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MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you for your attendance.

I'm going to ask the acting secretary if she would call the roll.

(Roll called. Patricia Curry not present.)

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you for your patience and attendance.

We'll move to item Number 2 which is approval of the minutes from our commission meetings.

And is there a motion to approve the minutes?

(Motion moved.)

(Motion seconded.)

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Seconded and moved.

Are there any objections to move forward? There is no objection -- I see no objections.

Please record a unanimous vote.

Item 3, which is to take up the monthly financial statements.

MR. ORTEGA: Good afternoon. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Before you, staff is requesting approval of the April 30, 2013, monthly financials. There are no material
changes in our net position between March and April.
Expenditures are consistent to prior year.

These numbers are a soft close and are unaudited.
And at this time, I give it back to the Chair for approval.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Ortega.

Members of the commission, the matter's before us, what is your pleasure?

(Motion moved.)

(Motion seconded.)

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Moved. Seconded.

Are there any objections to adopting or receiving the monthly financial statements for audit?

If there are any objections, I'd like to see any of those who have objections. Otherwise, I take this as a unanimous vote.

Item Number 4 is before us.

MR. WAGNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the board.

I would like to just make a few introductory comments, which is to the consent items, and then turn it over to Yolanda.

Staff is bringing to the board just under 100 contracts to you today for consideration. This is part of our annual budget process.
In many cases, these contracts whether they be new contracts or renewals, have been in the pipeline in some cases for many years.

At the same time, as we were discussing further on in the agenda, this board has discussed in the past -- we are involved in a Best Start inquiry, which is really an effort to answer the question of and provide clarity and focus on the Best Start investment as well as the nexus between Best Start and some of these county-wide investments.

So one thing that we would like to modify in the consent items and propose for the board consideration is, should there be a desire by the board to go further into that inquiry, specifically go deeper through the board retreat and further discussions on Best Start, that we could take those county-wide investments that are applicable and put those off for consideration in a future board meeting after the board meeting on Best Start.

To go through these in better detail, I'll turn it over to Yolanda.

MR. STEELE: Commissioners Fielding, Southard, and Delgado each have individual conflicts of interest on individual contracts, and they are abstaining from participation.

And you still have a quorum without their
participation.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much. And all eyes will be focused on those individuals who are so named in the event they try to vote without our consent.

Ms. Bosch.

MS. BOSCH: Thank you. Good afternoon, Commissioners.

As I mentioned to you last month, this is the time of year we come to you asking for approval of contracts to be renewed for the upcoming fiscal year.

Today, as John mentioned, we are -- have almost a hundred. We have 76 renewals as a part of the '13-'14 budget. We also have 12 proposed amendments for the fiscal '13-'14.

And in '13-'14, additionally, as John mentioned, we have 4 new agreements, not 6, that will be part of the budget for '13-'14.

The two that we are asking to continue are the Health Food Access Contract and the Peer Support Group for Parent Lead Agencies Project.

And those, again, will be -- we can take those back and come back to you once we have a better opportunity to align them with our Best Start findings.

Also included among the renewals is 211 L.A. Counties Referral services. Please note that under Item
10 of the agenda, we will elaborate more on their compliance.

Another highlight that I'm very proud of is -- is that yesterday our executive director, Kim Belshé, signed the master agreement with the County. And it's currently at the CEO's office awaiting his signature.

This has been a matter we've been dealing with for quite a while. I'm sure you're familiar with it. It's to streamline a process of contracting with the County; so rather than renegotiating with separate County departments every time, we give them funding, the master agreement now becomes one single agreement with the County for multiple scopes of works and budgets.

So as a new party, we simply approve the scope of works and budgets, then they get added to our master agreement.

So on the consent agenda -- consent calendar for this meeting, we have four of those contracts, now, that are up for renewal that will be part of that master agreement. First is the Department of Mental Health Parent Child Interaction Therapy Contract. There are three with the Department of Public Health, and they are the Substance Abuse Treatment Services for High risk Kids, Reducing Childhood Obesity, and Health Access, which is the Healthy Kids.
While it did take some time to get this done, this will streamline future work with our county partners. With that, I'm requesting your approval of the agreements, renewals, and amendments as -- as noted. Staff is to complete final contract execution upon board approval of the 2013-'14 and program and operating budgets. That concludes my report, and I'm happy to answer any questions.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Members of the commission, questions or comments for the staff on item Number 4? While you think of what you might want to pose, I do note that there is a request of a member of the audience to be heard; so if Richard Cohen (phonetic) would come forward.

MR. COHEN: I have no comment.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: So you're waiving your opportunity to be heard?

MR. COHEN: Yes.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Looking for any other questions or comments, Commissioners?

MS. AU: Just a comment.

I really appreciated it, the staff's response because I think I'm the one that raised the red flag about
especially the new agreements and how they connected
to our Best Start effort.

And it -- it is becoming really, really clear
that a lot of the initiatives that we have, as a
commission, authorized oftentimes does not show clearly
how it all connects. And I appreciate the staff taking
the time to do that work.

And, therefore, again, I'm feeling optimistic
that, as First 5 L.A. we will have a very clear narrative
that what it is we're about and what it is we intend to do
with our funding.

So thank you very much.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Sir?

MR. DENNIS: Like the other commissioners, I'm
out of this as well.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Still you might
be in a little trouble now. They're dropping like --

MR. STEELE: We're still okay.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: We're still okay, for the
record?

MR. STEELE: For the record, we're still okay.

MS. AU: May I just raise one question?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: You may, indeed.

MS. AU: About the master contract with the
County, will we still be able to track the -- each of the
individual initiatives even with this masterizing of the contracts?

MS. BOSCH: Yes, we will. This is just the legal side of it. It's making sure that we have one set of legal compliance that needs to happen for the contract. But each scope of work and budget are still with the department, and that's where you'll get information and those will be handled just like they are now.

MS. AU: Okay. Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Anything more on this?

MS. AU: I move it be approved.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: With respect to one piece of it, there's a request for Richards, Watson, and Gershon be continued. I'd like to defer that for one month at this point in time.

I think they're -- had an initial conversation a month or so ago with the Executive Director, and I think it's appropriate that we close that discussion before we continue the contract.

So if there's no objections to continuing that piece for one month, I would make such a request. The Richards, Watson, and Gershon contract.

All right? Any questions or comments on that item?

Why the one month delay?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: There is a question, Commissioner Au, about the legal counsel that we do receive, and in the context of overall health of the organization, there is a question that at least this one board member has about how that is to be situated, if it is, in fact, an in-house role, or it is a role to be contracted with is the question that I raised a couple of months ago.

There has not been closure on it. And it seems to me in terms of the overall review of the agency and how it's being looked at, that's one of the outstanding questions that warrants our consideration.

MS. AU: Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.

Any objection to that matter being continued?

All right. Commissioner Au moves. Is there a second?

(Motion seconded.)

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: My assumption is that we still have enough members to vote on this matter without those -- all those members eligible to vote, please do so by -- I think we should have a roll call, Madam Secretary, so we get this right.
BOARD SECRETARY: Nancy Au.

MS. AU: Aye.

BOARD SECRETARY: Jane Boeckmann?

MS. BOECKMANN: Aye.

BOARD SECRETARY: Philip Browning?

MR. BROWNING: Aye.

BOARD SECRETARY: Jonathan Fielding?

MR. FIELDING: Abstain.

BOARD SECRETARY: Sandra Figueroa-Villa?

MS. FIGUEROA-VILLA: Aye.

BOARD SECRETARY: Neil Kaufman?

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes.

BOARD SECRETARY: Marvin Southard?

MR. SOUTHARD: Abstain.

BOARD SECRETARY: Mark Ridley-Thomas?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Aye.

BOARD SECRETARY: We have six "ayes."

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. With respect to Commissioner Dennis, I don't know that he -- he is an abstention for the record. So I am -- let the record reflect that Commissioner Dennis is a voting member pursuant to action of the Board of Supervisors as of this past Wednesday representing his supervisorial district. So it's not -- he's not being able to vote, he abstains owing to somehow being a part of the paternity of
abstainers today.

So this will start with Commissioner Dennis.

MS. AU: Is congratulations in order here?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Mr. Steele, are we in order with the requisite number of votes?

MR. STEELE: Yes, sir.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Let's move to Item Number 5, which will be the most impressive presentation of the day.

Thank you very much for your patience.

Item Number 6 is before us.

MS. BELSHE: That was memorable.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I wanted to move my time for my Executive Director's report to provide an update on some of the work we have undertaken to Best Start communities.

Commissioners will remember that as a part of our inquiry process to really dig into the -- some of the key overarching questions about our results, our strategies, our intermediate outcomes and processions by which we will measure outcome.

And engaging with the staff, the learning from our work today to date and most recently, Best Start communities for meeting with the senior leadership team with members of each of the 14 communities.
This is the schedule that we have had over the past two weeks. And I want to note Commissioner Swilley who joined the meetings down in Long Beach with Long Beach and Wilmington. As well as Commissioner Dennis who joined the meeting with Metro LA.

Just to recap for -- not to recap, but to share with the board members, these are the goal -- goals that we worked with to develop for these two-hour meetings the one and only times for conversation, but really to provide an opportunity to new leadership in the First 5 L.A. to meet with community leaders, to create a forum or context for the community leadership teams to share with First 5 L.A.'s leadership, some of the highlights and challenges associated with their work.

For us to report back on where our board and staff are relative to this review process and fundamentally, that Place Based work that required team, it required collaboration, and these meetings were an important step in that direction.

So I wanted to share at a high level some of the key things we heard from parents and learned from our community partnerships. And I categorize the achievements in two principle areas in that we heard. One around parents and one around a more community-level achievement.

First is it was really very exciting and
energizing to hear from parents. The parents were the leading voices participating in these roundtable discussions. You could see the power of them having a seat at the table, being in a role of decision maker, not just a receiver of service.

It was a chance for them to speak concretely about how their knowledge around healthy child development and their capabilities to really support the social, emotional, and cognitive competence of this program.

Not just parent to parent, but also parent to service organization that I will touch on a bit more in a moment.

Initial steps and learnings concretely show services -- they need to be the best parents possible and with a very deep sense of ownership. Ownership for both communities needs and challenges as well as solutions in recognizing the role that mobilizing, advocating.

Community leaders complain of how important that type of organizational role is for families with young children. At the community level, parents had a very strong presence and voice, but there was leadership from the place base community, business community, service provider community, civic leadership, and others.

Again, working together, identifying issues and opportunities to improve outcomes in their communities,
and specifically the families.

We heard a lot about community level leadership and communities really stepping up. First 5 L.A. has been supporting them and how that leadership kind of extends to the people from whom those participating are interacting, both parent to parent and community member to community member.

We heard a lot of about investments and efforts are not in isolation, but really trying to connect with many of the other important initiatives going on.

In central Long Beach, the California community found indications that the promised neighborhoods initiative in Pacoima is working. A clear recognition that these organization -- these community partnerships are going to be as successful as they can be by leveraging and working with other efforts. Also a clear recognition that organizations are going to need to change.

And there was some initial evidence of how bringing the voice of parents directly with those who organize and deliver services supporting families with young children.

We're already seeing some changes in the practices of organizations in terms of bringing more formally the task force into their work to inform how the organization and deliver services to be as responsive as
possible.

And then the issue of getting information out about the information importance and that this is not just important to individual families, but really is a community-wide responsibility and opportunity to support these families.

We also heard a lot of challenges -- and I really appreciate the candor with which the conversations occurred. We heard back from communities -- all 14 communities in terms of some of their considerations and concerns about the start and stop nature that has been First 5 LA as a place based initiative.

There was discussion about communications and clear and consistent communications from First 5 about our work in communities and broadly, not just as it relates in county-wide investments, and how they related to our place based work. And definitely some questions about the community partnership plans drafted to staff last April, And kind of what the status of those plans are.

So very candid and constructive conversations but clearly some frustration among our community partners. We do know and appreciate that developing place based initiatives, developing relationships is time intensive and also absolutely central to our ability to effect change.
While there was frustration about the -- what has been perceived as an action over the course of the past year, it was also very striking to hear from communities about the additional relationship work that occurred. Capacity building trainings that have really helped solidify and strengthen those -- these partnership.

Relationship building is critical, but it takes time, it takes nurturing, and it takes support.

This point about existing resources was a very, very present theme. And a number of anecdotal examples of how the partnerships are playing a role in terms of helping the parents who have a need for concrete services better understand and access services that exist in their communities.

At the same time, a very clear theme was there are also gaps. And the gaps, not surprisingly, are in some of the critical areas we know so well, particularly accessing quality preschool.

A recognition of really -- regardless of the state of the community partnerships, and they are all in varying stages of development, but almost all of them understood potential is measuring the impact, but something they really wanted to roll up their sleeves and be a part of in partnership with First 5 L.A.

And finally the importance of us bringing clarity
and focus to our work with the partnerships and with Best Start broadly.

Finally, let me touch on opportunities and in your packets and in your iPads we have more slides that summarize in a different way what we learned from parents and what we heard from community partnership. But let me touch on some of the opportunities we heard.

Notwithstanding the frustrations, we very much heard much more about the positives, the communities, the points with pride, the constructive dialogue about how to focus the work of the Best Start partnerships as much as possible.

Focus on the importance of strengthening families, helping to support parents be the best possible parents they can be, and a number of activities to advance that goal. We heard a lot about the value of these communities partnerships as a platform for parents to engage.

Training mobilization platforms for communities across communities as well as relationship building across neighborhoods and sectors on behalf of families with young children.

A recognition that these community pipes can play a role in helping to better integrate available resources in communities serving young families with young children.
and this idea of networking, weaving, recognizing the Best Start community partnerships don't exist in isolation, but rather can play the glue role in their communities.

Part of the value that we heard from community partners about that -- that integration and glue role was an opportunity to help leverage and extend the resources across the organizations that exist in communities.

Finally, a quick couple comments about opportunities. It was a recognition that, again, by bringing the parent voice to the community partnership table, there is an opportunity to really work in a very concrete and constructive way with community-based organizations to support their capacities and to meet the needs of families with young children.

And, finally, this idea of this infrastructure involving parents and community together seems to be coming together in a fairly concrete and potentially forceful way.

This idea of a Best Start army. Though it's conceivably violence oriented, it's a nice image in terms of sense of the team and community orientation on behalf of what parents need to be best parents they can be and a recognition that it's not all about the parents, it's about the community environment and the extent to which that community environment supports the services that a
family needs.

   To be so important to improve outcomes and
supports a parent's ability to be resilient and
knowledgeable and in support of their children.

   These, as I say, are a little bit more detail
about what we learned and what we heard.

Finally, in terms of next steps, we have our
board retreat that will be coming up in a couple of weeks.
The intent of that meeting is to bring to the board a more
focused framework for how we think about our results with
Best Start as well as indicators as we and the
partnerships will measure our partnerships from that board
conversation or board retreat and direction to sit down
one-on-one with the partnerships to discuss their plans
and priorities through the lens of a more focused results
based framework that we'll be discussing.

That was a whirl wind tour. I want to end by
again acknowledging the investment to date. The very
meaningful achievements and highlights, that they point to
as well as an eagerness on their part to bring what we're
looking at -- to bring as well in any goodness to work
with us this summer to get to those goals; so I invite any
comments or questions. Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Any questions or comments for
the executive director on her report?
Going once? Going twice?

Resist the temptation Commissioner Au.

We're on to Item Number 7.

MS. AU: I was good.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Item number 7. The L-3 update.

MS. BELSHE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Sorry I didn't give you a chance to catch your breath.

MS. BELSHE: I'm good. I'm readily to roll.

So, Commissioners, we have carved out a little chunk of time, relatively speaking, of our three-hour agenda to talk about our listening, learning, and leading agenda in the previous agendas for quite some time to walk through principally what we have heard.

That's going to be the emphasis of this presentation. We'll talk a little bit about some initial learning given what we have heard, and then talk about next steps, really to digging more deeply into the learning or suggested approaches, and a road map for developing a leadership agenda, an action agenda going forward.

I would note as we start this presentation that First 5 L.A. is an organization that is in transition. We have a new senior chief operating officer as well as a
knew chair in January. We are also midway through
implementation of our strategic plan. So a change of this
nature is a time of great opportunity.

And as I shared with the board just as part of my
coming on board, my interest in undertaking this L-3
initiative is to take stock of where we are, what kind of
progress we're making with implementation of the strategic
plan, what we're learning relative to our impact, our role
and opportunities for us to have greater impact.

I think the findings thus far through L-3 are
everly important, and I view them from a very
optimistic lens.

I'll talk about the methodology in a moment, but
I'm very optimistic about the participation of this board
and our staff and the broader community, the candor with
which input was provided, and some very important
insights.

And we know for any organization to move forward,
to maximize it's impact and it's success, it's important
to understand what we do well and what we can perhaps do
better. And we have some good insights to both what we do
well as well as what we need to learn from where it will
ultimately lead.

So this is a restatement of learning goals for
L-3 relative to the status of what we've learned, our
role, our internal systems and processes, and how they support our programmatic work.

Soliciting input from our grantees and contractors in terms of how we're doing. What's the user experience to be a partner with First 5 L.A.

You recall that we reached out to a broad array of perspectives from our staff, internal interviews including most of the deputies of the board of supervisors.

We reached out to external communities, our research and advisory communities couple dozen of key informants as well as a survey that was responded to by roughly 30 percent of all of our current and former grantees and contractors.

In total, over 300 folks participated and importantly in terms of external input, those represent almost entirely organizations; so those aren't necessarily one person that's giving input, but a broad, significant group of people behind those organizations.

It's a very, very diverse group of people with whom the L-3 process engaged, but an important point -- I really want to emphasize -- is the consistency, the diversity of the folks providing input -- and I'll speak more to that in a moment.

Also on a note that we have a number of other
analyses and reports related to the listening, learning, and leading inquiry. One of which we had at your board just when you sat down related to the First 5 funding LA analysis which provides a snapshot of where our money goes relative to our goals -- relative to types of services and supports we invest in and some other interesting background information that we would commend to our attention.

It is a process that we don't want to overwhelm you with, but we will be providing over the next couple -- courses of weeks.

One of the things we did was we asked our contractors and grantees to share one word that captures First 5 L.A. And we developed a word cloud which is a way to graphically depict the words that were most prominent in terms of responses to words; so to speak. But a number of representative words that most often in the feedback from our contractors.

And we are clearly seen as a funder. We are clearly seen as a leader. We are clearly seen as valuable. But we're also seen as bureaucratic. We're also seen as confused. The word I like to emphasize is the one at the bottom right which is transitioning as well as the word potential, which I think really underscores who we are.
And, again, these are contractors and grantees. But I think this is a theme throughout the L-3 process that both -- that's going through some transition.

So I now want to turn to relative five critical strategic issues if you will of how we try to characterize what we've heard. And the external forces I'll speak to in a moment, because the pyramid reflects us, but we're not an island unto ourselves, and forces and influences and considerations that influence and shape how we think about our work and opportunities to be successful.

The single most important and consistent finding we heard through the L-3 effort is that we're an organization that would really benefit from having a clear strategic focus; a clear, more focused, direction; and a recognition that that is really foundational to how we think about impact; how we think about our role; but also how we think about the programs and initiatives that we support and how they relate to one another.

Implications for our external relationships. Who do we work with? Why? To what end? Our internal systems and infrastructures and are they organized and executed in a way that is aligned with our strategic focus, the impact we seek, and the role we seek to play on behalf of families with young children.

And, finally, recognition that there is a
leadership governance context that really has the critical responsibility for bringing that focus and shape and executing consistent with the direction by our board.

I want to talk through now -- and I'm going to do this fairly quickly -- but again acknowledging we don't exist in isolation. We exist in a world with a lot of external forces. We need to know the needs around a zero to five population, the challenge to serve in different ways.

We also have a number of opportunities not the least of which is the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. We have promising research that I think we are increasingly endeavoring to use to inform and guide how we think about our role, the impact we can have, the -- and the programs we support. And we recognize that there's a lost need. And while we have the benefit of having resources, the external procedures, the good news is fewer people are smoking, but that does have implications for our resources and a recognition that our resources are arguably -- they are never going to be enough.

Calling out questions how we as an organization can be as strategic as possible in using our declining resources and the importance of partnerships and policy and advocacy in addition to the important services and programs we fund.
For each of these areas, we have a couple of quotes that we share. These are quotes that are taken from the environment scan which will be demographic changes and their significance, as well as observations about the implications of our declining revenues.

So this fundamental issue that I mentioned around strategic focus was really very, very prominent, as I said.

First, there was a recognition that our organization over the course of it's now nearly 15 years has had an important impact on the population that makes up the zero to five system. And particularly in terms of First 5 L.A.'s contribution to really broadening awareness and understanding in LA county of the importance of the early years and the potentials for our organization to have greater impact.

Consistently, it was noted that we have a strategic plan. Yes, we have an implementation plan. We have modifications to the strategic plan. But that -- our work lacks the kind of strategic focus that is very important to an organization.

Our strategic plan was characterized by some as an aspirational [sic] document, that it provides a good and very powerful broad direction to our work on behalf of zero to five, but lacks specificity and focus was a real
theme.

Consistent with that, a related theme was yes our most prominent role is funder. That was very consistently identified. But there really wasn't much consensus internally or externally about what roles we play beyond a funder; so it's all over the map in terms of leadership role, catalyst role, convening role, trend-setter role. But the importance of bringing clarity to roles was certainly a theme, that given the number and diversity of the projects that First 5 LA impact, and as a result impact is often articulated in the context of process metrics or deliverables.

And, finally, an acknowledgment and important agreement that, yes, First 5 L.A. does exist to serve all children of LA, but prop 10 and this organization has utilized the ability to direct increases resources to certain populations and geographic areas that have greater needs.

Here are a few of the quotes that we call out. And we tried to pull out quotes that were representative of those in terms of weighing in or participating in lower compact quote focusing very much on our impact but also recognition that our plan really is too big a tent to use the words of one commissioner.

Respects our strategic planning somewhat of a
moving expansion over the years. In terms of program initiatives, we clearly heard that we have a lot of activity that is making an important contribution, but those benefits, those accomplishments are generally speaking at the participant level in terms of those families or children who are survive a particular program as opposed to a broader county or population level impact.

There was recognition that progress has been slow with implementation of the strategic plan. Good progress has been made on a number of fronts such as through a number of the county wide initiatives with Welcome Baby and home visitation, but a recognition that given the -- the breadth and complexity of our work particularly with the additional augmentations that were made in 2010 a recognition or concern that perhaps what we're trying to do is perhaps too broad and overly ambitious.

The interconnectedness of the various 54 projects that are currently supported by First 5 L.A. as well as some questions about the implications of number of the projects both in terms of expense and the financial sustainability managing work of this breadth and scope.

A recognition which we see in the funding analogy assist that was shared that a lost our resources indeed a majority strategic plan activities, some of which don't appear to be well aligned with our current strategic
direction.

And an acknowledgment, importantly, that the board focus on a place based effort as part of new strategic direction back in 2009 and '10, but some questions about the extent to which First 5 L.A. fully and sufficiently thought through some of the operational and internal and staffing considerations to really execute effectively that new place based strategic approach.

And, finally, as I touched on a moment ago, that a recognition is that if a lot of different things it makes it difficult to really identify clearly and measure organizational impact.

These are some of the quotes we would share around our programs and initiatives in terms of reflecting both the value of the work we do and also the recognition of the perhaps the activities and services are a bit too broad.

The fourth area and again these build on one another and are all interrelated is a recognition this we have a very extensive network of external stakeholders and that's viewed as whom we work as well as those with whom we have the opportunity to work to advance some shared aspirations for young children. Also recognition that First 5 L.A. staff is a very valuable resource in terms of their expertise and contributions to a variety of
organizations as county wide.

Relationship with the county was seen as a kind of mixed blessing. Some said this is a really important relationship. We are part of the County governing structure as well as the work we support to really leverage and accelerate changes and influence systems. Others spoke to the extent to which there's a perception that our work is influenced by county agendas and county dynamics so that was decidedly mixed.

We learned internally and we also got feedback from our external participants as well. We really don't have a clear and consistent definition of partnership. Has been kind of opportunistic and responsive to partnerships that come to us and not always proactive and strategic in coming from us specific with our specific goals.

Our reputation as a partner was also kind of a mixed bag, and we definitely got some feedback that sometimes we can be perhaps not the most flexible of partners, that we may be sitting at different tables but with a very focused and sometime as I said rigid focus on what we're interested in rather than bringing a broader more flexible perspective to our work and proprietorships with others.

And finally we probed our contractors and
grantees specifically about the user experience. What's it like to work with us? And generally the feedback was quite positive.

We probed the full array, the different steps that make up the contracting system, but we absolutely got some critical feedback such as the 10 percent cost cap which I understand is not an issue to this organization as well as a recognition that we could do a better job in terms of sharing information that we receive.

Couple of comments contractor partners again underscoring the importance of clarity and consistency in the work that we do and the messaging with our external partners and again very strong recognition that our staff is a very important asset and resource also very, very encouraging and rewarding to hear from our staff about their very strong support for our mission. And their very strong optimism for this organization and it's future.

We -- also looking introspectively -- got feedback both within the family as well as from those outside that our processes and procedures are sometimes not very consistent and in some cases they're not clear and in other cases they're just not in existence.

So we have a real set of important issues internally we're going to need to be working through to really maximize our impact.
We also learned there's a history with this organization as with any organization and some of the many years in the making historic internal culture what is characterized as a kind of stylized departmental structure fragments and inconsistent processes and procedures and have had implications for how information flows in our -- in our departments across our departments, with our board of commissioners, with our external community.

So there's a really important set of issues there or learnings in terms of what we're hearing recognition of both internal and external for how we work with others how effective we can be.

And as I note here you know. They've contribute today sometimes a reliance on focusing on compliance. Being very black and white and the letter of the law if you will. Sometimes at the expense of invasion and inflexibility. We heard internally and particular of the important of aligning the skills and experience of our staff. Relative to the work requirements and the jobs to be done.

And finally staff was very clear about the importance of vesting in professional development and training which can not something we really have much of it in First 5 L.A. The value and the need for that. But also a recognition that that training and professional
development needs to be grounded in clarity about the job requirements and those job requirements need to be anchored in the particular goals and strategic focus of First 5.

Couple quotes that we share here, both on the upside in terms of the nature of our staff but also a recognition that we need to be more of a learning organization. Finally in terms of leadership and governance a clear recognition of the asset that our commissioners are in terms of being very dedicated advocates for children zero to five and the important leadership role they play both on this commission as well as in your day jobs.

Consistent feedback in terms of questions regarding the extent to which the goals and strategic plans which has been approved which the board the extent to which it's been used decision making.

Feedback that staff can do a better job both in terms of how we work with the board as well as how we keep the board informed and insure that go the board has the kind of information and material and analysis to really help board members understand and provide the complete picture for the issues that come before it. And provide the kind of decision making framework that is so important to our important responsibilities. And a recognition that
we don't really have much of a new member orientation and that it definitely something that we can and need do a better job in terms of preparing new board members.

This issue of roles and responsibilities in terms of board and staff. Particularly senior management was identified as an issue that I guess has been around for some time but one that is very important in terms of clarifying the policy rolls and responsibilities relative to the board staff rolls and responsibility to execute that policy decision additions.

And a recognition that just as their shared responsibility and account ability for challenges there's a shared responsibility and account ability forgetting the results we seek.

The issues of rotating chair I think was a unanimous observation again like many of these issues not new but a recognition that the changing chair does have a potential to contribute to discontinuity in leadership to changing priority ands directions and that has implications for our ability to or implications for our work in a number of ways.

And finally as I noted the relationship with the county was raised in any number of different surveys and interviews as again as a mixed bag but again the perception that First 5 L.A. at least on occasion is many
of the dynamics and agendas that drive down at this
government also come into place as it relates to First 5 L.A.

The recognition of the role of the commissioners
is becoming clearer but also a recognition that perhaps
commission and staff not always historically been on the
same page in the importance for that alignment to occur.

Finally, I want to touch on just very quickly
this very quick summary of what was said. Across the
diversity of perspective that's engaged in the L-3 effort.

I want to touch on now just very briefly some
initial take-aways in what we learn and close with what we
would suggest for the next board meetings which so what
are we going to do.

This is what we heard. This is what we learned. The question is what are we going to do? First, in terms
of some of the positives we heard very, very, very strong
support for this organization for our mission for you are
focus for the relevance of the work that we do. Not just
for children in communities but for our economy. For our
workforce for the health of our communities. And a very
strong desire that our organization succeed.

A recognition that much of the work we have done
has had a contribution; LAUP was cited as an important
example of providing needed and important areas that are
critical to the school readiness of young children.

A clear and consistent recognition that we are an organization that is having an impact albeit dispersed across a number of large programs, but a recognition that this is an organization that really has an opportunity to greater impact and a recognition that as our resources decline it's going to force the organization to think for strategically about it's role and focus and how to have the most impact as possible for young children.

And, finally, that we are -- we have many other resources we have many of the ass to be successful and we behalf of young children. We have a network of partners we have passion national knowledgeable staff and commissioners and substantial resources.

To so those are not inconsiderable assets at all and had many organizations would bend over backwards for those kind of assets.

Some of the issues that I would touch on very quickly that have been thematic in my comments thus far in terms of summarizing what was said.

Clearly the importance of our bringing more focus and commitment to a clear strategic direction and that is has been a message that board has been very clear about particularly in the context of Best Start and that Best Start review is it's going to be a very important part of
our effort but organizationally to bring broader or more
clear and sharper focus to our strategic direction
organizationally.

We played many roles, but there is a lack of
consensus about what role we should be playing beyond
funding as which note and had some recognition of some
opportunities for us to deepen some existing relationships
but also to build some new relationships and business
communities was cited time and again as perhaps a unusual
but very important strategic partner in advancing or our
-- our work to healthy recognition that we have a
potential as the largest First 5 to provide statewide
leadership particularly in the policy arena, a recognition
that a locality of good work has been done.

That is absolutely was what we heard consistently
across stake holders but a recognition that for to us
maximize our impact certainly in the near term we have
some work to do around aligning integrating and linking to
a clear strategic direction.

Again, this is a theme this board has articulated
in my short time here. It's a theme that emerged and
provides us with an opportunity to engage in that more
focused conversation.

And, finally, you know, we're learning about our
staff. We have a remarkable staff. It's one of the
reasons I am so optimistic, it is a staff that is passionate, that is committed, that has tremendous expertise.

But we also are working as an organization through some of the residual ill effects of some of these cultural and organizational and informational issues that really do have implications for our ability to be effective and be held accountable for the work we do at the staff level.

So, finally, let me close with some suggestions regarding next steps and certainly invite commissioner comments and additional suggestions.

Today was intended principally to focus on what we heard relative to the strategic issues. Recognizing that the strategic focus and clarity of direction is really foundational to role to impact to our program alignment relationships internal systems et cetera. As well as the funding analysis which is intended as a background piece.

At our next board meeting, our recommendation would be that we spend a little bit of time focusing more deeply on the principle learning that is emerging from the L-3 efforts as well as with a particular focus on the opportunities that we are hearing about and learning about through this process for greater impact.
Some of the complementary information that has been very helpful for example the learning and accountability report is our annual report that we broaden to provide a picture of where we are in implementation of our strategic plan.

The environmental scan we touched upon very briefly that has been done around our brand and we want to make sure that the learning from grounded in the more focused strategic direction of First 5 Los Angeles.

And finally if we have an August meeting or otherwise in September, talk more deeply with the commission about ultimately what does this mean. What does this intend to share with the board? Ideas regarding both internal and external opportunities solutions as well as priorities and to present a more concrete action plan and agenda for moving forward.

Part of our thinking with the sequencing that the Best Start inquiry does not exist in isolation to what we are hearing and learning and ultimately intend to do through L-3.

It's very important that these initiatives that these inquiries come together so that we can ensure that the work we're doing is really organization wide and not specific to one program or one initiative.

I appreciate your patience and forbearance and
welcome thoughts and observations.

MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you very much. Any
commissioners have any comments?

Start on this side of the room first. Comments
or questions.

MR. FIELDING: I think it's a very comprehensive
and objective view of our strengths and weaknesses both
past and present. It does help us know how we want to
move forward. Very thoughtful and concise report.

MR. KAUFMAN: Comments on this side?

MS. AU: Excellent.

MR. SOUTHARD: I think it presents us with a
realistic platform for future actions; so I for the right
in some of the issues that we faced for quite a while.

MR. KAUFMAN: Anyone else have any comments?

MS. AU: I have to commend Kim and John and --

MR. KAUFMAN: Please talk into the mike.

MS. AU: Excuse me. I have to commend Kim, John,
and her team to embark on this. And the -- the reporting
back has been just right on. I mean, these are -- are
comments that I have been hearing over time. And to see
it in our report has essentially validated some of the
feedback I've been hearing and it's quite encouraging that
it's finally getting into this organization.

And I'm trusting that the -- the movement forward
will be -- will be -- be informed by this work that you've been doing. And it's quite encouraging. I'm really excited and I think this is a great opportunity.

I think First 5 L.A. is really at a pivotal point. Where we will truly make our presence known not only here in LA county but I believe it will go national and even international because of the work that we're doing here.

I truly believe that. And I'm banking on your leadership, Kim, as well as John's to get us there. And it's really quite exciting. It's not easy work and I won't -- I won't even assume that. In fact, I know that it's really tough work. And it can oftentimes be very frustrating.

But I truly believe that with if we stay focused and we -- at the end that have retreat where the commissioners really engage in conversation about getting clarity that have a list of interests in terms of where we land and with that clarity I think the sky's the limit for us. So thank you very much.

MR. KAUFMAN: Any other comments?

MS. BELSHE: I would just -- and thank you for your comments, Nancy, and just to underscore, you're right. It's absolute -- you're absolutely right. It's tough work, important work, as a number of commissioners
And I had noted in my comments I appreciate many of these issues are not new issues. But one of the reasons why I am optimistic is because of our effort to work very transparently as a staff with the Board with the broader external community to make sure we understand what we're doing well so we can build upon our strong infrastructure and assets where they exist, but also to be clear where we're falling short.

And so I really think we will become a stronger organization as a result of the candid nature of the feedback we got discomforting as I frankly think some of it is.

But the first step an organization needs to take to improve and accelerate its impact is to understand what it does well and where it can build upon and improve. And so that will definitely be a major role that I will play as a leader, but it is a shared responsibility we bring.

And the governing board has a very important role to play in terms of bringing the kind of sharp strategic focus to our work that makes clear what we are prepared to invest in and what we have not going to be prepared to invest.

And as the commission has discussed, of course,
over the past number of months that I've been here, our fiscal context is really going to compel that. Alignment of fiscal circumstances that really make this a very opportune time to engage in this conversation together and we will definitely do our work. But it's going to be work that really ultimately the Boards going to have to make some important decisions go forward.

MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you. Two comments.

Beautiful presentation of what could have taken three hours, but you really got to it. And actually just wanted to comment on the side that's up there for August/September action plan agenda.

Do you feel -- and maybe this is not a question for answering today. It seems to me that there's something that comes before the action plan and that is strategic direction commission decisions that you might need to have before an accident plan can be done.

I don't know whether you call that modifying the strategic plan or clarifying it. It does seem like there's some of these unanswered questions.

MS. BELSHE: Thank you.

MR. KAUFMAN: Does did that fit in to the September time frame?

MS. BELSHE: Thank you for calling that out, Neil. The intent is for us to come back to the board we
want to be further along with the Best Start inquiry. Be further towards aligning because once we bring as John noted in the consent. Clarity to the results we seek through Best Start, you know, that opens up the opportunity for us to have a conversation the board to have a conversation about so what does that mean for how we align our county wide efforts.

And, frankly, I aspire to First 5 L.A. To be an organization that doesn't have county wide strategies county wide initiatives. The prior strategic plan place base work and counsel city wide work and we have clarity about how those investments and efforts interrelate.

In my mind, this is a refinement or revision of the implementation plan to the strategic plan. I think that's the ultimate deliverable. By August or September is basically to be mapping out the approach for getting there.

And those absolutely are decisions that the board is going to make.

MR. KAUFMAN: I would think that's --

MS. BELSHE: That's a planned deliverable.

MR. KAUFMAN: I think what you're describing is certainly necessary. The question I have is some of the -- those decisions that, you know, need to give to us require commission policy direction that is thought of
like a modifications to a strategic plan so that you'll have a policy that you're working under which is more important governance issue. How you implement is to let us know about it, but that's really your job.

Our job is to help with your assistance to clarify what our real strategic goals and objectives are. So I think the way I just put that August comment at some point those get exposed we talk about them we make those decisions while you're also helping us understand the action plan agenda moving forward.

MS. BELSHE: Yeah, I think that's right. And I think the conversation around Best Start will be an important -- very important data point in terms of how we think about organizing and focusing the results we seek for Best Start and the results we seek as an organization.

MR. KAUFMAN: Reminding everyone the retreat is June 20.

MS. BELSHE: June 26.

MR. KAUFMAN: From 8:30 to 1:00 or something like that.

MS. BELSHE: We will be sending out information.

MR. KAUFMAN: That's -- the public's invited and welcome to attend.

MS. BELSHE: Correct.

MR. KAUFMAN: Anything else on this item?
MS. AU: I will not be able to participate in that retreat, and I'm really quite sad about that. And at the same time, though, I think it would be very important -- I'm presuming, and maybe I shouldn't -- that the commission will really need to have a context.

And I -- I think we need to have a fiscal context in which this conversation occurs, that we really truly need to follow the dollars. And so we do not find ourselves being so excited about moving in a direction without taking into account the -- the fiscal reality in which we're going to have to grapple with.

And I think that's really going to be very important.

MR. KAUFMAN: Any other comments.

Item 8. Universal preschool budget.

MS. BELSHE: Item 8 is Universal Preschool Budget and Aleece Kelly is going to walk us through a number of slides with a particular focus on the proposed augmentation as well as different scenarios for how that augmentation can be funded.

So let me turn it over to Aleece.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Let me make the observations that we have several persons that wish to be heard on this item, members of the commission; so after the boards -- staff presentation, we'll take those who wish to be heard
and then we'll deliberate pursuant to that. Thank you.

MS. KELLY: Thank you.

Commissioners, we're returning with an action item following discussion of the June commission meeting as well the June program and planning committee meeting.

Each year, LAUP and staff matrix and annual budget as proposed in matrix for fiscal year '13-'14 is included in your packet and was reviewed.

For the sake of time, we're going to focus on the LAUP budget, but we'll be happy to answer questions about the matrix following the presentation.

After reviewing the proposed changes to the proposed increases to the LAUP budget, I will offer four budget scenarios, as Kim mentioned for the commission's consideration.

This slide outlines the LAUP budget for the next fiscal year and the sources of funds, this year's budget is approximately $4.9 million over last year's. I will quickly review the reason for the recommended increase.

The first component of the budget increase of the $4.5 million increase due to shifts from subsidies to LAUP providers.

Per the master agreement, LAUP replaces spaces lost through other providers in the past LAUP has largely been able to replace subsidized providers with other
subsidized providers of the LAUSD programs in a need to replace with unsubsidized spaces in the same geographic. $1.5 million impact on the budget for next year. The other increase in regard to provider payments is due to anticipated gains in the LAUP provider star ratings. And fiscal year '12-'13, due to the introduction as the classes into the star rating provider ratings decreased resulting in a budget district to increase of approximately $1 million for teaching training and coaching. LAUP now anticipates higher star ratings to provide a $600,000 increase to the LAUP budget.

The second area of budget increase for next year is for IT infrastructure intended to improve efficiency and more collectively collect compelling data. The example is the child level data.

In regard to attendance or currently the data is collected differently even by hand by some providers. And by investing in the requested upgrades, LAUP to is to abrogate the data to better tell a compelling story follow makers and other funders about the children that LAUP serves.

Longer term cost reductions are also in efficiency including a five to six information positions with LAUP in coming years.

The final component of the new budget is related
to sustainability planning.

First 5 and LAUP have been in conversations in recently in regards to sustainability.

The first is policy and advocacy for high quality, affordable preschool. Through a communications assessment by LAUP were identified to us.

The current federal momentum and to effectively build public will in support of quality preschool. This is included a public education campaign to focus on quality preschool and has resulted in a rebranding of LAUP.

These proposed costs are annual going forward.

In the second proposal is to proceed prepared for the possibility that public funding is unsuccessful.

The second prong of the sustainability is the development of alternative business models, utilizing fee for service preschool. Fee for service quality ratings build on by LAUP through its star rating as well as its involvement for a race to the top grant.

And this was something that LAUP -- this would be a one time expense, but could potentially have cost implications in subsequent fiscal years.

So I'm now going to review the four proposed budgets -- I'm sorry the four budget options for the commissions consideration.
Option 1 represents LAUP's proposed budget. It's increased $4.9 and ends in 2016 with about one and a half million dollars remaining.

I will be presenting three other options for your consideration, each represents the use of the original $508,000,000, nothing beyond that. Each also allows LAUP to add the proposed increases that were just presented in regard to provider payment, IT, infrastructure and sustainability, with some amount of money remaining in 2016, but varies in regard to the amount and the source of funds.

As I review each option, I will highlight the remaining dollar amount and the minimum for each number of scenarios.

Option 2 utilizes LAUP's intensive funding to recover some increase. Option 2 projections are based on Option 1. The exception is the draw from the performance incentive fund is the component of a contract with LAUP that places LAUP carry over to a performance later use dependent on identified the targets.

You can find the procedure perform contract exhibit as attachment B to the memo.

Option 3 would allow LAUP to make the proposed increases to IT sustainability and provider payments, but would maintain the current levels in '12-'13 budget year.
It would pay for the requested increases through a mandated reduction in services. Option 3 ends in 2016 with a higher amount left in the sustainability fund, but reduces services by approximately 1,100 -- 11 spaces per year through mandated cuts.

It's important to note that it would be very challenging to reduce spaces for the upcoming fiscal year this close to the close of the '12-'13 year. Operationally, school districts have to notify staff of pending cuts in March, and therefore any mandated reduction of LAUP services would be to community based providers only.

Additionally, parents have already submitted enrollment forms and would be challenged to find alternative preschool or child care by September.

Finally, staff is recommended the fourth scenario. In order to provide an option to the commission that represents a LAUP contract for June 30, 2017, by reducing services annually, funding preschool for approximately the same number of children but over a longer period of time.

To avoid some of the challenges discussed in regard to option 3, mandated cuts would not begin until fiscal year '14-'15, allowing time for appropriate planning of reductions. The only reductions to services
proposed in fiscal year '13-'14 would occur through natural attrition of providers.

LAUP loses approximately 500 to a thousand spaces annually through attrition of providers, but currently consistent with their contract with us, LAUP actively replaces would allow up to 500 spaces to be reduced by attrition only.

The 63 million proposed budget in the scenario, for a potential rate of attrition should that be necessary and also to allow for some to quit as attrition occurs.

Staff recommends this extension to -- through year '16-'17 to allow for additional sustainability planning both for the policy efforts and the development of alternative business models.

Finally, in regard to this option, I would note that the figures you see on the slide both in terms of budget, number of spaces, service numbers are estimates only. Revised projections would be developed during the next fiscal year.

Finally, with your approval, staff would amend and execute the contract consistent with your direction in the fall following completion of the analysis of progress data.

Staff will return to provide a final report on '12-'13 performance.
Finally, in the next months, staff from First 5 LA and LAUP will continue to work policy as well as to toward affordable LAUP business -- alternative business models.

Any questions?

Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you for your presentation.

Madam Executive Director?

MS. BELSHE: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and you Aleece for the presentation.

I just want to make a couple of comments before we open up for public comment. By way of context, I wanted to say a little bit more about option 4, which was the product of -- in some respects, of a very vigorous actually a discussion that began with an executive committee on May 1 about augments budget for very important contractors and partners at the time the contract is coming to an end.

And the allocation is diminishing. A similar theme was picked up in a more robust and vigorous way among a number of commissioners, which on the one hand support for the important work that LAUP does, but also a very clear recognition about the fact that the contract is coming to an end as is the allocation, and thus the
ensuing -- I think Commissioner Au talked about the looming fiscal cliff.

So it's that context that just led us Number 1 to focus on a lot of work with LAUP as well as in First 5 L.A. around sustainability.

Public funding is absolutely critical to extending support for the -- sustaining and extending the reach of LAUP's very important services, but also a recognition that the allocation unlike in the past is actually dwindling; so we tried to come up with an approach that would enable LAUP to continue to fund the augmentation.

We agree with LAUP is so critical to it's sustainability and ultimately its efficiency to allow some level of attrition and reductions to occur in order to build up the sustainability fund and allow First 5 L.A. to continue a fairly meaningful though not at the same level but a meaningful level of support for another year.

If the board were supportive at this meeting or next meeting of some type of glide path, if you will, we certainly would want to work very closely about LAUP and as much as possible the very real quite consideration that's we spoke to in her comments.

So I wanted to provide a little bit more flavor for the comments off our development of our fourth option
as well as the basis for our recommendation.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you very much for your input.

Let's now turn to those who wish to be heard by way of comment and they -- that would be taken into consideration of the commission deliberation.

Patricia Phipps, if you would come forward.

Followed by Cindy Riding, Martin Madrano, Lindsay Evans, Matt Stopper, Annette Pounsey, Casey Dalton, and Damian Carol.

If you would come in that order. Please.

Ma'am?

MS. PHIPPS: Good afternoon, commissioners.

I am Pat Phipps, and I'm the executive vice president and chief program officer for the Los Angeles Urban League.

The Urban League has been in discussions with LAUP about potential opportunities for more than a year. Our program recently moved to a new location in Crenshaw Corridor, and had to be re-licensed before we could officially apply to be part of the LAUP network.

The League recognizes that systemic and sustainable change in student achievement is possible in early education.

We are committed to closing the achievement gap
for children in the high school theater pattern, and we
strongly believe that the first step in closing the gap is
providing quality early education.

The children that found us in our neighborhood
need access to high quality preschool and unfortunately
there aren't enough high quality programs in our area to
fulfill the need.

To continue LAUP funding would give our program
access to specialized coaching training and technical
assistance, and they won't otherwise -- in which they
won't otherwise have access to.

These resources will allow us to focus on
continuously improving the quality of our programs and
assure that our children enter kindergarten with the solid
foundation that they build on in years to come.

We understand the fiscal realities most programs
face these days, but we ask that if cuts have to be made,
that you please figure out how can you direct some of the
resources to those who need it the most.

Areas like the Crenshaw corridor today have not
had the privilege of receiving LAUP funding, and the young
children in this community are certainly in the highest
impacted and most vulnerable areas in the county.

Because this area has great need, it's also one
of your wisest investments. It is the best investment you
can make. Therefore we ask that you support LAUP's budget increase request.

Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you for your testimony.

We'll take the next speaker, please.

MS. RIDING: Good afternoon. My name is Cindy Riding. I'm a provider. I have three LAUP programs in the San Fernando Valley and five centers serving children birth through five years old.

We were part of the LAUP pilot program of 2004; so we've been serving children for about nine years. All three of our LAUP programs have either received or maintained the five star quality rating system. And at this time, we're serving 144 children and their families each year, which means we've graduated nearly 1,300 children.

The children who have gone through our LAUP program have entered kindergarten with a firm foundation for success, and 73 percent of those 1,300 are now in the magnet program, the gifted program in LA unified school district, which I'm appalled that we're even thinking of cuts with this kind of success.

All the children have entered -- who have come in through our program have come in as first time students they were never in preschool prior to our program, and 3
percent are English language learners.

Currently, we have 59 children and families on a waiting list. We're fully enrolled at our LAUP programs. We have 7,011 children on waiting lists for our other five programs. I don't know how I would go about disenrolling children in this wonderful LAUP program. If you cut by 10 percent, how do I decide which 10 percent go?

It's shameful to even think we would add to the waiting list, reducing the number of children that LAUP serves. Not only does LAUP build the firm foundation for success, but we have a new slogan that preschool is no longer just for kids.

I added the "no longer." It's for families, communities, and societies, and we all benefit.

I'm going to tell you one story very quickly.

Is my time up?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Yes, ma'am.

MS. RIDING: I'm asking you, then, please, please do not cut the LAUP program. It's the most wonderful program I've ever served as a director for in my 37 years in this field.

Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much.

MR. MADRANO: Hello, and thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak before you today.
My name is Martin Madrano, and I'm with Assembly Member Calderon's office. Assembly member Calderon represents the 57th assembly district, southern Los Angeles cities along the 60 and 605 freeways with many LAUP sites.

I am here on behalf of the assembly member and the constituents he serves. I want to thank First 5 for creating LAUP and for funding quality preschools in our community.

As many of you are already aware, LAUP is a quality program whose model is highly respected among those in early childhood education communities.

You have been working tirelessly with the White House, the U.S. Department of Education, United States State of Health and Human Services, Congress, and the California State Legislature and the list goes on.

Why? Because LAUP knows that for many children access to preschool and the First 5 preschool is the first assurance that they have to be able to join the workforce, to become productive members of society.

We would ask that the commissioners not change the funding for LAUP. A reduction at this time, as I'm sure we all agree, of young children in the 57th district.

Everyone in this room understands, more than most, what the benefits are to communities. Reducing
seats will have unfortunate consequences and implications
for children, families. And reducing access to quality
preschool will have consequences that should be taken
seriously. Communities won't be able to manage the cuts.
We encourage the First 5 L.A. commission to vote
for Option 1 or 2 on the staff report to insure children
are ready for kindergarten.
The assembly member feels it's worthy of an
opportunity to continue its good work and most importantly
the toddlers of Los Angeles County deserve an opportunity
to benefit from that good work.

Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you.

Next speaker, please.

MR. STOPPER: Thank you.

My name is Matt Stopper. I'm a field
representative for assembly member Steven Bradford,
representing the 62nd district, which includes Gardena,
Inglewood, Hawthorne, Lawndale, El Segundo, Venice, and
Marina del Rey.

I want to echo the previous speaker and thank
LAUP for their work in providing quality preschool in our
community including our constituents.

As you are aware, LAUP is a highly respected
program and they, with the federal, state, and local level
organizations, work to provide access.

And I want to speak on behalf of the assembly member and say that cutting access to the preschool program will have greater consequences for our communities and constituents, and I want to ask First 5 to reconsider these cuts.

Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much.

Next speaker, please.

MS. EVANS: Hello.

My name is Lindsay Evans, and I'm the director of Amiga in preschool in Long Beach. We serve 1,616 LAUP children each year. We currently have a waiting list of over a hundred children.

After tomorrow's graduation, we will have graduated over 700 kindergarten-ready children who did not have any other option for preschool education.

37 percent of our children live below the poverty level. In 908 is the area code for three school spots in Long Beach. However, we have the lowest availability of spots with only one spot per every 2 children.

If you cut funding to LAUP, our entire school will be affected causing us to close down one whole classroom affecting children, teachers, and the community as a whole.
Services should never be cut to students in greatest need and with the least resources. Preschool is in one such geographical area of the federal government and Obama have been looking at LAUP as a model program.

You are demonstrating a lack of confidence in the importance of the program. We can all agree that early childhood education is extremely important; however, by cutting enrollment you are diminishing the importance and need for early childhood education.

Today's decision will affect children and families for many years. Please do not cut the funding from LAUP.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you for your testimony. We'll take the next speaker please.

MS. DALTON: Hello.

My name is Casey Dalton. I'm from Happy Bear school.

I started my first preschool over 15 years ago, and I was in the think tank of Family First prior to LAUP since its inception, and we serve 96 children a day with free preschool school in the 914 area code.

35 -- 40 percent of our families live below the poverty line, $25,000 for a family of four.

We're currently -- actually all eight years, we've been fully enrolled with an existing waiting list
and the same for this year. And I know that you guys know more than anything -- or more than anyone how important preschool education is and kindergarten readiness, and I understand the dilemma that you have.

There's only a certain amount of money and a certain amount of years, and a pressure in trying to extend this by one year.

But we've had a 13 percent cut from the time we started. We've never had a raise in the reimbursement rate. And because our summers were cut and because we've already taken a 10 percent cut -- I'm the one that does the budget. The only place to cut is going to affect quality.

There is no more fat to trim at this point and I'm a little bit -- every space is actually a child. I would -- and I'd prefer if it was referred to that way.

I have 96 enrolled. That means I have to make 10 phone calls to families who have already taken the enrollment and tell them they can't bring their kids.

It's very emotional for me. And I understand you're in a rough position, but I would just -- from being on the ground level and operator in the day to day thick of it, i would rather that the money stay now and we lose that year later, and we have that much time to come up with some sort of sustainability plan internally on our
level, or -- I'm sorry. I ran over.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you very much.

Next speaker, please.

MR. CAROL: Good afternoon, board members.

My name is Damian Carol. I'm a parent. I have two daughters, one of whom went through the LAUP program at Cindy Riding's child care center three years ago.

And I'm here to say that this is a terrific program. My daughter went to school with children from all walks of life. She came to kindergarten very well prepared, as were all of her peers, and has excelled in schools and loves education now in large part due to the tremendous service that she received in her LAUP program.

I have a younger daughter who is in a day care program who will move to LAUP in a couple of years. And we're very excited that she'll have the opportunity to participate in the same program.

My wife and I do not live in poverty, but, likewise, as my wife is a public school teacher and I work in government for our family, and I can only imagine the circumstances of the families that are less affluent than she and I having to make a choices about the spots available in the LAUP program.

What to do if that would affect their employment
status, whether they were able to put their child in a daycare program or preschool.

    We all know the quality of this program. We know the effect lasts long beyond just kindergarten, but studies show for decades these improvements are dependent of them having access to quality preschool.

    Do not cut mandated spaces in these programs. They're very important. You know the community is counting on these kids going through school programs to come -- and coming out on the other side as an improved generation. And preschool is a very important first step to that.

    Choose the option that continues the great progress of LAUP and committed to fully fund this program. Thank you.

    MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you for your testimony. We'll here from the next speaker, please.

    MS. POUNSEY: Hi.

    My name is Annette Pounsey. I'm a site supervisor in the 891 and 405 area code.

    We've been part of LAUP for the past eight years, and it's a remarkable program.

    We have families that still come back today and share with us how well their children are progressing in their schools.
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So-and-so is in a reading program, and this is the level that they're at. And it's because they had access to a preschool within the area.

96 children are enrolled in our program for -- for the upcoming school year, and we have 37 on a wait list beyond those 96. And they have been waiting for this program for the next school year.

Some of them we have to say you are on that waiting list and then you get that space. And we want this program too. It's a wonderful program, and we just ask that you just take everything into consideration for the children.

It's a great program. The community they -- they depend on it. We all depend on it. And it's for the benefit of the children.

And please take everything that we have said here today into consideration.

Thank you for your time.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you for your time and your testimony.

We thank all those who came to express their views.

From the members, I'm going to call on Dr. Cecilia Avila (phonetic) to come forward if she would, to give the prospective of LAUP for the consideration of the
MS. AVILA: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and good afternoon, commissioners.

I don't have to speak on the wonders of LAUP. I actually want to thank the commission for establishing a program in 2004 that ten years later, you do have a national model.

I wanted to share because I have been asked and we have gone -- as a couple of speakers have said -- six years ago -- we started on our public policy and advocacy campaign. Six years ago. And it's beginning to pay off.

We have influenced state and national legislation to begin to really look at the viability of quality programs in terms of public funding. I came on board six years ago to LAUP, and I want to thank you for your investment. Because as of this June, you will have provided a quality program for over 70,000 children.

And they best -- the parents, the teachers -- can attest to it in terms of impact that we are having. I do realize that it is a difficult challenge because we still don't have a way to look at sustainability beyond 2016. But becoming a national model is something that we worked at so that ultimately -- and today we do have a president's initiative that is looking at establishing quality preschool programs for all four years olds in the
country. And I want to share and brag on our staff and
our parents have had a lot to do with that.

We're not there yet, but thank goodness it's only
2013. We currently have a place based contract that,
thank you to Commissioner Neil Kaufman in 2011 coming and
saying we need to work at a plan that allows us time to
build, establish, and demonstrate that programs like this
need to be publicly funded because all children need them.

So we have and will continue to work to that end.

Our current performance based contract -- I don't know how
many other contracts you have, but we have met almost
every single metric. Every single year since we went on
it. And we will continue to work to did the very best for
the children in LA county.

We are your investment. The children of LA
county are benefiting because you have the forethought to
initiate such a program, and we are being looked at not
only locally or state wide, but nationally.

I ask for a couple of things. One, that our
current budget be approved in separate conversations. If
you choose to change the model of what we currently have
approved through 2016, we need time. I'd like to know
what the future of First 5 L.A. is going to look like for
one of your three priorities, which is early education.

How does that focus? And Kim said it so
eloquently in terms of infrastructure that you already set up in terms of relationships that are already built in terms of credibility and the responsiveness of this organization in a program that you've vested.

Is there going to be that focus clarified in terms of earl I didn't remember learning? And is that something that LAUP and the that are currently part of the network that fit into. So the budget in this year we present and had it's been a while and it's before you and it has impacts beginning two weeks from now.

So our board had approved this budget way back in March or April. And as last -- this last Thursday, they gave me authority to come to you and say we can for go some of the improvements although they're very need but this coming year it's too late to tell provider that's have waiting lists and we have waiting lists for provider that's we're not going to fulfill what we have had planned for the money that we're asking.

If approved in whole as opposed to without the 4.9, we can look at our incentive fund and make we won't need 4.9 because trust me I have been working with all the staff to become more efficient and more cost efficient every year.

So I plea for to you consider that this budget is one action. And that's what we've been planning for
months. If you choose to change our performance based contract let's work together to identify which strategies based on the focus of what your agenda is for early learning in this great county of ours.

So those are my comments. Thank you very much for your consideration, and I just wanted to let you know that I'm here if you have any other questions.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you very much for your presentation, Dr. Avila.

We have quite a bit of business to conduct with respect to this item. It's going to be the chair's recommendation that we continue the item for one week. I think it would be returned to program and policy committee and consultation with staff and to discuss this a bit more in light of what we have already heard plus the additional comments for the board to consider.

We are certainly prepared to -- the members of the commission, to express their concerns their issues and the like for all of us to consider.

Are there any comments or questions for the staff or each of us today?

Commissioner Browning?

MR. BROWNING: I was wondering if the 750,000 in the budget is actually being realized per year and fees
are charged?

That's just a clarification that I was curious about, but that could be carried over to the program committee.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Question by Commissioner Browning, ma'am. Do you want to answer?

MS. KELLY: In terms of the $750,000, LAUP has exceeded that requirement for this current fiscal year.

In regard to parent fees it's -- the question is if LAUP charges parent fees essentially. Not for the LAUP services. And part of the reason for that is that the -- our agreement with First 5 California to receive child signature programs and in the past power preschool programs includes the requirement that we do not charge parent fees.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.

Commissioner Au? I think I saw your hand.

MS. AU: This is really a very depressing conversation, to tell you the least. I know Cecilia.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Dr. Southard, she's calling your name.

MR. SOUTHARD: We'll talk.

MS. AU: Silvia, I have tremendous respect for you as well as your organization and you guys have done wonders and it's very depressing because as previous
liaison to LAUP, I had already anticipated this day coming and it's -- it really saddens me that it's right on the horizon.

There's no -- there's no debate I mean you have exceeded all of our requirements. And on top of that, I think there's a growing awareness of the importance of early childhood education as well as preschool for four year olds.

The bottom line, though, is that First 5 L.A. has invested over a half a billion dollars on this initiative. And in some ways it's a good investment. But unfortunately, it's not something that we are in the position to continue beyond -- beyond the -- the expenditure of that investment, because we have other commitments as well.

It's not just for four year olds, we have a mandate to address the issues for children zero through five. And it's not just in school readiness but it's also in health, and in child safety.

I mean, we hear the -- see the headlines recently and those are heart wrenching concerns, but we are also challenged with.

So I -- I don't know what to tell you other than that in my heart and in my spirit I support you, but then, responsibly, I see that the fiscal reality as well.
And I would like to know that public funding is going to be coming -- and remember my comment last time we had a brief contact is that it's a matter ever of timing. Often times -- so if we could have eked out some way of extending your work even if it's a matter of -- of reducing the access as we go along perhaps in you know, we could maintain you at a significant level. But right now, we didn't do that.

And unfortunately, with Option 4, we just have a plan to extend you one more year. And clearly that may not be enough.

And it saddens me tremendously. But I think that's the reality. And it -- again it's very depressing. MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Well, let me see if I can arrest you of your depressed state.

MS. AU: Are you going to dance?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Let's not get personal.

I think it's fair to suggest that the staff has worked very hard to try to figure out how it request best deal with our realities as they are being defined.

Though don't know if this is part I should say called to my attention by a supervisor key nab by that the value of LAUP warrants curtailment. And registering rather substantial concerns in this regard.

I think we should proceed with a fair degree of
caution as to how we define our reality. I think our reality is evolving. I think our reality is -- is revolving in terms how we define or refine our Best Start. I think our reality is evolving with respect to how our human resource program is -- if you will the personnel status of this entity is being shaped or reshaped.

I think there is great which is demeanor in the words that were put up in the executive director calls our attention to the bottom right of the screen and underscores transition.

There is reservations on the part of the chair at least to lay claim to a conclusion of this sort in the midst of transition. I think it's very important to look at what the best product of First 5 is at this point.

No one disputes the fact as best as I can determine unless someone wants to contradict this that LAUP has done well by it's constituents and by it's funding entities.

Do we offer a counselor of perfection? I think not, but performance can be celebrated. Claims and advocates are seeking to publicly imitate this work so I think there has been a degree of sensitivity that has been applied by staff in terms of the four different options that could be potentially pursued.

I firmly believe that there is a lot of decisions
yet to be made by LAUP -- by LAUP. I'm sorry. By First
5. This commission. And this is momentous to put it
mildly.

And I would think that we would want to have more
discussion as it relates to you are focus on early
childhood education. Universal preschool, as it relates
to the overarching concerns that we have here as an entity
and is to move in this direction at this point in time
might be putting the cart before the horse. Might be.

I wish to say this in relatively tentative terms
which is not the way I ordinarily speak because I want to
expect the fact that a lot of thought and work has gone
forth on the part of the staff I think further
deliberation and thought is the order of the day.

Thus my recommendation that we continue the item
for at least one month. Extend the contract for a month
-- I would not choose to say that we ought to fund LAUP
for another year pursuant to the proposal made bit staff.

We ought to really get a bit more clear to accept
that we can accomplish that in the context of the
committee process which I would add is an open process.
And if we were to do that there may be a broader embracing
of more readiness on the part of the commission.

That would be the chair's preference and
consideration. I'm open to your feedback.
MS. TILTON: Just a quick question. I think it's probably argument to address the governor's $30 million in preschool. Do we get 10 million of that? Where is that 30 million of what is outlined?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Right. I don't have the capacity of the -- or the audacity to speak for the governor.

MS. BELSHE: I'm not going there, Mr. Chair, but I would note to speak -- consistent with your suggestion about further dialogue and programming and planning the timing is I think very good, because one of the agenda items we'll be bringing forward to the programming and planning is about policy and advocacy.

I think that will be a helpful assignment of conversation for that committee, and we'll certainly have full information and analysis of what's in the governor's we will have a budget by then.

So we'll have more detailed information about how those funds westbound districted.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you.

Commissioner Kaufman?

MR. KAUFMAN: My issue I think is how -- I don't have a problem with the way -- with moving it for a month.

I guess for me what I'd like to see from that conversation come back is more clear understanding of
where the trade off that's LAUP has to make between actual spaces -- actual children in those spaces -- I agree "spaces" sounds like a chair, but it's actually kids -- versus sustainability efforts versus efficiency activities.

I have no idea if that's the right amount but sustainability. And the sustainability efforts and there's a challenge, I think, between how many children can LAUP cover, what kind of sustainability efforts do they do try to change public policy. What kind of efficiency things do they do. And how much do they pay providers program support budget.

Those are very complex issues which I believe they should solve not us that. We should not try to tell them how to best to allocate money within their budget. But then we voluntary did have our money. The responsibility of knowing how much -- if we had a bet he shall sense that have a month from now and LAUP said we want to did this this and this.

And we're trying to have a goal of saving whatever amount we get but spend 3 million or 4 million less because we do this and this and this.

That's another story. But it seems like we're not quite getting that understanding. I think that would be very helpful.
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: I think that's important.

Dr. Fielding.

MR. FIELDING: It's so wonderful to hear the continued success of LAUP, and I think we're all very proud of having been involved for this period of time.

I think what -- I have a couple of notes. One, I think was critical now is to generate a level of public support that will lead us to what we all want which is universal coverage. And so I think the additional funds I think $900,000 for that purpose, I assume it will be well spent in my view is a critical time sensitive investment and we certainly need to in that effort be a full partner as this commission to try to generate that kind of public support and representative that's can lead to that.

I think on the other hand, we also need to be realistic. And every year we talk about well, you know, we think things will get better or we think there will be level of public support needs to be clear what's going on happen next year the year of after that.

Trying to -- is to delineate that. And I -- I don't have a have preferences but I'll wait to see what comes out of further discussion. Is not just to assume that everything is always going to come up roses.

We want that. We all want that desperately. And assuming it for a little longer than we should. So I
think that will be important. But I also think that
$200,000 looking into alternate plans is very important.

And I don't know what would happen if we said you
know, we have -- have a means tested program. I know a
lot of the children families couldn't provide anything.
But there are some families like the gentleman who
tested who probably could contribute something. And
not having any money contributed to if I'm not mistaken
seems to me to be the wrong direction when we're trying to
make something universal.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you.

Additional comments on behalf of the commission?

MR. STEELE: Mr. Chairman could we have the
minutes that Mr. Delgado's status, he's also a board
member of LAUP. I forgot he neglected to say something
when he got up and left.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you. Duly
noted.

Any other comments on part of the commissioners?

Yield not to temptation Commissioner Tilton.

MS. TILTON: I want to follow up on
Dr. Fielding's comment.

I understand there's a lot of policy, and there's
a lot of guidelines, et cetera, that prohibit charging
families for preschool of their children.
And this is bothered me all along because the cost per child is very low level and we just assume that we can never charge because the state says we can't charge.

But I think we should pursue that because it is an answer that makes sense. At least a sliding scale or something that basically in terms of the history of participation and programs for families in many different areas.

The success always seems to rise with the investment made by that family even for substance abuse programs et cetera. If you invest in something you are more apt to stay with it.

And so can we -- can we research the inevitability of never being able to charge a family a dime to place their child in preschool. Because if you can spend five $ a month. Why not? Why can we not do that. And can we challenge this prohibition.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Certainly a matter of sympathy of consideration in context of the committees deliberation. And maybe the case that Dr. Avila or those who are familiar with it that you might want to share now. If so, we can do it in the context of program and planning.

MS. AVILA: We will certainly continue, and we
have asked for that before the on the First 5 commission.

California level has had the free preschool. And
even as late as this year because they reformed to now the
California signature program, they truly believe that it's
needs to be free.

Now, I want to say that about 80 percent of our
sites. Some sights we do charge based on ZIP code not on
income but it's very small. Of over 80 percent of our
programs are in signature programs so we can look that
the.

I just had one question. Since you allowed me to
come up here, if you're continuing it for a month, we
anticipate and you said we will extend and obviously money
because I have to pay providers and staff et cetera that
we would look at the regular advance that we would get we
can work it out with staff?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: That would be the assumption.
Thank you for the clarification.

Dr. Southard?

MR. SOUTHARD: I'm approaching this from another
angle. Somebody may know this already are e-cigarettes
included in what we can't charge for income under our
funding? Or not?

Because as I understand it that is a rapidly
growing segment of the smoking market and if that were
included maybe that would change our income trajectory.

MS. BELSHE: I'm seeing, Commissioner Southard shaking heads by our government relations and -- and policy team, but we will look into that specifically and come back to inform program and funding.

But I'm getting the sense that it is not. It's a good question.

MR. KAUFMAN: There's also the illegal purchase of cigarettes on reservations. I don't believe we get tax on reservations. Obviously not from your illegal sales side.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you so much.

MS. AU: Since -- do you remember early on again reflecting back we talked about -- or I talked about a scholarship or voucher system whereby the preschools would still have to meet your star rating requirements, but then you would give them the opportunity to sort of mean tests students coming to their door. And allow them certain numbers of slotting if you want to call them slotting as an new business model to give some of that flexibility I guess you can call it that regarding the funding

MS. AVILA: And the answer that's not changed since the last time we assess the classroom so the classroom gets rate and had then they get reimbursed based on three, four, or five star. Based on our fund
development First 5 California dollars.

MS. AU: Yes.

MS. AVILA: But it's a significant amount. We would not be able too take their dollars and still then give them a voucher, because it is through -- they have different criteria.

It's about the academic performance index of the community, and with the community it's the elementary school that's we're sending the children. So it's within the attendance area. So the voucher issue that you had raised earlier would not work if we continue to accept First 5 California dollars.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you very much.

Anything more to be heard on this subject at this time? One month continuance is the order of the day unless there's an objection.

I see no such -- no such objection. Therefore we will continue as indicated.

Let's move at this time to the next item, please.

MS. BELSHE: Mr. Chair, as Raul comes to the mike, I was remiss in not making a very important acknowledgment earlier in my presentation along the listening, learning, and leading initiative that I wanted to note that Wang Ching Chin (phonetic) and Celia Sandoval
(phonetic) as they're leaving, I'd like to -- I really was remiss in acknowledging their important leadership and consultant capacity. And, again, thank them for their time.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much on behalf of the commission.

All right. We will now move to Item Number 9. Approval of the operations programmatic budget for FY '13-'14.

MS. BELSHE: And we're going to try to move along, those of you who have presentations still to come, work through these at a good clip.

There's a very important decision before the Board, but I don't wish to foreshadow other speakers to come.

Please make your presentations in quick order.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: You get that Professor Ortega?

MR. ORTEGA: I sure did.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Good.

MR. ORTEGA: I got it clear from John.

Good afternoon. We're here to discuss the adoption of the resolution 2013-14. I mean -04.

By adopting this resolution the commission is approving authorizing staff to implement the following for
fiscal year '13-'14. The operating budget of $17.8 million consists of staffing, supplies, and services related directly to program design delivery and oversight of programs and the administrative support.

We'll also be approving a program budget of $194.3 million which consists of the five place based county wide strategies and county wide initiatives prior strategic investments and reach and evaluation.

It also establish as not administrative cap of $9.8 million which equals 4.61 percent of total budget and approves the schedule of commitments to comply with CASPI 54 requirement.

Before you is a slide of the specific actions that you will be approving once you adopt this resolution. In order to expedite my presentation I would really jump into the main changes which is in the program budget.

The budget under review is what management considers to be a transitional budget that is consistent with the '12-'13 budget as amended.

In addition, staff and management acknowledges that due to efforts underway with the L-3 and Best Start inquiries staff will be coming back most likely in the fall to address the impacts those efforts have identified. To the fits calendar year '13-'14 budget.

The budget that's before you is a total of
$212.1 million. That's an overall decrease of $2 million from what staff presented on May 16 to the full board.

The decrease was made exclusively to the program budget which I will go further into in a minute. No changes to the operating budget at all.

The overall administrative rate increases from 4 had the 57 percent to 4.61. And that is only because of the denominator, the program budget decreased by the $2 million.

The changes are highlighted on the attachment A which is called at den dumb and in addition attachment C which is the program budget summary. Those attachments have been provided in the folder that's are in front of you and also electronically on the board packet.

I'll be referring a lot to attachment C. And I'm just going to really focus on the program budget because that's the action that we're asking to really approve, which were changes from what we presented on May.

As I said, the total overall budget 194.3 an overall decrease of $2 million.

The most significant changes are primarily related to program based place based Best Start. Which reflects a decrease of $4 million. The decrease is exclusively related to the area of family strengthening.

The $22.9 million for place based reflects
funding for three months of community level work. For families strengthening it assumes ten hospitals including the pilot and Antelope Valley and up to three additional hospitals to sign on.

Of the three predicted hospitals to sign on, staff has determined that those hospitals have a lower amount of Best Start birth than originally projected.

In addition this would result in a smaller number of births projected to be referred to select home visitation.

These estimates will be further informed by the responses to the LIOI received on May 31st is the commission's policy decisions on the scale of Welcome Baby to be taken action on at the July board meeting.

Changes in the other four components of the budget. County wide strategies the county wide initiatives and the prior strategic plan and research and evaluation are detailed in the addendum and as indicated earlier.

Staff finalizing contracts grantees scope of work and budgets. For example that could be identified on page 2 of that attachment. C, I'm sorry.

On page 3 under the county wide initiative, the increase to children's dental care initiative by 1.3 million. In the current fiscal year, those original
objectives that were proposed for this year to be completed by the end of 2013 will be moved to the next fiscal year and because of that the scope and the budget has been changed appropriately.

Moving on. In reviewing attachment C is the second significant change which is in the last section which is the contract authority section five.

The increase of 17.1 million from 169.2 million to 186.3 million represents changes to accurately reflect the timing of contracts start date.

To remind commissioners, the contract authority reflects the amount needed to execute contracts beginning on or after July 1st, 2013, but both fiscal year of '13-'14.

Now I'm moving on from the budget is reviewing our year end fiscal requirements. The commitment schedule which is also known as the GASB four presentation which is attachment E.

The approval of this table is consists of First 5 LA's revised fund balance policy which also included a set reserve of the 25 percent of operating and program budget of a little bit over $53 million.

This schedule complies with the report and requirements for our year end comprehensive final report also known as the capture. The approval of this schedule
reaffirms the committed fundings for these projects which include previously prove June 23, 2013. And the alignment the to the strategic plan as amended.

Also, in addition, for your information, staff has also provided a fund balance schedule, GASB 54 presentation which is attachment D to reflect the June 30, 2013 uncommitted fund balance of $96.4 million.

In addition to the fund balance we also provide you a long term final projections attachment E which was presented back in January of 2013.

I'd like to note though we do reflect remaining uncommitted fund balance as of June 30, 2013, I would like to remind commissioners when this document is reconcile today the long term financial projections the current uncommitted fund balance and future revenue is notated to meet the design of our zero based efforts under our current strategic plan as amended.

In this graph alone the family strengthening strategic indicates that it is project today cross our projected revenue by 2019.

Of course, this assumes that no amendment to any GASB 54 presentation and no changes to the current strategic plan as amended.

This pretty much concludes the presentation of great work and collaboration of the organization.
specifically the members of our budget and finance committee headed by Dr. Southard, Commissioner Figueroa-Villa, and I'd like to acknowledge my staff Tino and Alison. And last but not least I want to thank all the commissioners and the supervisors staff who have supported me for the last year as the interim director of finance.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much. Well done.

Let's hear from the committee chair. Dr. Southard, if you would choose to weigh in at that point, the floor is yours.

MR. SOUTHARD: So I think we are recommending adoption of the recommendation as presented. And I -- I don't think I need to expand on that.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much. Are there any questions from the staff or any further discussion?

Moved by Dr. Southard and seconded by Dr. Fielding.

Once again questions, comments on the presentation by interim budget director Mr. Ortega?

Going once? Going twice? Please record a unanimous vote.

Thank you for your work, sir.
MR. KAUFMAN: Can I make one comment?

MS. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Please.

MR. KAUFMAN: I have no problem with what we just voted on.

One of the things that we have struggled with is spending money at a pace that we projected.

Will you be -- is it expected that to the budget and finance committee that on a periodic basis you will present to them how it's going? Or are we actually spending the money at a pace that we projected?

MS. BELSHE: Absolutely. You recall in January we provided then the Q1 performance plan and we did a second quarter report as well.

I recall I characterized it as embrace the red, where we were slow getting money out of the door. we had an organization wide effort to put together a quality improvement performance plan. So we will be continuing to -- unless the Board provides different direction, we'll be continuing to provide reports on a quarterly basis.

MR. KAUFMAN: Quarterly?

MS. BELSHE: So you'll recall from our most recent update, we have moved to yellow, and some has actually moved to green.

We're not out of the woods, but we're putting it towards some important internal improvements.
Vice chair, as we move on to the next item first I want to acknowledge that the people Raul acknowledged, he didn't -- this is his son and daughter. Very important to our little people under age five. And as a rule, noted he has served as an interim finance director for a year -- how long?

MR. ORTEGA: 16 months.

MS. BELSHE: But he has really grown and developed and contributed in so many cases during a very challenging time for First 5 L.A.

So we really want to thank him as he was able to steward this ship during that period of time and recognize his ongoing contributions to First 5 L.A.

(Audience applause.)

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Well done. Well done, Raul. And if you could try to use pictures -- it's all right. We know how it works. You needed a little help; so you brought in the little ones. That works every time.

Let's move at this time to the next item before us.

Thank you.

MS. FICEK: Good afternoon, Commissioners.

As you may recall, at last months commissioners meeting, there was an autism investment agenda items, the board directed staff to develop options to continue
funding to and care for this national project.

Options have been created and presentation was provided at the May programming and planning committee meeting for review and feedback.

That same level of detail was also included in the memo that was part of your board packet.

In the interest of time, today's presentation will provide a overview or summary and divided into two parts.

This will provide context and will also frame the general presentation of their developmental screening project. Progress and performance will be highlighted for both projects. I'm now going to turn it over to Ms. Tith, who will provide the remainder of the presentation.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you.

Ma'am?

MS. TITH: Good afternoon. As Tara mentioned, I'll first start with performance of the information regarding services contract.

First 5 L.A., just as a reminder, has funded 211s information and referral service since 2005 County wide systems and improvement investment.

Four goals in your current strategic plan. In 2011 the contracts performance based agreement that had clearly defined outcomes and performance measures to
insure that through First 5 L.A.s funding a timely and efficient response provided to pregnant woman and families with children zero to five seeking information about their child's health and billion being.

For fiscal year '12-'13 performance targets were accomplished by 211 for First 5 L.A. to evaluate of these measures.

The table before you outlines 211s current performance to date on these targets. The first are the key measures defined in First 5 '12-'13. And the those in purple are further counsel contracted with the County of Los Angeles for reference.

The next column states by 211. And next to that are the performance to date. The same table shared in the memo and as noted from July 2012 to April 2013 although they are established targets, two key performance targets each time to answer and abandonment rate have not been made.

This is highlighted in the red box you see before you. First 5 L.A. staff, a provider for this contract and 211 have been involved in discussions of their current performance and understanding reasoning for not meeting these targets.

Activities to take place in the next quarter of fiscal year '14 to address these performance issues. At
the end of the quarter, if 211 continues to not show
significant achievement of these targets, a corrective
action plan will be developed.

    Staff will be come back by December to inform the
board of progress and if applicable status if their okay.
So that contract serves as a context and now spend the
remainder of the presentation on their developmental
screening and care projection.

    Coordination project of this project. So I won't
go through all the slides you have before you in your
packet, but are there for further reference.

    I'll just briefly state what the project is, what
the efficiency five currently funds and continue the
current funding option s of this wrote project.

    MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Proceed.

    MS. TITH: An overview briefly of the project.

Enhance 211s information referral services standardized
screening tool easy of over the phone to identify children
that may be having disability.

    Of those identified the occasion coordination
aspect of the project seeks to connect them to early
intervention services to through the formal agreements
established with key service partners.

    This project supports our current strategic plan
goal that all children are school ready. Briefly this
slide just highlights that First 5 L action funding for the period of March 15, 2012 through June 30th, 2013. Due to interests of time, I won't go over this but there are highlights some of the key lessons learned from First 5's LA current funding this of this project.

First 5 L.A. recognizes the opportunity to maintain the capacity of this project. In the context of additional resources approved by the board last month in the early identification of autism spectrum this order is other have developmental delays the slide presents options for a continued funding.

The First 5 option the second states what the proposed budget set for that option. And the third states what it means to adopt the specific option for fiscal and programmatic.

Option 1 is to maintain funding at First 5 L.A. level for an additional year not to exceed an amount of $278,371.

Option 2 is to maintain First 5 L as current level of funding as well as include the match funding that's slated to end at the end of this no to cover the total program costs for an additional year not to exceed an amount of $582,207.

Option 3 proposes to the same funding level as option 2, but if First 5 LARQ, which is scheduled to be
related and they are eligible to apply they will be encouraged to do so.

This will only serve as bridge funding until receipt of that award. Based on the options for presented before you staff recommends funding option Number 2. This option will allow the capacity of broke eastern based on current lessons learned as well as alignment for our investments with staff will work with 211 to address ways to increase number of signed consent forms from parents could directly follow up with their key service partners establish and collect process and evaluation needs and children of families served by this project.

Develop a plan that coordinates their grantees of the autism project possible coordination activities include. M L Us with the selected grantees sharing information resources to increase prenatal knowledge of child development and working collaboratively to form identify and adjust challenges and service deliver equipment as well as this opportunity will help explore options for connected 211 with Best Start communities that selected and reserve services as a priority.

We ask the board to approve funding of Option Number 2, authorize staff to complete final contract execution upon approval this proposed recommendation that will need to be other adopted for fiscal year '14
programmatic budget.

With that, this concludes our presentation.

MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you very much.

Any questions or comments?

Jonathan?

MR. FIELDING: I have just a couple of comments.

I'm concerned about the extent to which the performance of couple of those performance metrics were missed. To have a 30 percent disconnect rate and to have, you know, basically double the expected time, I think we just need to understand that a little better and either modify our expectations -- I would hope we would be able to move in the first direction with 211.

But I want to really understand what they're planning to do to remedy this before approving this contract.

And maybe the staff understands that, but that was not explained to us at this point.

Well, anything you do will have to have a plan of correction. That is not sufficient. There have been sufficient performance.

My second -- and I'll let you comment in a minute.

My second comment is every year we come back and the funding we're looking at funding 211. I think among
among all of our investments, I think this is one that most people would think this needs to be continued over more than a year.

And to hold them I don't know if they're staff turn over has anything to do with the fact they have year to year contracts over whatever, but I was wondering if we could consider a multi-year contract if in fact you think this is going to be central to what we are doing and the importance of developmental screening which is insufficiently done, unfortunately, in the practice of medicine, which it should suggests to me that this may be important to continue over a period of time.

I would like the answer to the first question.

MR. KAUFMAN: We heard a little bit about it at the planning meeting if you want to tell us what you heard.

MS. BELSHE: To summarize some of the learnings -- cooperatively, the 211 -- to better understand what the issues are, and I want to underscore, Commissioner Fielding that our reaction was just as yours, which is we want to better understand the problem to support their ability to address it rather than adjusting the standards lower.

So that, in our judgment, was not an acceptable response; so we're work very both the problem and the
correction with a keen eye towards monitoring and coming back and frankly with a different way of structuring the contract to be even more performance 211.

MS. BOSCH: Yes. There were issues with hiring and training of staff new staff. They ended up having to let go a large majority of the people they hired. And they now rehired and have trained and are actually are already seeing better numbers in the last month.

Due to the role out of new staff that are trained and we expect to see the members get better as we proceed over the next quarter.

So we -- again it's an issue of hiring. I think there was an attempt to hire veterans and it became just a problem.

So they've rectified that and now they are on course to be successful.

MR. FIELDING: Thank you. I just wanted to know then with respect to multi year agreements, the only issue is we have approval not off of our bets on an actual five they can be contingent on approval.

Organization that would make well out of kind of central to what we do and so we could be subject to approval of the budget or subject to whatever. But then at least they have the anticipation worried about whether something is going to be happen that with would reduce
their level of work that we're expecting.

MS. BOSCH: Understood.

MS. AU: Just to comment on that multi year. I think I brought that question up when the budget was first introduced to us because is it was one of the recommendation that's was made to the commission to consider multi year contracting and the position on the part of Kim was that it's a bit premature that they need this year to sort of take care of some other fundamentals before we begin officially moving into multi year contracting because I think your comment would apply to a lot of other grantees that we are in contracting with as well.

MS. BELSHE: You're speaking to earlier consideration about moving to a two year budget.

MS. AU: Yes. Correct.

MR. KAUFMAN: Any other questions or comments?

MR. DENNIS: The only thing program and planning meeting with regards to developmental screening. I do like the fact, one this is not an opportunity although over the phone to do developmental screening and I would also suggest that we should consider developmental screenings in other venue that's we have I think it's a tragic to the degree to which we do developmental screenings of young children and I -- I
suggest that we look at that in other early childhood
arenas in which we are seeing young kids on a daily basis.

MR. KAUFMAN: I don't -- any other comments? I
don't think we have any public comment on that.

Let me clarify what I think we're doing. One is
we're receiving information about the general 211
contract. There's no action that we need to take on that.
Just an explanation to help you come back in December
letting us know more things.

Also you're asking to us take an action on either
extending at the same amount or additional amount on page
270 in the hard copy.

So I guess I should read that as a motion and we
can discuss it.

So the motion would be maintain First 5 L.A.s
current level of funding with matching funding to cover
total program costs on an additional year.

MS. BELSHE: Additional year.

MR. KAUFMAN: Additional year not to exceed
$580,607.

Anyone -- I'll make this motion.

(Motion seconded.)

MR. KAUFMAN: Seconded by Dwayne.

Now we have a conversation on this. So any --
any questions on this specific motion?
MS. AU: I think the staff is recommending option 2. Is that what you just --

MR. DENNIS: That's what he just read.

MS. AU: I missed that part. Thank you.

MR. KAUFMAN: So to clarify the second half of the amount of money putting into this is because there used to be matching fund from outside foundations and those moneys have gone away.

MS. TITH: It's going to end at the end of the month.

MR. KAUFMAN: And if this were not be to be matched what would be the implication?

MS. TITH: If not, then they would only be able to continue with their program or what our current funding's left; so that's only one -- that's only care coordinators versus --

MR. KAUFMAN: So half the number of children would be screened and referred. To clarify, what you're saying is that if the 211 applied for the autism grants that were coming out in a month or two, this would be bridge funding. But if they weren't successful, this would be there for the coming fiscal year; correct?

MS. TITH: Not for option 2, but option 3 was the bridge funding.

MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. So the difference between 2
and 3 was that this -- that this is there even if they
don't apply.

MS. TITH: Direct, and we will fund them full
level.

MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. I'd like an opinion of the
commissioners if they think this should be there even if
they don't apply or make it so expect them to try to apply
with? The competitive grant for the opportunities I just
want to be sure we're clear on what we're saying.

MS. AU: Again, for clarity, option 2 is to
provide them with the five A V 2807 option? And -- and if
they should choose to apply to the office of and they were
successful in receiving that additional funding, it would
be in addition to the 58267 rather than a bridge funding
as reflected in option 3?

MS. TITH: That's correct.

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes, that is correct. That's
clarifying it.

MS. AU: Thank you.

MR. KAUFMAN: The question is what's the sense of
the commission do we prefer. Option two versus option 3.

MR. SOUTHARD: I'd move option 2. I would move
option 2.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. It's been
properly moved and seconded.
I see Ambassador Wagner is trying to weigh in here.

MR. WAGNER: I think we really need to clarify and make sure the options are clear.

Option 1 is to continue First 5 LA's funding portion of the grant which is rough at this $28,778,000.

Option 2 is to pick up that matching grant which is set to expire this month so the total First 5 funding would be $582,000. And that's regardless of whether they compete they would get the $582,000 for the year.

Option 3 is the bridge where we would provide the 3582. And if they compete and successfully bid on the R F P, the portion that they would receive only gets them to when the R F F contract picks up that's why it's a notion of a bridge.

MS. BELSHE: And if I might, one of the important basis and we candidly, in consideration in terms of options 2 and 3. But in where we landed in terms of option 2 reflects a recognition that the 211 developmental screen is really a county wide program. It provides county wide value. Service and to sustain and candidly a little discomforted because it effectively has us do the matching funds. We're back filling another foundation that's stepping away.

But it is an important developmental screening
tool. It is very promising it is county wide. The R F Q
the R F P board direction of a month ago is frankly
anticipated to be more place based. More community
oriented. So we would view 211 very important county wide
complement to those community based programs.

So that's why we ultimately concluded these are
very related but separate.

That's why we recommended 2.

MR. DENNIS: That's the pint I made on P and P.

The assumption that the supervisors motion last month
would replace -- I mean, that that's just I don't think
that that was the intention and so therefore I think
staff's recommendation around option 2 is the one that I
would personally support.

MR. KAUFMAN: Jonathan?

MR. FIELDING: Now I'm a little confused. I'm
sorry.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: It's okay. Go ahead anyway,
Jonathan.

MS. AU: You need to switch to coffee.

MR. FIELDING: First time in my life if I do is
that.

The -- what I want to make sure is we're always
trying to have the right kind of incentives for those we
contract. A lot of the cases and it seems to me option 2
does not have any incentive. Option 3 does.

Option 3 really doesn't weigh either because it says if you get it, I wouldn't bother to get it. If I knew I was going to have the money anyway. Do we want to give some extra none. To give them sources of funding and give a little extra none if in fact their successful. And then have it part of option 3.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Very well taken position.

Commissioner Fielding, I suspect that it is fair to suggest the following that which you mention as a worthy pursuit is precisely that but it is not meant to be exclusive option 2 stands as it does to support that to Commissioner Dennis's recommend motion and staff recommendation and I think it should carry with it your statement and insight so that 211 is cognizant of the fact that it can and should precisely the incentive.

Commissioner Kaufman, please.

MR. KAUFMAN: I agree with Jonathan about incentives. I think one of the incentives that I would put in, there were a fair number of children screened and we lost them. Part of them had to do with some bureaucratic challenges, and -- but I think screen on the phone is actually counterproductive if you don't get to a comprehensive -- to actual services. Done no good or more harm than good and add anxiety.
And so I think the incentive how many children get screened and how many children get screened and two is the responsibility is to get them to that definitive evaluation.

We can't hold them past that. If there's a way to look at that and constantly monitor to -- to monitor for that to understand how they're progressing to show that they're getting more and more kids to those definitive evaluations then I think they do serve some incentive based how that might work with a success grant.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.

MR. DENNIS: What I -- I just want admirable but could potentially be quite pensive and that could in essence be double this contract.

I mean, the -- the identification piece is one thing. Once you try to connect ma'am families to the actual provider is --

MR. KAUFMAN: I'm only talking about the evaluation provider, not the children screening in large proportion did not get to regional centers somewhere else for an evaluation.

I'm not in anyway holding 211 responsible for what happens close to that definitive evaluation.

MR. DENNIS: And I'm all I'm suggesting that is a remainder piece that causes a programmatic item to take
care of. And if we are going to give that type of a review, I would suggest that double is this contract.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Called your attention that we have five minutes remaining on this agenda today. With the admonition the executive director has been very blatantly disregarding, but I'm here to help reinforce it. As best as I can.

So let me earn my money today, will you? I'm going to go now to the public comment on dispose of it. Call your attention to the fact that there is a motion before us.

Mary Belle Berg (phonetic.)

MS. BERG: Good afternoon, commissioners.

I did want to point out that when you look at the 3000 number, yes those are the screenings but those to take 10 to 20 minutes the majority of the work is the follow up and.

The focus is on getting children to the services. And what you're seeing is just the lag time. That is -- is associated with looking at the day it for one year versus the three year program. And also the fact that there is time need to get the outcomes but it does not mean that the outcomes are not occurring.

And, in fact, that is the most successful aspect of this work. The care of coordination and the network
partnership that is the emphasis. And so the bulk of the
costs associated with this program is related to follow up
the advocacy and implementation of the care plans the
family scan.

To clearly understand, because the screening is
clearly important and as Commissioner Dennis said, if you
don't have a plan for implementing the care plan, then
you're not being successful. So the focus of the program
is implementation of the care plan.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much. As I
indicated, it's been moved by Commissioner Dennis. The
discussion of the staff consistent that recommendation is
before us.

Are there any further questions or comments at
this point in time? Are there any objections?
Seeing none, please record a unanimous vote.
We'll move now to the next item on the agenda,
which is item number 11. Thank you.

MS. BELSHE: We have two issues before the
commission, Mr. Chair, that are follow up to presentations
made to program and planning.

At our meeting last month regarding legislative
criteria for the year ahead, at that meeting it was also
suggested that we call out specifically the importance of
the commission endorsing the existing direction that has
come in different avenues relative to a particular focus
on sustaining financing or securing public financing to
the best our ability to support home visitation and
quality programs.

So the two items before the board by Ms. Lee who
has a very brief presentation.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much.
MS. LEE: Good afternoon, commissioners.
We appreciate your time and we know we’ve gone
over many of these points; so I will quickly go over them.

As a reminder that the policy department has been
working with our executive director on assessing our
overarching policy, buckets seem in temps of the work we
will be doing.

And there is a -- so there are many components.
It is not to your policy and advocacy strategies.

On the agenda and the criteria for developing
that agenda, this is just to emphasize the point that we
reviewed hundreds of those every year, and used the
criteria to cull the list down to a more focused list to
insure that those bills are worthwhile for our attention.

And the we also look at the budget and identify
opportunities to advocate on behalf of the population and
the issues that we care about as well.

In terms of legislative agenda for those issues
on the agenda you see before you, it will include activities of various levels of support as you see in the list. And this is the criteria that we have developed the five below alignment which are part of the strategic planning process to develop the legislative agenda and the top criteria is alignment which we first viewed as our facility to insure that those bills we want to support and the agency investments.

And that reflects the waiting is that the staff uses when we're looking at the bill that's are proposed. As we develop the legislative agenda. We work with our providers feedback we discuss and work with the commission regarding the legislative criteria and agenda as we did alternate the programming and planning committee a couple of weeks ago and provided a overview in May at the commission meeting.

The meeting and then continued to work with our consultant team and provide advocacy and provide regular updates to the commission on our as well as work with the board to engage your leadership as needed on important areas of interest.

As we are enhancing our policy activities and strategic abilities, we're looking to make sure that we're looking at key correlations that we want to insure. We had flexibility that we're able to play a more active role
in bills insert changes in the different in the past in a more substantial way.

Considerations and relationships that we're building all along the way as an important thread to the work we do.

As Kim has mentioned, we will continue to come back to the board to talk with our overall and in July present that campaign to the full commission and provide a free view in a couple of weeks in but before you have the criteria and the legislative agenda that we would ask for your support on so that the agency can formally adopt that list of bills for support.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right the matter is before us.

Any comments for staff in connection with the presentation?

MR. FIELDING: Good presentation.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Good presentation is regarding section five. And we should have a further conversation about that at our next regularly scheduled meeting in July.

Section five deals with overall consideration. Consideration I have in mind here in is the discussion that we had earlier is that go back to universal preschool matters of the relationship with LAUP the issue of LACOE.
It's really to drill down with more care on early childhood education one example is ECE the works and I do believe that there's a great need to look at ECE generally. But we have an obligation, I think, to look care carefully at what's on our plate and to look at whether or not there is the appropriate level of alignment and that we are taking advantage of it in the interest of a stewardship that is resources we have and development of those resources and the extent to which things are working that we don't fail to recognize that and in that connection build on the strengths that may already be in place.

So I want to make sure we take a close look at that when we come back in July. This is 11 priority focus areas ECE and H V and Stacy you know what I'm referring to.

And I -- so we really do need to do that. In terms of care and abundance of attention to existing programs to see if in fact do we are taking stock of their contribution I one of the thing that's contribute to in efficiency in context of transition is to reinvent the wheel. If it ain't broke don't fix it. If it is working, well, let's celebrate it as best practices, promises practical assets and see what we can get from it.

All right. With that in mind, any further
MS. BELSHE: So, Mr. Chair, there are two action items as a part of this one.

I'm hearing your direction or recommendation to the full commission that the second piece, which is affirming the priority areas of early childhood education and home visitation for policy and sustainability, you'd like it that to be healed over a month.

That will give us an opportunity to have programming and planning take concrete action steps to broader for conference.

Certainly, we take your comments very much to heart in terms of wanting to build upon existing resources and activities that are working and we expect to be coming back with a broader set of strategies some very important work we are already supporting.

The second action item that is before you is to approve the criteria for developing First 5 L.A.s annual legislative agenda and approve the agenda for 2013.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. It's before us as presented.

Is there a motion to move this item forward?

MS. AU: I move it.

MR. BOECKMANN: Seconded.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Moved and seconded. Moved by
Commissioner Au and seconded by Commissioner Boeckmann.

Is there any further discussion? Are there any opinions?

MR. DENNIS: Clarification, Mr. Chair. The second piece that we moved to July. That is when we presented it at program and planning?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Correct.

MR. DENNIS: And then debate for the full commission in July.

MS. BELSHE: And what we really want to bring in the full commission for the commission to affirm the areas, but we're really spending a lot of time is developing a broader campaign that reflects this board's already very clear direction about this public financing as fully possible important areas.

So that's what we'll be taking to the planning committee.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much. We appreciate that clarification, Commissioner Dennis.

Item is before us.

If there are no objections, we will record a unanimous vote.

And thank you to the staff for the presentation.

MS. LEE: I want to thank our team.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much. Duly
noted.

MS. BELSHE: That sets up -- this is another presentation that we dove into twice now with program and planning. And intended to do further later this month.

This is brief updates on implementations of family strengthening.

MS. DuBRANSKY. Good afternoon. Don't blink, I'm going to go really fast.

The objectives here before you and really the purpose so to prepare you to have conversation busy a policy decision about the scope and scale of the family strengthening investment.

We present this to you each month to justify what we're talking about when we use the term family strengthening. Is targeted home visitation. And then we also want to make sure that you recall and are aware of the various policies and decision that's have been made that have led to us where we are in incomplete presentation at this time as well as the fiscal implementation as have you also reviewed on several occasions.

And as we reported in January, in response at this time letter of intent that was post and had disseminated to the 24 eligible hospitals in Welcome Baby.
Nine hospitals have February 1st. One began May 1st, and two were on the consent calendar today.

These nine hospitals pilot deliver over a quarter of the babies and half of the Best Start babies.

So this gives a sense of where those hospitals are placed regionally throughout the county and then also like to show you that you how that looks visually; so as you see the red cross in the middle our locality.

The Blue Crosses have come on since the pilot this year.

Now, these four hospitals listed on the slide responded to the LOI in May. Along the with the ten currently a third of the babies and almost 60 percent of the Best Start babies.

Again, to look at it visually, you can now see the you have the red and the blue and you have the green the green crosses indicate the four hospitals that responded to the LOI in May.

You see Valley Pres by Panorama City and the northeast valley community. In the south, you see Centinela. West Athens and Torrance serving Wilmington. You see Baldwin Park, Best Start El Monte.

MS. CAREAGA: And in the negative amount of time we have activities and staff are planning for the family strengthening strategies which is set to start with this
visual which is described in more detail in the handout that accompanied this part of the board packet.

So I'll just go over just some of the visual aspects to help you understand this visual. So as you see there are some studies that cross both the LA metro pilot communities and the Best Start communities and county wide.

We'll see that there's some color coding as well. The green studies will those that really have an implementation focus. Aspects of program fidelity and quality on our overrule all efforts to create a system within LA county. The studies that are in the blue color are those that will really be the support to our sustainability work looking the funds to help offset costs for the Welcome Baby program and then the studies in yellow are more of our child and family work looking at the gain that's family will make who participate in those these programs and I should also already underway or are employees to launch the at the beginning of the next fiscal year and some still are in the flanking phase.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: What was that that you said about the negative time you had?

MS. CAREAGA: Allowing for technical difficulties as well.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Okay.
MS. CAREAGA: So this is an example of a study that is currently underway in our metro LA community and we launched this in 2010 and as well as placed based efforts there are child and family sufficient survey and that's providing Welcome Baby program specifically.

We're going long today household survey of parents and we come in and do a 90 minute in home infant observation at 12, 24, and 36 months of age with these children.

And we're 12-month survey analysis which is slowing some promising outcomes the social emotional development and homeowners environment.

I'll go to into that in a little bit more detail in a moment. Highlight that we see the child and family survey in indeed the helping us to develop a sustainability agenda both by providing a long today natural data but also at the juncture we have a very stable program that's reached a level of nature and direction in our work.

So this next slide highlights of some those key findings from that just reference and had outcomes that have raised level of statistical significant such as perceived social support, breast feeding, homeowners environment, and some socio-emotional issues.

What's also of interest is that is there are a
number of desired program outcomes such as depressive symptoms maternal and child healed coverage immunization which have not reached that level of significant.

Some of these are on the cusp of achieving that hope to be able to cusp but that those are shown in green they did not reach significant difference between the groups because actually both groups are doing quite well. There is really very little room for improvement.

So an example of some work that we're looking to start in fiscal year '13-'14 we have a cost effectiveness and Medi-Cal data match study.

We actually brought in an economic analysis expert back ins 10 and asked them to look at the better Best Start program in entirety and come up with some recommendations in how we can could and the findings from that recommendation really did send cent era round the welcome way by program.

So we're poised at this juncture those recommendations specifically to Welcome Baby and specifically to help advance our sustainability objectives.

We're also looking at the feasibility of doing a data match study using the Medi-Cal data system. Look about look into any sort of differences in use of Medi-Cal with those woman who have participated in Welcome Baby.
Also under consideration is a new Welcome Baby study. And one of the reasons we're thinking about that particular study is because we want to improve those significant findings.

Particularly one that's may have a health or health utilization focus because really in that sustainability work, we feel that those maybe outcomes of the most interest to potential funders certainly private insurance companies so we may need to did better than we currently are doing.

So current metro LA study around difference between our comparison groups having a quasi ex-permanent design beginning the evaluation of that program at the same time the program is being implemented so we haven't reached a level of fidelity or maturity.

Potentially, control for and to improve our outcomes if we need to do a new study. Knowing the answer to whether that's going to be required will come out of our work with our partners policy and CalStrat.

And restarting those conversations with those potential find out what it is they need to know and how we need to best position ourselves to provide that information to them.

These aren't my slides so let me just find stay at this notes.
MS. BELSHE: Let's wrap up in maybe a minute or so. Just touch on -- Stacy's going to do this, or Barbara.

Just in terms of --

MS. CAREAGA: Stacy. I think I have this one.

The policy department is working with our state policy and contractor and these are the short term and long term goals that they have in mind to exist in supportive legislative policy opportunities to advocate and policy early education and on the longer term to identify and support public funding streams to sustain our investments in early education and home visiting.

And Stacy will also mentioned main strategies that will include policy and advocacy policies and partnership development communication plans and long term revenue development at the next program and in July, the team will turn to the of that plan.

And so our next steps. We will be coming to the June program and planning committee meeting and staff will provide family strengthening scale.

Cost projections did transitional information on our sustainability work and so some open for further refinements to the July commission meetings staff will recommend a action to recommend the scale for investment.

And that concludes our presentation.
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.

Any questions for staff on this item?

Mr. -- Commissioner Southard?

MR. SOUTHARD: This isn't a question so much as a comment. It's perhaps for the July meeting.

If you could make a linkage between the outcomes in which have you had some statistical significant and potential cost savings in the health system if there have been any that might be a marketing plan for sustainability for these programs in the long run; so if there are such as we implement the ACA those things may be important in exactly.

Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Other questions, comments, suggestions, recommendations.

Commissioner Kaufman?

MR. KAUFMAN: Following up on what Barbara said, child welfare cost saves health care is certainly one for effective home visitation prematurely in terms of are reporting and placements.

It is a challenge when three major indicators are already doing 80 -- 90 percent.

You can't really improve on that. Some indicators of health benefit to be able to show it is benefits are very high; so I'm not sure what the answer
would be, but coming up with things that are lower; so you can show important that's certainly important.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.

Further comments?

Commissioner Au.

MS. AU: I guess I'm -- when we're looking at the universe of all these kids that are entering into the best baby hospitals or the Welcome Baby expense, perhaps the significant in terms of comparing the two populations versus those that are not. Perhaps the difference would be statistically challenging to me but I'm just wondering if we could begin to narrow in terms of height by risk factors. You know, and perhaps maybe there we would see a more of a differential. I'm not sure. So I'm -- you're the expert; so.

MS. CAREAGA: Well, with the introduction of the universal assessment there will be that risk screening and those families who are at the higher risk many home visitation program so we will find with Welcome Baby that there is participants primarily will be of a lower -- it really does run the gamut of those prior rates more at risk; so that will be one thing that we're hoping to control for.

MS. AU: Okay. Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Questions or comments?
MS. BELSHE: Chair and members of the commission. Hayley, who did this presentation has been a long time senior member of our R and E team. And she's going to be resigning in the next number of weeks; so we're going to be losing her extraordinary skills and talent.

Trying to bring home visitation and welcome evaluation work as well as serving on our inquiry team; so we are here it in terms of her personal and time and professional endeavors that no doubt will come but want to acknowledge her really significant contributions to this department.

She'll be missed.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much. We take note of her exquisite wit as well.

MS. BELSHE: Don't mess with her on vocabulary.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: We'll see. Thank you so much, ma'am.

MS. BELSHE: Wow us with your brevity and clarity.

MS. NUNOZ: I'm going to do my best. Good afternoon, Commissioners.

We're bringing in item today for discussion with we will return in July for an action item for your additional decision.

This is a pilot project update, for a program
extension and program expansion.

The family child care higher education academy was a proved as a county wide initiative. In support of November 15, 2010. With a two year allocation of 1,057,000, administered by east Los Angeles community college.

Administered at east Los Angeles community college by its foundation the program supports a unique population of monolingual Spanish speakers who are English language learners to educational equals.

The program aims to increase access to higher education. The ability for providers to navigate the college system, permit assessment and the preparation of the providers to would provide quality ECE include contextualized courses and in professional ongoing tutoring and educational career advisements.

So what have we learned over the past two years the program served over 200 providers, approximately three quarters of them were Spanish speaking, and one quarter with Cantonese and Mandarin speaking. They will qualify for child development permit and 37 additional qualify for the AA degrees.

In addition the east Los Angeles community college foundation contracted the Department of child and family studies at Cal State LA to conduct an evaluation.
And they found the program really progressed from just helping providers to obtain their child development permits to helping them attain their A A degrees and transfer to get their B A degrees which really speaks to the readiness of the providers.

The program also changed the providers perceptions of themselves to just being babysitters to being E CE professionals and profession lies in the field.

The providers completed approximately college GPA of about B or above. It raised computer literacy skills significantly. There are three other important lists that emerged, and we'll talk about the first one. The others can be found in your packet.

Institutional change within the college.

Leveraging the knowledge gained by First 5 L.A. by the First 5 L.A. investment.

The program was able to develop and contextualized other contextualized college courses without the First 5 L.A. funds.

This is not only important because it changes the pedagogy of how the professors are teaching providers, but also because it better supported monolingual students in light of the program.

It takes achievements over the past two years, capitalized on lessons learned.
We are seeking approval to expand the program and expanded services through August 31, 2016, in an amount not to exceed $2,125,000.

There are three key considerations for this proposal.

First, it offers an opportunity to promote sustainability institutional higher education assist to better serve FCC students, but also strengthens the capacity of the FCC provider communities to better to further professionalize the field.

Second, because the program offers hands on support services to a unique sub population of the workforce it is well position today Asian it's participants to other First 5 workforce in cares plus and the workforce initiative. This is in direct support of building a pathway for providers.

Third, it offers an opportunity to provide a unknown number of services for FCC preparation to serve E CE and other Best Start communities.

This is in alignment with the 2013-'12 Best Start community easement.

Compton, Pacoima, and Wilmington expressed a need for a high quality child care as a priority, child care priority F F C can help fill the center based spaces which was also noted as a priority for the -- for most of the
Best Start communities.

This proposal increases the actual to $750,000. The allocation allows the program to serve an additional 50 people at another college. It will also increase some of the critical service that's have made this program very successful.

Again, this item today is for discussion only and we will return to July for your addition. I'd be happy to answer any question.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Questions Commissioner Au.

MS. AU: I guess I'm trying to again set the tone in terms of connecting the dots and various programs that we have in terms of E CE workforce.

And we just approved the funding for three E CE workforce development programs just earlier. And I just need to know how this particular project connects with those as well, because I again trying to see interconnections and enhancement of each component as the they work in interaction and collaboration.

MS. MUNOZ: Absolutely. I think this program is really focusing on a sub population of the FCC providers that are English language learners; so they're well positioned to transition through the other workforce programs so that they can gain more experience, more knowledge, and continue throughout the pipeline.
In addition, the program there, moving forward, there will be a bigger effort to give all of these participants directed to other workforce projects so taking them where they are and assessing their readiness and moving them through your pipeline of other programs.

The R and E department has already worked on they're working on a very comprehensive evaluation of the consortium if it is continued.

MS. AU: Thank you.

MS. BELSHE: And the point I'd emphasize, Nancy, is that we have a continuum. We have a cluster of workforce development grants, 14 of them. And what we're trying to do is, you know -- this is a good example of opportunities that exist for us to really think purposefully about how to integrate the work that already exists.

It represents an important part of your continuum of workforce development because it's important albeit focused continuum or population in terms of monolingual speakers who are family child care providers.

So the early evidence that this is a potentially very effective way of moving this education and training, Number 1.

Number 2, if we're going to explore expanding our recommendation would be as maybe Linda indicated is focus
that satellite in a Best Start community has identified
the workforce that family child care providers as not an
important need or issue in their community; so we can
start creating our county-wide work.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Sir.

MR. KAUFMAN: Do you have outcome data on the
longest of the newly trained family child care providers
staying in child care versus number of children that they
actually serve?

I'm trying to -- I don't need it right now, but
for the next time. It's the real question for me -- is
are these people -- they're being trained.

Let's assume they're being trained beautifully.
Do the same amount of money and putting it no into a
center based workforce development center maintaining the
number of children served?

So I don't need to know it now. But I think
that's an important outcome, and we should be looking for.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.

Any further questions at this point?
Comissioner Dennis, you obviously do not wish to
go home today.

MR. DENNIS: It's a small question.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: It's all right. Let's order
dinner.
MS. AU: Not unintentional results of him becoming an official commissioner.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Would you wish for me to say what it is? Thank you so much. Proceed.

MR. DENNIS: Kim did mention replication. And if program and planning -- we could have some sense of financing replication taking consideration, this was the pilot, I would imagine that replication would be somewhat -- if we did the same amount of providers in another part of the county, how much it would cost and if you would duplicate it at the Best Start area?

I mean, just -- that would be helpful.

MS. BELSHE: Is there any cost efficiencies? One of the issues is our interest in doing this is in a way of advancing our goals in sustainability.

MR. DENNIS: I'm finished.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Further questions or comments -- dare I ask -- on this information item?

Ma'am, you've done well. We thank you for your testimony.

Next item please.

MS. BELSHE: Mr. Commissioner, from your program and planning committee meeting where we got a quick update off First 5 L.A.s recently housing project and we have Pam Yee from the CDC of the county of implementation.
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: No more pretense about being quick. I've heard that before. I'm not going for it. Do what you need to do.

MS. YEE: Great thanks.

MS. BELSHE: For the record, this was generalized for a limited period of time. We'll see how quick is quick.

MS. YEE: They said five minutes including questions and answers.

THE COURT: It's down to four and a half now.

MS. YEE: Okay. I want to start by thanking you for having me here this afternoon.

I want to remind you that the permanent support housing initiative with homeless families was begin but the commission as a result of their July 2012 report.

And one of the key findings in that record are there are 3,000 children age zero to five that are homeless on any given night either in shelters, transitional housing, or somewhere not fit for human habitation.

So what's the current need that was a year ago. The 2013 data from the bi-annual homeless count is not in yet.

Agencies working with homeless families -- that's 60 percent of the families that they're currently seeing
have children zero to five. That's 60 percent.

So before I give you the sort of first quarter update, which I think many of you have seen at programming and planning committee, I want to give you a snapshot of how the rental assistance program works, because there are two components.

The rapid rehousing approach done in the rental assistance program and then there's the capital development program which is the bricks and mortars, you know.

You get First 5 units set aside for your families for 30 years. But what we have underway really is the rental assistance program. So this example will show you the rental assistance program, pro strengthening families.

So the anecdote goes like this. The household size is one adult female and one male child, two years of age.

The family was evicted and left homeless.

DPSS provided a 16-day emergency motel voucher.

The family was placed in emergency housing at the San Fernando valley rescue mission, and during their stay, they learned about services provided by the family solution center, which is LA family housing the family as was assessed there.

The family solution center provider then enrolled
them into the First 5 rapid re-housing program and during
the initial assessment it was determined that they were
eligible.

The family was referred to the First 5 provider
upward bound for assignment and was approved for rental
assistance.

On June 1st, the family moved into permanent
housing the security deposit was provided by the family
solutions provider -- not First 5, but family solutions
center. But the two year rental assistance was provided
by the First 5 L.A. provider, Upward Bound.

Okay. So you can see from this example how the
rental assistance program works. In a highly
collaborative environment where there is alignment with
other homeless service providers and other resources and
typically 211's involved family solution DCFS-DFSI, a
variety of programs.

Everybody shares similar assistance tools. The
initial assessment tool used by the family solution center
First 5 agencies use add with the h M I S data collection
system. The rent comparison tool on the housing resource
center Web site is used by all agencies.

So leveraging -- well there is currently no
easement of the dollar value of what other resources are
being brought to bear on the family in assistance side, an
argument could be made that the First 5 leveraging other homeless resources now on the capital development side this is much more clear.

On the capital side we deal with dollars all the time. And as previously reported the $14.6 million of First 5 funding is leveraging $52.8 million and they're coming from private tax credit investors and you may know that some of these investors include people like Bank of America, Citibank, Google, Edison.

They're also leveraging other funding coming from local jurisdiction state and funding agencies. And these funding entities have to collaborate with the development team made up of service providers as well as the developers to bring the house on the record line.

Okay. So this is the refresher of -- of -- so I think some of you already may have heard some of the updates. So this sort of outlines what we could go through.

If you want, I'll go through it pretty rapidly. This is the funding allocation that was done. With it points in time in July for the original 25 million, then the specific projects in November.

We are serving target populations which are homeless families or families at risk of homelessness with children age zero to five with an involvement in the child
welfare system.

Include four new construction and rehabilitation
to provide of which -- sorry. 86 are designated for the
First 5 families for 30 years.

Rental providers, they are expected to serve
target families annually for a total of approximately
hundred families over a two year period.

Okay. The first quarter report was submitted and
not only it was first quarter of our operations; so we
have typical stuff, administrative stuff, annual
contracts, signed systems modified to adapt this program
to.

We have had a fantastically successful joint
press release April 2nd. Generated almost -- inquiries.
We still have inquiries coming in.

It totals now about a thousand forty.
On the capacity closely underwriting took them to
loan committee. Had commissions base placed on these
projects.

One project funded last week we put out $3
million they are begun their expect to be to be funded in
about six months. Antelope valley, constituent of
Lancaster.

So DCFS has been a great partner. They provided
23 verifications at the -- we did the quarterly report a
total of 639 program referrals were received and I'm sorry. A total of 639 program referrals through the phone actually got responded to.

We originally said at the end of March we had three families in place. But right now there are 13 families placed. We said there were three or four families in the pipeline. There are now nine families in the pipeline.

So we are -- there were some challenges identified above. But all in all we are on target.

If you want to talk about any of these challenges I would be happy to do that. And you can expect staff and possibly me to come back in to do a another report at the six month point.

Any questions?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Hearing none, we thank you for your testimony or your presentation.

MS. YEE. Thank you. We finally wore them out, you see.

MS. BELSHE: Mr. Chair, we're going to finish and thank you. Nancy Yee for your quick presentation that you covered a lot of ground.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: And you did it well.

MS. BELSHE: And you did it well.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: You exhausted all of our
questions. You did it real well.

MS. BELSHE: This final item is for a very brief limited time because we covered this in different ways. Including this one but let me ask Raul to set this one up, please.

MR. ORTEGA: Per the health and safety code, section 130150-2 and C, the -- the First 5 L.A. County commission is required to acknowledge and file the First 5 California report and a public meeting.

First 5 California report is public on the annual basis and all the outcomes and all the expenditures from all the counties summarized the report is included in your file. And it is available on both the First 5 LA Packet and First 5 L.A. web site. Thank you.

MS. BELSHE: So this is one of two important but necessary ministerial actions before the board.

Greg can give us the letter and verse in terms of statutory requirements, but not only are we required to file the state First 5 annual report, but conduct an annual review of our own strategic plan.

First 5 has conducted that review in different ways over the years. I think most recently development of work plan for the budget last year. Certainly in the past six months, we've been undertaking a quite -- particularly in the context of listening, learning, and leading
organizational review of our strategic plan.

So we are bring this forward to the board for the purpose of compliance with the proposition 10 requirements.

This is a public item. We can receive public item soliciting extensive as well as plan.

And, Craig, do you want to say anything about the extent to which the activity we see have taken to date are consistent with the act and any final thoughts before the vote by the board?

MR. STEELE: The activities we have taken today are consistent with the act. And those items before you are really statutory compliance. It's the paper trail, if you will, to -- to complete our annual statutory compliance requirements that we then forward on to First 5 California as a condition of receiving our funds for the next year.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you very much.

Any further discussion on this? This is largely pro forma, I think it's fair to say.

To the extent there is no discussion, is there a motion?

(Motion moved.)
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Moved.

MR. SOUTHARD: Seconded.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Second. It's been seconded by several people who wish to get out of here.

If that is the case, record a unanimous vote.

MS. BELSHE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to mention to the board of commissioners before we adjourn, we are on a path for a focused discussion on Best Start on March 26 -- excuse me. June 26. June 26. Thank you.

We have been working with Val Coachman as part of our small but mighty consultant team, and Valerie will be facilitating the time together at the retreat.

And at the encouragement of the chair, we are going to be reaching out to each of the board members for a focused conversation about some of the key issues raised which Best Start and that will be occurring next week so we know are you are very generous with your time and investment of First 5 L.A. broadly, and we begin carving out 20,30 minutes with Valerie sometime next week before the board meets. So thank you for your consideration and continued participation.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Seeing there is nothing formally before the this board, I look for a motion for adjournment.
I'm sorry, sir. Hold on. If there's a desire to be heard, we have no such indication of such.

MR. LANGLEY: I apologize.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: For future reference, you need to fill out one of these forms. But since you are anxious to be heard, we will accommodate you in light of the fact that you're here and ready.

MR. LANGLEY: First of all I want to acknowledge you, sir.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you.

MR. LANGLEY: And my name is Dr. Chris Langley. I'm a member of the Watts, Willowbrook Best Start partnership. And I'm also executive director for Each One Teach One academy.

And I just wanted to take time to acknowledge Ms. Belshé and her team that came out to our community.

I wanted to let you know that your leadership was very well felt. We have had a meeting today and there was a lot of discussion that the commitment we could tell from our leadership and commitment -- your commitment to us. And it really encouraged a lot of enthusiasm for our organization to have someone.

I just wanted the board to know to have someone come out and speak with the community heartfelt and listen to our challenges and to encourage us that things were
going to be much better.

So I just wanted to say that, since I've been here all day.

The least I could do is say something. I know everyone wants to be getting home to dinner.

I just wanted to publicly acknowledge you and thank you very much for your leadership.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much for your impromptu remarks. With that, we are adjourned. Thank you.

(At the hour of 5:02 p.m. the proceedings were concluded.)
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