board, Advisory Board, to approve all recommendations. And submit them to the CEO for approval and then to the Board. That's exactly what we've deposit with the funds. But it seems the Board and CEO office has gotten ahead of us and started to do this. And it feels very disingenuous considering there's a lot of work we all put in, reading through all the concepts that we've done year after year, having the community come out and give voice is it feels like it feels shady and it feels like it's skirting the process of CFCI and what we've been entrusted to do for the community by 2 million voters.

And we should do whatever we need to do to halt the dollars from being allocated, because if they're not meeting the priority of CFCI, then they shouldn't be allocated. And unless this board has approved and submitted to CEO as a process where it's supposed to go. I find it very convenient that certain county that didn't spend the money and now they're able to allocated through this process which is also disingenuous and not forthright in this whole process for doing. And I've been a good player. I've gone through it and showed up and I've advocated for all of our communities, not just the native community, but -- yeah, you know, I don't think it's legal what's happening under this process. And I think we should examine those parameters, too, on the legality of what they're doing. Because I don't think it's legal of taking those funds we already pre-approved, that people didn't spend, should be sent to CFCI and allocate to do our priorities. So if the Board is allocating our funds already and not with the vote of CFCI and the voters entrusted us, they're out of line. And not doing what

their responsibilities are for this process. So I'm just speaking freely and I'm just reminding us of the process and all the hard work we've done here. And, yeah, something needs to be done. And you know, also for future allocations, we need to look deeply at people who didn't spend the money or responsible for spending the money and not give them anymore money until they can prove how to spend it. Otherwise, we're going to be back here over and over again for the following year. And our communities pay for it. The people that need it the most. It's a life-or-death situation out there. Like Reba always reminds us. This is not fun and games. This is real dollars going to our community.

>> DEREK STEELE: Thank you, Joey. All the way, man. Please.

>> Thank you, member Williams. You know, as a member of the community, you know, not a dog in the race. It's really, really uncomfortable for me right now, as I look around this room at county representatives who I'm certain had knowledge of what the process is and what is already going on behind-the-scene. And not to, you know, express that. You know, so I don't know if we are a committee that is lacking in the area of cohesion? What is missing here? Because it feels disrespectful. It really, really does. And it's unfair. It's just really -- and it needs to be said. We have given up our time and we're here together, and it doesn't feel like there's a togetherness. And I want to know how moving forward that can change, because what is transparency?

And how are we holding ourselves and each other accountable? And we can't -- I can't act as if the elephant is in the living room and we'll put a tablecloth on it and it doesn't exist because it exists. As we're asking and we're probing for questions, we shouldn't even have to go there. It should be laid out on the table so that we know what we're all up against. Because it makes me look at you different. It makes me look at you differently.

>> DEREK STEELE: I think toward that end, knowing where we are -- oh, please, member Tsai.

>> Member Tsai: Thank you, Reba. I certainly appreciate the way that you feel. Speaking for myself, although I would assume there are other county departments represented here who are in a similar position. I just want to be clear. I did not know these details. I don't know if I'm uniquely ignorant to the process. I think we all know the process has been complicated, fast-moving, and hard to track. I mean, I don't know what's going on.

Given this is a public forum, I just want that to be clear. I mean, certainly, any group, any advisory bias such as this should be unified, cohesive, coordinating on the work and responsibility of the group. I certainly agree with that. But I don't want -- I wouldn't want misunderstanding about the complexity of the process, and who knows what. Like, which is why I wanted to say this. Thank you.

>> Chairman, Steele, member Sheik has their hand up.

>> DEREK STEELE: I'll come to yours after member Lou with us.

>> Thank you. I'm sorry I couldn't be there today. I just want to echo what the Advisory Board has said. We want to clarify some of this information wasn't clear to us as a department. And, ultimately, what transpired on June 24 and cuts to the program that already launched and funds that already have encumbered and what happened. And just agreeing with what member Tsai said, ultimately, not everybody knows really how things went down and we're piecing it all together. And so I hope, as a body, we will work together on a unified message, on a coordinated message, and make sure the recommendations coming out of the community are prioritized. So the ideal commitment is to make the programs that launched and in the process of getting rolled out to the public, continue to remain as whole as possible and we'll do our due diligence to find the resources possible.

>> DEREK STEELE: I appreciate that. Thank you very much. Member Lewis.

>> Member Lewis: Couple of statements and then a question. Thank you for your leadership throughout the 7 weeks in creating space for this conversation. I do think there's a lot of things that have been disheartening in the last several months that I also, unfortunately, don't believe that the Board is going to shift what they've done. You all heard me say that because I want to make sure that potentiality was at the forefront of the extra hours working overtime and commitment people put in. But for me, and now, you know, whatever organizing we do to push them to change their minds, so be it, I don't think it's likely. So for me, what this brings up, the motion which the supervisor did, help and make sure we weren't left out. And at the same time, we need a workflow and other processes memorialized in terms of what that looks like with respect to the community Advisory Committee, the CEO, the Board, and covering all the scenarios, right?

If there was an unspent fund in the middle of the year or somebody returned, whatever the different scenarios that would arise that would allow us to inform how the money would be spent and/or when the 3-year, I think we extended to 4 years and we voted on that and we're actually issuing the whole tranche of money. And we need to focus on putting that in writing and not just from the CEO office but board of deputy that is where the money well spent, so no matter what happens, we're going to come back to it and follow-up so it makes sense. And that's the next step for this body. So my question is, what is the overlap from your tier 1, I believe you identified the 2019 is tier 1. What is the overlap between our proposed tier 1? Anybody has done any analysis and what was already approved by the Board? Has anybody done any analysis? We're having a whole conversation but what does that look like? JCOD, did you do that to the analysis to the overlap and the programs that are already approved that are also in our tier 1? Has anybody looked at that?

>> So the only proposals that we received from the community that overlapped with the recommendations that were approved from the CEO was the military and Veteran Affairs. You're talking about the concepts?

>> DEREK STEELE: The question is being asked, the June 24th letter? From the CEO's office. How many of those overlap what's proposed in tier 1?

>> I know there's more than one so that can't be accurate. It's more than one.

>> DEREK STEELE: Particularly, the county ones.

>> It doesn't sound like it's been done. We need it. If you're still going to push, let's push. But I don't know how we're having a conversation with the absence of understanding what that looks like. So how much is aligned to what was already approved by the Board and what they're asking them to do? And we need to know that quickly.

>> DEREK STEELE: Yeah.

>> So we're in the process of doing that analysis now. We're taking a look at what was approved in June 24. The other thing is we're going through the recommendations from this body. Some of the areas, it was clear what percentage should go TPA versus county. Some of the areas, it was less clear. And so we're looking at the different proposals within each of those sections to see how much funding we could recommend will go to county departments. And then quite honestly, from there, some of the amounts when you start to boil it down are fairly small. And trying to determine, again, how those small amounts of funds, are they meaningful enough to be allocated?

And I want to back up a little bit. So the CFCI budget policy currently, and this is something that we should take a look at if there's appetite for it, which I think there will be. I mean, it states that CEO will make budget recommendations on one time unspent funds.

>> DEREK STEELE: That was the original before the May 6.

>> Right. So then, again, May 6 happened. And it's given this body a, what we just established, right? Over the past several weeks. So I tasked the team working all that out until September 30th, until the next fiscal year so we have a longer time line to look at the recommendations that this body can make. Meaning, concepts come before this body, without knowing what the dollar amounts are frankly, because you won't know until later in the fiscal year. Concepts could come, people could come and make presentations if you want to take it that way, and it would give us -- it would give this body a lot longer timeline to make determinations on one-time unspent. There will always likely be unspent funding year over year, over year. The county department, despite best intentions, things happen, contracts are slow to start, can't hire staff and things like that. There's going to be money that should be allocated, which is why the May 6 motion sought to set up some sort of process. We've gone through it once. We learned a lot. So I've asked the team to start to map that out.

So that we can have a process that we're going to follow moving forward.

>> I'm sorry, before we go too far back to the other conversation, you said you were working on the analysis to understand the overlap between what was approved

DISCLAIMER: This is NOT a certified or verbatim transcript, but rather represents only the context of the class or meeting, subject to the inherent limitations of realtime captioning. The primary focus of realtime captioning is general communication access and as such this document is not suitable, acceptable, nor is it intended for use in any type of legal proceeding.

and what we submitted. What was your timeframe to get that done? Will it be before the September 18? I don't know what that is. The chair keeps referencing. So what is your timeframe to get that allocated?

>> We can get that done before September 18.

>> Okay, can it be the week before as opposed to September 16 so we can analyze it? Can it be the week before?

>> We can do it next week.

>> Okay. Thank you.

>> Cool.

>> DEREK STEELE: Thank you very much, member Lewis. I've been having -- I was reading something that was in an article about the difference between hard power and soft-power. And to be honest.

[End part 1]

Beginning of part 2

[CAPTIONER CHANGE 5:00 PM]

JCOD CFCI Committee meeting

>> CHAIR STEELE: And to be honest, this entire year has felt like a battle against soft power. That's what has been going on. CEO had the ability to wait; they decided they didn't want to wait.

To be honest, my friends around the table and those not around the table have the ability not to wait and it is up to us to make the decision to wait for the time frame and to make recommendations and to be able to come forward without actually making moves. I understand the people who don't have a choice in waiting on the people impacted by these resources. They don't have the ability to wait.

So even in suggesting giving it time to go through the process, I get consternation just thinking about it because I know who actually loses in all of that. It's not any of us around this table; it's the people outside.

But I think the choice to be in concert with each other is that choice. I think, you know, we've been able to have to make that choice over the years. I think this is one of those moments where that choice matters. Right? Do we make the decision to try to move forward with resources just

because we can? Or do we actually do the work together, stay and lock arms until we have gone through the process to understand exactly what is possible and what's not?

I think it says something to the Board of Supervisors if the departments are standing down and waiting for what the community's recommendations come afford. But the question comes, are we all brave enough to do that work and be in solidarity with each other in that way? Do you know what I'm saying? It is in moments like this when the world feels like it's on fire that it matters how we showed up.

That the memory ends up being long on who decided to do what in a moment like this. I'm just an optimist at heart. There's a belief that those of us within the capacities that we do have, you know, when given the choice to lean on your better judgment, lean in that direction. That's my hope. I'm a hopeful person in that way.

But I am, you know, not to put anybody on the spot right now, but at least putting it on your hearts in the conversation, let's do the right thing.

We did this work. We spent the -- we toiled, we spent the hours, we spent the time. We spent the -- we gave as much thoughtfulness as we could do it. You know, tried to narrow it to some positionality that made sense for the quality of what all of us can do and we got it to the point to where the Board of Supervisors get on Board with what the community wants to see but we have to be in that same vein. For those listening who are around this table and those not around the table, to have the ability to reach to JCOD because the June 24th letter that CEO decided to use their soft power and do any way even though they knew what they were trying to do in this space, you know, I'm asking, maybe not. Let's wait until September 30th before you reach out, when the decision is actually made by the Board of Supervisors to say what the actual say is on the issue. Member Lewis?

>> Member Lewis: I want to understand, best case scenario, the Board of Supervisors decide to shift and change their mind and what the departments have planned for continuing to plan for and new things. What needs to happen? Given how volatile time is and funding that's reduced and everybody that's a Stakeholder in all these factors that we're talking about, we do desperately need the resources to hit the ground and expansion.

What else's else would need to happen to make sure we don't hinder the department and TPA's ability to fully utilize the funds, given the time frame. So what does that look like?

I want to make sure we don't inadvertently create more challenges with the delays because that's a possibility.

>> CHAIR STEELE: That's a good question. All the way up to encumbrance itself, what are all the steps up into the line?

>> MEMBER BETTINO: I want to make sure that I understand the question. So we're talking about the full amount?

>> CHAIR STEELE: Mmm hmm. She's asking the -- like, say everything waits until September 30th, the Board of Supervisors gets behind what we're trying to do but the departments who are going to be in charge of this, it may impact their ramp up and timeline to actually get the dollars out the door. So I'm interpreting what you're saying is like, what can we do to --

>> MEMBER LEWIS: Make sure they have the full amount of time to spend the dollars so we don't run into unspent funds because we delayed it. If you're saying Day 1 starts whenever they start is not an issue, if that's the answer, that's great. If that's not the answer, I want to understand what the implications are.

>> MEMBER BETTINO: It depends on the program, unfortunately. When we review these things, right, the question that we're asking all the time is what is the actual ramp up time. The not perceived ramp up times. Some organizations are going to say we're ready to go. When you start to big into it, there's no contract in place. They need to hire staff. If you're going to hire staff, do you have an active list? These matter in the terms of bureaucracy. Program by program, what the actual ramp up time is going to be.

In the example you gave October 1, the dollars are free to be programmed but each program would need to have its own ramp up time. So the only thing we're doing by what you're suggesting is waiting two months for them to actually go. They can potentially still start some planning. We'd have to have some conversation with those departments to sort of push pause. Not all of them are part of this table, right? As you have acknowledged.

Some of them aren't members or watching this very closely. They are counting on us to give them feedback or updates accordingly. We would have to have a conversation with them. Nothing is actually lost because I don't know if any of them, other than the one that we mentioned, and I want to make sure that I'm being responsive here.

Housing retention contingency general has encumbrance. No other program on the June 24th Board letter has started to spend, if that's helpful.

Again, all it does is delay things a couple of months and October 1 they still have the additional ramp up time after that.

>> CHAIR STEELE: So, there is a world where the possibility is the conversation can be had to get ready so that October one we can go. That's what you're saying?

>> MEMBER BETTINO: Yes. And this is where our team comes into play, right?

So if the dollars have been -- and, again, Member Lewis, please jump in if I'm misunderstanding. The dollars will be programmed on a 36 month cycle. Our team works with everybody very closely to make sure that they are spending.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Mmm hmm.

>> MEMBER BETTINO: That the ramp up time is shortened as much as possible. We can't control their contracting process or their hiring process. We're administering the dollars. So I can't have my team push any harder than, please provide information on where you're at. Please make sure you're spending.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Right.

>> MEMBER BETTINO: Every time I see my colleagues, if I know there's under spent, please spend, please spend the dollars.

The other part is we have implemented a process whereby the folks will need to come and have a conversation about what's going on with us what's going on with your project. The May 6th Board motion also, we provide quarterly data on spending.

The dashboard is just about done. We met with our team yesterday. You all will see this on a much more regular basis where you all will have access to where the spending is and you can ask the question at my point, where are we at? Why aren't we spending? Those things will be implemented moving forward. We have the May 6th motion to thank for that.

>> CHAIR STEELE: In the conversations that you are having, let's take the steps to get them ready for sure. But, like, slow walk this encumbrance piece as much as we can until we get to a decision from the Board of Supervisors and that's what my ask. I Joe Judge has the ultimate decision on what she does and does not do and I know the departments have the ultimate decisions on what you do or do not do. But a party to this space, acknowledging what has been said by Member Stevens, Member Williams, Member Lewis, and even Member Tsai. We know what we have done. How much work we have put into this. Let's get to the finish. Do you know what I'm saying? Let's work together to get to the finish line. Member Lewis?

>> Member Lewis: We recommend to the CEO who makes the recommendation to the Board. The things you're saying there Chair Steele, don't come inform fruition unless the CEO makes the recommendation to the Board to adopt ours. I haven't had that come up in our conversation because we're the recommending body to the CEO who has the discretion or not to modify or accept what we submit. It doesn't get before the Board.

>> CHAIR STEELE: I got you.

>> MEMBER LEWIS: So, by what date will we know? I'm thinking about a lot of important things. I'm thinking about not letting our hard work and time and effort to be ignored and thinking about the community voice. And I'm also honestly thinking about the additional chaos this creates for the grant administrators. So, by what day will we know whether the CEO's office is going to propose the full 219 or to propose to adjust any of the previously approved budget in the supplemental process. It doesn't happen unless they do that.

Any insight from folks from the CEO's office on kind of the timeline where when we would know whether they are going to move anything outside of the 50 million forward to the Board?

>> CHAIR STEELE: The cluster meeting on the 18th matters too, right? The CEO office has to go there first before it gets to the Board office on the 30th. And we --

>> MEMBER LEWIS: [off mic]

>> CHAIR STEELE: We will know for sure then and at that point we have the ability to make the case. Just like the community organizations did to us as far as like the California for healthy living stuff and all that type of stuff where that wasn't even part of the consideration yet. But then we went back and reevaluated it because it was brought forward.

Like, we have the ability to make sure that the Board offices know for sure, like, up now until that point -- because the letter that's gone out to them and advocating inform that standpoint and even in the meeting saying look, we have a full \$219 million set of recommends and all of this stuff that we have done. That needs to be considered and not whatever the CEO is talking about.

>> MEMBER LEWIS: Strategically it's important to have the overlap. If there are services and supports that our community feels strongly about that are not included in what's been approved, we will need to make strategic decisions about which pieces we're lifting up.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Hmm.

>> MEMBER TSAI: One question. I may be missing something but I think the Board needs to act before the CEO would offer up the bigger recommendation. The Board has acted on the money that has been allocated. I think the COE is only going to recommend from the 50 million because the other money has been allocated because the Board acts in advance. I may be wrong. I don't know, Adam or others, if you know that, but in the line of conversation, I think that's the first step.

>> CHAIR STEELE: To both of your questions, Kieu Anh?

>> The Board has already acted on 169 of the 219. That's 219 minus 50, right? And so the Board acted on the 15 recommendations, including the three programs restored via Board motion on June 24th and that adoption provides instruction on the departments to move forward with implementation. As Adam clarified, some departments are moving faster

than others and some departments have been, working on protect designs. I'm assuming all of them have. I'm not sure who has been implementing.

>> CHAIR STEELE: You are aware of what we're trying to do. What is on the table is the CEO recommends to the Board offices, particularly at cluster, what are you all going to do? Are you leaving room for our \$219 million or are you, is this, you know what I mean? What is the intention of the CEO's office.

>> KIEU-ANH: Of the 219 the Board gave a green light to 16.

>> CHAIR STEELE: But you have the ability to go before the Board knowing what we have done. The question is, are you all willing to put forth both tier, is of our recommendation.

>> KIEU-ANH: I can't speak to CEO's final determination because we're still in the progression of evaluating what you submitted to us on the 31st and the memo that you submitted to us earlier this week.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Is there at least willingness?

>> KIEU-ANH: There is always willingness to consider the material presented to us by the Advisory Committee or by JCOD.

>> MEMBER LEWIS: Process wise the Board has to direct the COE. The Board has directed the CEO to move the 169 forward. So, the process is why the CEO cannot tell the Board to redirect. It will have to come from the Board office, Chair Steele.

>> CHAIR STEELE: All right.

>> MEMBER STEVENS: [off mic] .

>> MEMBER LEWIS: I'm saying strategy.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Strategy wise. I get it. It shouldn't be this hard, man. That's just the point I'm making. Okay. Heard.

September 18th is on a Wednesday.

>> September 18th is a Thursday. Additionally, we have quorum in the room and there's 40 minutes left in the meeting for the presentations and voting on the minutes.

>> CHAIR STEELE: The next meeting is actually on that same day. On the 18th.

So we'll know what's going on as far as that's concerned. All right. This is heard. I understand.

So just so you are aware what we can do is to have some level of advocacy that is needed to bring this to the attention of the Board of Supervisors now. I mean, we were already going to be organizing to metastatic sure the voices were heard for the Board of Supervisors, but I hear the understanding that there needs to be some action made to instruct the CEO's office to [laughs] -- to move option of what they are doing right now. I'll just leave it at that. I have so many other words that I will use that are a lot more colorful, but I won't use them in this space. Yes?

>> Just to clarify, the cluster will be the 17th. The date I gave is incorrect.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Okay. So, it's on the 17th. All right. There's still work to do. There's still work to be done is what I'm hearing. And for those who are interested, I think because we still have the community engagement ad hoc committee or the Committee on community engagement.

So it sounds like we do some additional strategic work we need to do outside of this space to make some of this happen so we'll work to activate the Committee on this. And I think most of the voices who are kind of speaking already are already on that committee.

So just be on the lookout for an email, for an additional meeting outside of these as far as additional strategies that we'll take. Cool? It's good to see you.

Yeah. Yes, Member Castillo. I'm sorry.

>> MEMBER CASTILLO: I also want to say, I don't want what Member Tsai uplifted to guess lost in the sauce. I feel like it's unfortunate and disheartening that you and County departments don't know what's happening in the County. That's kind of alarming, right? I do feel like as much as possible, when in this space, please ask questions so that we can get answers together. I think that will kind of help us move the needle in a direction that the County is supposed to go.

Because sitting idle and asking questions and not inquiring only further complicates things and ultimately our communities have to suffer. Again, strongly encourage those of you who have a little bit more of a bird's Aye. View and invite sight of what's happening on the back end to inquire. It may be difficult because of your positionality within the County and you may feel disempowered but ultimately again, implore you to think about the Community Agreements and remember why you're here and really pull up for folks that you are offering services to and trying to support.

That is ultimately why we're here. So again, just encourage you all to show up in that way. Thank you.

>> CHAIR STEELE:

>> I think there's a lot more alignment than I think we realize and the lack of clarity. We need Crystal clarity.

>> MEMBER HONG: We didn't put our parties forward and we may have had different parties that we would have put farther with one-time money and we were awarded funding and if it remains how it is, we will act on it and deliver the services to the County. I think if we had all of our choices on the table we would not have necessarily selected the same allocation of funds and I want to note that we recollect speak up and ask questions and we're aligned in many ways and when there's lack of clarity of the process, there's impact on both sides.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Noted. Something you said earlier, Adam, and we're going to move on. About taking the concepts and like utilizing that to determine what the amounts are. That is not a good strategy to the CEO who is listening as well. If that's what y'all are doing, don't do that.

Mainly because, like, for instance, the housing ad hoc committee did not utilize the concepts to determine what their amounts were. Like, they -- based on what they heard from those concepts, they determined five categories and put percentages of amounts per each in there. So for the County recommendations call us. We can help you out. You ain't got to try to do it in a vacuum. You weren't here when we put it together so you don't have the answers.

Holler at us. We got you, be we're here to help. We're not here to be adversarial.

Clearly the points of contact of everyone around the table and those to lead the efforts we can get the answer of what you're looking for. Don't do it blindly because you were not here in the process we got you. That was to the CEO and not JCOD. JCOD, you were here. Any additional questions on this? I'm not to move on. Member Carbajal.

>> MEMBER CARBAJAL: Apologize I was late and I've been in traffic listening and I don't want to relitigate everything being shared.

I do want to lift that I am 100% in agreement with Member Lewis about the way she framed the conversation about the need to have timelines and processes in place to get us here. I can't help but think about how I operate my own department and the programs that I oversee in that we look at the budget cycles in terms of when we make decision on things to be answered and not funded or funded.

I don't think so it's the fault of this body but the fault of the time and space of which we have to react to what's happening. The time has not allowed us to step back and look at what's working and not working and that we have to pull this back and reallocate it.

The question of some departments that were fund and didn't spend the money and the money that was pulled back. There was a serious conversation like Member Williams mentioned, do we fund them again? Is the idea mature enough to fund them again or at a later moment? We haven't been allowed that space as a body to make shows types of Assessments and decisions because we're constantly playing catch up to what's happening and responding to what's happening.

I raise that not to relitigate but because I couldn't share when I was driving.

What has been recently allocated, my department was allocated some funding through the reallocation of the CFCI unspent dollars. One was for rental assistance for those impacted by the fires or the negative impact of the economic state of the result of what happened by the fires. There was \$8 million I believe that CFCI allocated to that. I can't touch that money because I need the abort to take action and take a motion to say move forward with this program as design and recommended and done. That money is still there.

Two, I was allocated funding for our state housing eviction program. You are asking if we have the ability to pause. I kind of do and I kind of don't. I am funded, this program is funded through the end of December so I am actively negotiating with my partners to enter into agreements with them. I have a fiscal cliff that impacted 38 nonprofits that provide these services, right?

I have potentially \$5 million locked in for a 22 million-dollar program and so if I don't lock those in come December than 38 of my nonprofits don't get funded and essentially our eviction prevention navigation services and rental assistance programs comes to a screeching halt until potentially decisions are happening at LaCasa as to what they do with the funding they control. Just is to provides perspective over where some of us are with some of this.

The other CFCI funding was for a first time home buyer program. We are spending that. I would love the opportunity to share with you the beautiful outcomes that have come out of that and the families that have been able to purchase homes and have come out of poverty as a result of that and have been able to start building wealth. I am proud and haven't been able to brag about it because we get caught up in things here. Lay program, we are in a deficit for immigration legal services.

From my perspective you have an ally at the table, whether it's talking through the nuances of how we navigate the complexity of our weird budget cycle that we have as a County and how we can use that cycle to achieve what we want to achieve as a body? Is it going to take time to sit down and map it out? It doesn't seem like we're going to have the opportunity to do it in this space because we're doing other things in this space. Maybe in the future if there's the possibility to create an Executive Committee or ad hoc committee to help us form how to put processes in place and keep us on track in future.

>> CHAIR STEELE: I appreciate that and as a cap to it, you're absolutely right as far as the rush process in this.

As I was saying at the top of this meeting and in this section, when we found out what happened, we immediately had to get to work.

I just feel like it's, it's just, uh, disheartening that even as we were doing our work in uncovering's things that we uncovered, we were -- it feels on the

backside that we were taken advantage of by way of some of the decisions made to put forward a motion when you knew we were doing this work to address this as quickly as we could.

Nonetheless, we are where we are at this point. Because of the May 6th motion we have processes that we can begin to put pen and paper too. Do you know what I mean? And I just want to say, we've been talking with JCOD, the leadership has been, with JCOD about what those systems and policies need to look like. I think as we go through the next several months of meetings, we have the ability to like really hone in on that piece. Once we get past this budget cycle. But the thank you still remains and the assuming of best intentions also remains too. By no means am I pointing the finger at folks around the table like you ain't even the one.

I'm in conversations on the side to make sure team members and Community Members don't either because there is a lot of, like, work that is happening that we're doing together and we are doing something unprecedented.

So but the thing about doing something unprecedented: Once you set precedence, you have to hold and maintain it. Right? That was the reason behind the decision to not just lay down once with you found out what was going on but to actually get to work and do everything that we did. Even if this turns out to not be successful in what we're trying to garner with the \$219 million, the fact that we set the precedence of what a process can look like is probably one of the silver linings of this whole thing. But the fight ain't over yet, though. We come in and we got words. We will have words with the Board of Supervisors for sure.

Let's go to the meeting minutes real quickly, Member Castillo?

>> MEMBER CASTILLO: For the meeting minutes, I was present on the 31st. They just didn't unmute me.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Say again? Kill I was present on July 31st. They didn't unmute me.

>> CHAIR STEELE: We going to run it back. Let's do the meeting minutes. If there are any changes to the minutes that are needed, please let it be known. Member Castillo said she was present and I think a few others were

not acknowledged. Let's try to be mindful of making sure that throughout the meeting when people do come we check the box. Nonetheless.

Any motion on the minutes?

>> MEMBER STEVENS: I'll make a motion. I move that we approve with the necessary corrections the July 31st meeting minutes.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Motion made.

>> MEMBER LEWIS: I second.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Now is when we move to Public Comment.

>> Thank you. This commences the Public Comment period for this agenda item. The Public Comment is one minute per person. For those online who would like to provide Public Comment please use the raise hand feature now. We will call you on and when called upon please state your name. For those on the telephone please dial star nine to raise your hand and we will say your name or the last four digits of your telephone number. Star six to unmute. Scroll to reactions at the bottom tab in Zoom and you will see the raise hand feature. We will begin the Public Comment for approval of the meeting minutes for the CFCI Special Meeting on July 31st, 2025. Do we have any Public Comments in the room? Seeing none, we would like to go online. Noah?

>> There's one hand raised online. Chi Chi Navarro.

>> Hello everyone. I'm a policy intern with the Trans Latina coalition. Thank you to the committee for the commitment for centering the need. We see every day how deeply TGI people especially elders and those reentering from jails and prisons continue to experience -- I appreciate that both the Community Agreements and funding priorities, specifically in communities and support for -- reflects what our communities have asked for. Resources that meet us where we are recognize the harm we face and birth a pathway.

Culture responsive programs. We are here to partner with you to ensure this process embodies a care first/jails last approach. Thank you.

>> There are no more Public Comments online.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Thank you very much. Take a vote.

DISCLAIMER: This is NOT a certified or verbatim transcript, but rather represents only the context of the class or meeting, subject to the inherent limitations of realtime captioning. The primary focus of realtime captioning is general communication access and as such this document is not suitable, acceptable, nor is it intended for use in any type of legal proceeding.

>> We will now conduct the vote for the motion to approve the minutes for the CFCI Advisory Committee Special Meeting of July 31, 2025 with the corrections. We will be using a similar process to the roll call. Again, we ask all committee members to be ready with a microphone before your name is called. When I call on your name please indicate your vote of yes, no, or abstain. We will now begin the vote.

>> KASSY: Member Carbajal?

>> MEMBER CARBAJAL: Aye.

>> KASSY: Member Castillo or alternate.

>> MEMBER CASTILLO: Aye.

>> KASSY: Member Diggs.

>> MEMBER DIGGS: I approve for the prerecord.

>> KASSY: Member Cronk or alternate.

Member Cyrus-Franklin or alternate?

Member Eakins.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Mmm hmm.

>> KASSY: Member Tsai.

>> MEMBER TSAI: Aye.

>> KASSY: Member Fuentes-Miranda?

Member Garcia.

>> MEMBER GARCIA: Aye.

>> KASSY: Member Hong.

>> MEMBER HONG: Aye.

>> KASSY: Member Lewis.

>> MEMBER LEWIS: Aye.

>> KASSY: Member Sheikh?

DISCLAIMER: This is NOT a certified or verbatim transcript, but rather represents only the context of the class or meeting, subject to the inherent limitations of realtime captioning. The primary focus of realtime captioning is general communication access and as such this document is not suitable, acceptable, nor is it intended for use in any type of legal proceeding.

>> MEMBER SHEIKH: Aye.

>> KASSY: Member Knight.

>> MEMBER KNIGHT: Aye.

>> KASSY: Member Scorza.

>> MEMBER SCORZA: Aye.

>> KASSY: Member Soto.

>> MEMBER SOTO: Aye.

>> KASSY: Member Steele.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Aye.

>> KASSY: Member Stevens.

>> MEMBER STEVENS: Aye.

>> KASSY: Member Williams?

>> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: Which one?

>> KASSY: Joey?

>> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: Aye.

>> KASSY: Member Richland?

Member Drexler?

>> MEMBER DREXLER: Aye.

>> KASSY: Motion passes.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Thank you very much. The last piece of the agenda was a presentation about the evaluation of our work.

Considering what has been mentioned by several of the members today, about the need to make sure that we're codifying the process, part of that is the evaluation as well, right?

You know, what we have done, what has been successful, what has not been successful. You know, what the impact has looked like over time. And so I know it took some time to put it together but we do have our evaluators here today. Harder + Company community research. Please.

I know I completely limited your time in the way that the conversation went today. But I think at the very least we want to make sure there's a hashed introduction. If there are some like very pointed pieces of the presentation that you want to make sure that we're leaning into, please by all means, the floor for the next 20 minutes is yours. Just speak up just a little bit. Can we turn the mic up.

>> CRISTINA MAGANA: First of all, I want to say thank you for having us here and also recognizing you all are doing really hard work. And part of me was thinking what kind of -- activity can we do to recognize the hard work and pride and think about the opportunity with evaluation. So I don't know what your practice s chairman Steele, but I was feeling you all with your hard work and you are doing things differently. When you're doing things differently, there's pain along the way. I just wanted to appreciate all of you for what you're doing for LA County.

With that, next slide, please. I'm here with my colleague Taylor Anderson and we're here with hard an and company research. We are the team selected to do the evaluation.

Next we'll outline the evaluation aims including the scope of the work and what we hope to learn together; we'll highlight key partner support and evaluation and implementation and walk through methods to guide our evaluation approach.

For context you had this information for your June 26th meeting. As you hear us, keep in mind the meeting and make sure we're aligned. I'm hearing you speak about shared understanding. As we're starting this partnership with you I want to make sure we're entering with the value in mind of relational approach and shared understanding.

We'll speak about the work we have done to date. Our contract started June 2025. So we've been busy launching the work and getting all of our activities organized.

We do want to open the floor for some questions. We'll try to go quickly through the content and allow you to ask questions. Not sure it's appropriate, Chairman Steele but if you want us to come back at the next meeting, we're happy to do that. Some of us need time to sit with the information before we're ready to engage.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Thank you.

>> CRISTINA MAGANA: We're a California based firm. We have about 30 employees; most located in Southern California. We've been in operation since 1986 and we have had hundreds of projects helping organizations better understand how to do their work and -- bringing about social change as well as the common challenge they face planning, managing, measuring, and learning from their work. All that you all talked about earlier. We understand that. It's familiar and important.

Specific to this project we offer a rich background in helping community-based and sector organizations better understand the needs and experiences of communities and constituents.

Our initial founding was in San Francisco, and we have expanded throughout California since then.

I'm not going to spend a lot of too I am here. Next slide please, next slides. Just to give you a sense of our reach within LA County. We are working with multiple departments and quite a bit of the grantees, possibly, that are part of CFCI, might also be funded through the other ones. If you're following on the slide deck, we're going to the section on values and approach.

We know that we each bring our own experience busy data and evaluation and those past experiences shape how we respond to evaluators and the work they do. As a community-based research firm we know that evaluation isn't always done in way that's centers or serves the communities well. In fact, for many the communities at the heart of CFCI evaluation has caused harm and we know that and that's why I believe it's important to be up front about the values and our approach.

We start by acknowledging that history. We owe the CFCI community recognition of the harm causes and to be open about our firm to ensure to create community strength and value.

Open framework, fostering trust honoring both lived and learned expertise and making sure the evaluation becomes community centered. At our core we're sharing power, mutual respect, and amplifying the voices of the community.

Due to the timeline we have in place we are intentionally balancing that pace with cultivating a values based relationships. We believe the relational approach not only enhances our ability to do our work effectively but ultimately leads to a more meaningful, equity centered and impactful evaluation that drives data informed change.

And just quickly, this next slide. This is the team. Taylo and are here and we have a larger team supporting the evaluation. Next slide.

About the evaluation. We want to begin by acknowledging that the evaluation of learning has been a top priority for CFCI. JCOD, this advisory committee. Amity, grantees and other stakeholders having intentional about balancing the need for data and evaluation with allowing grantees the space to do their work while meeting reporting requirements. Data capacity through contract monitoring through amity. This has been an important step. This approach on building data capacity stems from CFCI's community centered process.

This community centered process also supports the use of community driven practices. In addition this committee developed the North Star Goals which serves as a strategic guide of putting the work into action. This background is essential and it is the foundation for why and how this evaluation came to be. This is your first step into systematic evaluation. Congratulations on that. It's been a long time coming.

Our team know significant effort and discussions went into shaping the crept evaluations and scope of work. To avoid conflict of interest JCOD took the lead in developing the evaluation questions.

The evaluation approach and methods are being carried out by our team. It's a little bit of how we got here, how the questions were developed and what we're doing. Next slide.

So we know that there is the strong interest in having a more structured approach to evaluation. And we also want to be clear about the scope of this first evaluation. As I mentioned earlier, you've all had a very robust

discussion in the June 26th meeting around what's possible and what's not possible.

Since 2020 request. F crime of has funded nearly 400 grantees to support community investments. All together this funding has covered 46 different program areas. This first formal evaluation is focused on Year one grantees that include just over 100 organizations and covers seven program areas. That's what you see in the slide.

We know you understand large scale systems change takes time and we -- the goal of this first evaluation is to paint a clear picture of what has been achieved so far and what steps are being taken toward North Star Goals. While allowing your grantees to do their best work. We can't lose that sight. This evaluation won't produce a single number or percentage. Instead it will give you a sense of progress being made in two ways. First, implementation. How the work is being done. Things that you talked about earlier. Second, outcomes. Where we are already seeing signs of progress. This information will help guide decisions about future fund, resources, and structures that will allow you to track those North Star goals and more effectively over time. Next slide.

I want to be clear about what you will see in the report. This work is going to be culminated in a report and one version in December. Is that right? November? Wait. Am I speaking out of turn? November. And then we are going to be providing a second report with recommendations in March. That's going to be the main deliverable of this work. What you can expect to see in that report first, it will help partners and Community Members better understand the work and the impact of CFCI. Second, we'll use what we learn to help guide direction with CFCI and identify improvement in grant making. Process capacity building and program areas. This evaluation experience will provide a foundation for ongoing evaluation. That means support CFCI to build on existing data, be strengthen how data is collected, and start to define what success looks like using more measurable outcomes tied to the North Star Goals.

Finally, if feasible, we'll make recommendations regarding evaluation tools that can be aligned to outline comes that are equity centered and culturally and linguistically responsive and focusing on being useful and not overly burdensome. The goal is to respect the grantees I'm and ensure evaluation is supportive and not a barrier to CFCI funding.

That's a little bit of how we got here and I'm going to hand it over to Taylor to talk about what we're doing moving forward.

>> TAYLOR ANDERSON: Good afternoon, everyone and thank you for having us, my name is Taylor Anderson and I have the privilege of providing more information.

Who we see as partners and what our methods are and what our timeline looks like moving forward. Next slide, please.

In line with our values and approach to evaluation as well as what I heard in you all's Community Agreements, we believe that our work is strongest when it's done in partnership with those most impacted by the working held at the center. So this slide here highlights the key contributors and partners that are involved with the evaluation. This includes JCOD, this Advisory Committee, Amity Foundation, grantees, and of course, program participants. Starting with the grantees and program participants, their main role in the evaluation westbound participating in data collection and sense making. You know, like as Cristina mentioned, honoring community is a core value driving this work and we really value that and we want to ensure had a throughout the evaluation we're really keeping that in mind.

JCOD's role is overall project guidance, including codeveloping the evaluation plan, participating in data and sense making and using the findings to inform the future of the initiative. We see this Advisory Committee as a critical partner.

You will be asked participate in upcoming focus group and sense making session. CFCI team will be sending an email tomorrow and be on the lookout for that because we will love to hear from you all. We anticipate the findings to form the future of CFCI. Amity is a key partner in this work. They have shared existing materials and data that we have been able to use and we'll be participating in data collection and sense making. Due to their role as the third party administrator, they are critical partners in the data collection phase, especially when it comes to participant recruitment and outreach.

They hold such valuable relationships and have been tremendously helpful in the process of recruiting folks to join the data collection activity. So we are immensely grateful for their partnership. Harder + Company

team, our role is to codevelop and implement the evaluation. Collecting data from survey focus groups and other methods and distilling those into the reports that Cristina was mentioning. Our hope is that from this slide you can see there is not one partner solely responsible or driving this work but that it's a partnership and that there's many different perspectives that are guiding the evaluation and service of our end product and the recommendations accident actionable and representative of a variety of perspectives. Next slide, please.

All right. So, I'll be quick on this slide. As Cristina mentioned, a few slides back. The questions guiding the evaluation were developed by JCOD within put from this committee and they are built around four key questions that are assessing the impact of the work, including how the grantees define partnerships and how the partnerships form and going how capacity is being built and where there are opportunities to improve and grow. These are the same as included in the evaluation summary that JCOD prepared for the June 26th meeting. I'm not going to read them all, but they should hopefully be familiar. Next slide, please.

Next for research method. How we will be doing this work. When evaluating CFCI using a mix of quantitative and qualitative data gives us a comprehensive picture of the impact. We are taking ace mixed methods approach not this evaluation by combining secondary data from Amity with new data we will gather and we have labeled as primary data. Grantees have submitted a lot of rich data already and we plan to build on that and supplement that information through new data collection where we will be conducting a survey with grantees, as well as interviews and focus groups with key groups, including grantees, program participants, JCOD leadership and staff, this Advisory Committee, including Amity staff and advocates.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Basically, using most of the content that we have created for this, right? Is that the case? Like, you know how we, the North Star work and all of that, like using that as a frame of reference to build of survey tools and stuff like that?

>> TAYLOR ANDERSON: Yes. Anything else? All right. The final step in this process is something that we call sense making. So, we will be bringing together a diverse group of folks to share synthesize the data we have analyzed and highlight the data, and the insights will help shape the findings and reports. As we have codeveloped the evaluation, our plan is to do the

sense making and the identification of findings really in collaboration are folks.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Got it.

>> TAYLOR ANDERSON: Next slide, please. As Cristina mentioned, it is a fast and furious timeline. There was a good amount of work happening between July and October and so when we think about the activities we have completed, so far we have facilitated kick off meeting with JCOD and Amity to ensure we're on the same page about the eval which goes and what we'll be doing. Reviewed and conducted inventory.

Activities in progress, we have currently we launched the grantee survey and we are working with JCOD and Amity to coordinate the various interviews and focus groups. And we are also in the process of developing a data analysis plan that will allow us to look at data across all of the sources and really connect the dots between all of the data we have collected from the different perspective to help service those findings.

Of course, we continue to meet with jay sod and other partners regularly to deepen our relationship and ensure.

Deliverables. As you can see, there's a lot of moving pieces to this and it's a quick timeline but we are happy to share that we continue to be on track with our timeline and with submitting deliverables. We know that folks are eager for this information and we are just as eager to get it back to y'all.

>> CHAIR STEELE: And the data sense making, data collection and sense making. Never mind. So, the reporting won't come out until October through March of next year.

>> TAYLOR ANDERSON: I can touch on that in the next slide if that's helpful.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Got it.

>> TAYLOR ANDERSON: If we zoom out a little bit. The evaluation is in three different phases. June and Julie valuation. Data collection and sense making August through September and reporting October through March.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Of this year?

>> TAYLOR ANDERSON: Yes. November we will submit a findings report within sights and finding and March a recommendation report on how to improve the grant making and administration process based on the findings of the outcome report. They are related.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Thank you. I'm going to ask for an additional 15 minutes here. We started 15 minutes late today. But if you need to go, we've already voted on what we need to vote in so you can call it if we need to step out. Just asking for additional time. Member Lewis?

>> MEMBER LEWIS: Thank you for the presentation. Three things. I just want to clarify. Year one refers to Year one cohort one or all 36 months of cohort one?

>> TAYLOR ANDERSON: All 36 months of cohort one.

>> MEMBER LEWIS: You may want to make that clear here.

>> TAYLOR ANDERSON: Thank you.

>> MEMBER LEWIS: And then on your research question slide, number one said what were the outcomes of Year one, et cetera. It has questions that are primarily focused on the process and the capacity development of the CBOs themselves. I just want to be clear. We had this conversation, I can't remember the exact outcome. But you are actually looking at ago aggregate participant outcomes as well. Can you clarify? There's nothing here other than the broad question that references participant outcome. Please clarify.

>> CRISTINA MAGANA: We're using some of the data collected by Amity so that will be included in the report for this demographic data.

>> MEMBER LEWIS: There's only one -- if these are your core -- I know their the broad categories but if these are your core questions on of concern, that doesn't come off the page that that's what you're doing. So can you speak a little bit do what the, what are the high level things you're looking at and reporting on related to participant outcomes because that's not here and a key part of what we care most about.

>> CRISTINA MAGANA: A few things. You might be familiar. There's milestone data collected from Amity and some of that is qualitative where there are findings around successes and challenges. So we're looking at

that across the program areas. There's also some of the TPA quarterly data that includes some of the demographic data and Amity is here so if they want to speak more about that but we have been working with them around that. From the data that we're collecting with participants, there are questions around impacts from both the focus groups, the surveys, and I think some of the questions will also come to you as part of the data collection that you'll be part of. I think one thing we want to continue to remind ourselves is that there's been a lot of change, right? There was like a lot of opportunity given to grantees to do their work. So we know that we're not going to be able to talk about impact when the perspective of percentage of reductions and incarcerations and this evaluation will not do that. It will tell you what you're doing around implementation.

>> MEMBER LEWIS: There's a lot between program enrollment and recidivism. For the sake of time, can we see in the categories, what are the broad outcomes they are looking at with the data they have pulled, Adam? Can we get a copy of that? What you said didn't quite answer my question but I'm sure you had it. What are the key types you're looking at related to participant outcomes. Does that exist somewhere?

>> MEMBER BETTINO: We would have to work with Amity to pull that out but we should be able to look at it.

>> MEMBER LEWIS: What is this evaluation company evaluating in relation to participant outcomes in relation to the seven categories is what I'm asking. Have you not established that?

>> CRISTINA MAGANA: I think at this point what we have is, as I mentioned, there's data on who is served. There is demographic data and data on region.

>> MEMBER LEWIS: So I'm alarmed. Maybe I'm not asking my question right. Obviously, demographics is important but that's not participant outcome data. If it exists in the seven category questions here, what are the key things you're looking at for participant outcome. Data is not an outcome. If you have it I'm asking for this committee to see. If you don't have it, I'm concerned. If this is a more so process evaluation project, then say that. If not, can we see the key things you're looking at for the outcome of the seven categories. That's my question.

>> CRISTINA MAGANA: To answer the question, the whole entire data set includes all of the participant or cut comes recorded throughout the 36 months. So we can share what those are.

>> MEMBER LEWIS: Categories of outcomes, the type of outcomes you're measuring for each of the seven categories. That's what I'm asking for. Is that possible to get the list?

>> CRISTINA MAGANA: It should be but as was mentioned, it's going to be -- it's similar to the presentation I provided the last time I was here as far as what are the outcomes we are seeing being met in program areas one through seven.

Because, again, our grantees are essentially doing --

>> MEMBER LEWIS: Right. They are doing different things but there's some high level outcomes that --

>> CHAIR STEELE: One time.

Part of the issue here is that there is a -- when we started this work, we started this work without indicating what -- I shouldn't say indicating.

We started off and got the money out the door --

>> MEMBER LEWIS: Without an evaluation plan, yes.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Do you know what I'm saying? Because of that what we'll end up doing is mostly a process report that has a starting place data. And I may not be explaining this right but the data that we do have that is congruent across all programs that have resources from CFCI is location, where the dollars are being employed, you know, who, what types of populations are being impacted. We have that stuff. But we have to actually indicate long-term outcome strategies that we're trying to make sure move, like that we're marking this against.

So to the point about like are we going to be able to show the changes for youth incarceration, we have to figure out the process indicators and the North Star indicator outside that so that we can see from when we started to where we are, did we actually meet that goal?

>> MEMBER LEWIS: I'm going to move on. I am very concerned. I understand all of that. That's why I've been pushing for this evaluation to be expedited. That doesn't -- okay. So, the final question is for you, Adam or JCOD.

Will there be a parallel process for the County departments since this is only focused on the TPA stuff?

>> MEMBER BETTINO: That's a really good question. We are talking through what that parallel process will be as a team and how we're going to be able to gather key data elements from County departments. Every County department's different data sets. All of these types of things.

There's also frankly a funnel mental question on JCOD's role and whether or not we should be reporting out on somebody else's program, just for frank. We're talking about that internally. The May 6th motion requires that we create a dashboard and start to report on outcome data so we're developing a plan to do that. That will be detailed in our next report back which is due to the Board September 7th. So we will detail what the plan is to start to gather that information and start to gather that data.

Part of that is that there are things we've been requesting from County departments to date. Part is gathering in more detail and developing Alain for them to actually report out on their own programs.

>> MEMBER LEWIS: Real quick. As a reminder, we extended this so we can have evaluation. I hope we don't get to the end of the extension and have JCOD say we can't really evaluate any of the departments. That's what I heard. Even if it's high level there need dollars to be equity. What I heard is that when we get to the end we don't have anything and I don't think that's acceptable. I have a lot of concerns about this one but I'll take them off line.

>> CHAIR STEELE: I want to note and I'm going to come to Member Williams.

One of the things we left out of the data and evaluation committee to green light this process when Steven was here was that through years wasn't enough time to actually evaluate the effectiveness of the work yet and that -- Reba, that was your suggestion. You're disagreeing with yourself. I'm just saying, I'm just noting that that was, part of the

agreement out of that so that we can move this process forward was to take a look at where we were for congruent indicators and untrusted the narrative around the process so we see this is a continuing process in a longer story that we're telling but this is the first part of the story of here is the process that we have created. His or her is where all the impact is happening. And this is what we will be -- so like the recommendations piece. These are the things that we should probably be tracking that we can make the decision and say here are the North Star indicators we will be evaluating in the foreseeable future post this first report. Post the first report is not the end all be all about what CFCI's effectiveness is but up until this point we don't have any report on what we have done at all.

Do you know what I'm saying? This is the first step into that.

>> Member Steele?

>> CHAIR STEELE: Give me one second. I want to come around the table. Go ahead you and I want to then go to Member Williams.

>> Thank you. I mean I think we -- we're careful around the outcomes pieces.

>> CRISTINA MAGANA: You've given the grantees opportunity to design their programs and Amity has come along to -- giving the grantees a lot of opportunities to define their individual outcomes. Part of our work as you have said chairman Steele is to mine through what has been collected and see what the commonalities are to get through a systematic way of measuring the outcome. I hear the account but I don't want to say we can provide the outcomes because the data was collected for a different purpose.

We're hoping the recommends will speak to what does it look like to move to a more systematic. We want to be careful to not over promise. It's Year one and a little bit over 100 grantees and only represents seven program areas but it's an indication of where to go with the other program areas.

So, we hear you and we're going to do our best to really pull out those meaningful insights and bring them back to you all.

>> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: All right. Am I up?

>> CHAIR STEELE: Member Williams?

>> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: I want to thank you all for being here. I just want to say that. I know what I'm not to say may come off hard. You're not the first group we've had to work with of consultants throughout the process. Just knowing you want to partner with us. We had no part in hiring you. My first question is how much is the contract that you have for this, I want to disclose that. I've been an advocate like Member Lewis from the beginning of evaluation from Year one and that's how we determine year two, year three, and then year four. Along with the County evaluation, we talked about the TPA evaluation and their process.

If you're using all the Amity's data we should just use Amity to pay the evaluation. How do the grantees report back on their experience with the TPA if they are part of the process. I have several questions and feel free to write them down.

Two, I have concerns about the slide about the team that you all have. I don't see any Indigenous people on that team or any Black folks on that team and I have deep concerns about it because evaluation can be very rooted in racial systemic racism and that's what is rooted in number J. I have concerned about the team we're going to be partnering with.

The last piece is you're talking about bringing the community together. You just heard we went through a rigorous process. Will our time be compensated for participating in this and will the grantees be compensated or are they forced to do this? I think you're going to be getting a different response if it's forced or if they are doing it for the community and being compensated. I'm you don't have to answer I'm hearing this to hear myself.

Experiencing the TPA. We should have been here a long time ago and here we are and we had no part in the hiring process of you and here we are again in another partnership and help me understand and help me help you because I think it will make the process, especially with the native community, go a lot smoother in this. Sorry I said a whole lot. You're probably thinking some of these things but you know I'm the one that like to say it.

>> CRISTINA MAGANA: I'm happy to answer what I can answer. And Taylor, help me.

When we talk about the next method approach we are using at existing data from Amity and using our own data.

There's a concept called triangulation where we bring the data together and what is emerging with the common theme when you look at the different perspective. Taylor mentioned the primary data and the focus groups and includes mullets approximately stakeholders and rounding out the data collected by Amity. Part of our challenge is the time frame and needing to collect the data and complete the work really by November when we're writing the outcomes report. It's a little bit about how we're mixing the existing data with the secondary data. When we are conducting the focus groups, Amity is not going to be in those spaces. We have experience around setting up and leading focus groups to work on creating that honest feedback. We have a protocol for that and we have been successful in that way so we're hoping to see some truths through those processes.

In terms of the makeup of the team, our firm is more diverse than what you see here. I'm happy to take the feedback and see what that means in terms of biases and I think that's what you're allude being to with the representation there. Incentives?

>> I need to double-check on Advisory Committee but I know for our program participants and the grantees will be compensated for their time.

>> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: Who was the group that hired you guys.

>> Our contract is with JCOD.

>> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: Can you disclose the contract amount or is that public information?

>> I think the contract is public.

>> It should be.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Yeah.

>> The total contract amount that we made with Harder + Company is 415,170.

>> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: And CFCI don't have to pay for that, correct?

>> MEMBER BETTINO: It comes out of our administrative percentage.

>> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: Great. How is, like, Member Lewis said about the County. That's AI whole other process but how are we thinking about the overall TPA evaluation of their process? Is that part of this or is there going to be something separate as well?

>> Part of our protocol has questions around experience with TPA. They hold a complex role. They are providing technical assistance and providing capacity building and accountability component.

Where they are seeing success and what that success looks like and feedback around opportunities for improvement. Recognizing there's a wide range of capacity within the grantees and reading taking that context. Likely feedback might be around more tailored capacity. Strengthening infrastructure but we have those questions as part of the data collection we will be leading.

>> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: I will recommend grace in working with grantees. They are under a lot of pressure and work and a lot of requirements they have to fulfill untrusted the TPA which I hear about all the time. And now they have this layer. Having grace moving forward and making sure we get to a --

>> Similar with program participants. We've sent out a -- what do I want to call it? A scheduling survey where we ask folks what is the best way for you to participate? Virtual? On the phone? What day and what times of days so we can schedule around their needs.

>> MEMBER JOEY WILLIAMS: Thank you all.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Thank you, Member Williams. I'm going to come to Member Castillo. Sorry.

>> MEMBER CASTILLO: I had a lot of similar questions as Member Lewis did, obviously, in our conversation. And I also want to name, you know, the further away we move as we extract information from details past -- the origin tension of Measure J and all of that, like, the further and harder it becomes to really get at the root of what we set outdo -- and I think it's really important to return back to the history and origin tent and not move just from information that has been extracted over time because it's easy to, you know, forget why we're here. So just wanted to, you know, put that out there and just kind of underscore that as deeply, deeply important from my

DISCLAIMER: This is NOT a certified or verbatim transcript, but rather represents only the context of the class or meeting, subject to the inherent limitations of realtime captioning. The primary focus of realtime captioning is general communication access and as such this document is not suitable, acceptable, nor is it intended for use in any type of legal proceeding.

positionality on the Advisory Committee and also echo the sentiments of my colleagues Member Lewis and Member Williams. Thank you.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Vibes. Any other questions? Go ahead.

>> CRISTINA MAGANA: Going back to the question Member Lewis asked about outcomes, I think there are a few outcomes on the Amity or TPA dashboard for all the program areas and we can share with you right now. Just let us know if this is what you're looking for. This is for all program areas, not just a few. And this is an older investigation. A new version, updated version will be coming out soon. That tells top types of housing, employment, education, et cetera. And this is public. [Speaker]

>> MEMBER BETTINO: This is public and you all can take a look and ask questions.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Go ahead, Ruby.

>> That dashboard is a public facing dashboard on the credit. FCI website and we're working on getting it uplifted because you have to scroll far down to the bottom of the page to get to it but I feel like a lot of the outcome questions you may be asking for might be on this dashboard and the updated one that we got a preview from today may answer some. Questions that you are asking for.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Thank you. All right. Cool. Thank you very much. Welcome to the team. Excited to get started. Eagerly excited to get started. We will do to general Public Comment.

>> We will now open the general Public Comment period. As a reminder, the Public Comment period is one minute per person. Telephone users star nine to us other the raise hand feature and star six to unmute. Computer and start phone locate raise hand to be placed in the queue. General Public Comment is limited to the matters within the subject marries jurisdiction. We will call on you in the order your hand was raised. Please remember to state your full name. We will now begin the Public Comment period. Do we have any Public Comments? The room? Seeing none, we would like to go online. Noah?

>> There are no hands raised online.

DISCLAIMER: This is NOT a certified or verbatim transcript, but rather represents only the context of the class or meeting, subject to the inherent limitations of realtime captioning. The primary focus of realtime captioning is general communication access and as such this document is not suitable, acceptable, nor is it intended for use in any type of legal proceeding.

>> CHAIR STEELE: Thank you, everyone. Thank you for your time and your energy. Like I mentioned at the top of the meeting, the Committee on community engagement, we'll be in touch so that we can engage with each other and come up with, finalize a game plan for our advocacy efforts that need to happen over the next several weeks. Other than that, meeting adjourned. Thank you very much, have a great rest of your week. See you all in a few weeks. September 18th is our next meeting. See you there.

[Meeting adjourns at 6:24 p.m.]