CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL:

1. Mayor Michael Antonovich called the meeting to order at 1:41 pm. Quorum was present.

Legal Counsel Craig Steele reported that prior to the Commission Meeting, the Commission met in a Closed Session for a conference with legal counsel pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(c), Initiation of Litigation. All Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Nancy Au, who was absent. The Commission gave direction to legal counsel to file litigation challenging the validity of AB 99. The vote was unanimous.

COMMISSION: (Items 2 – 15)

2. Approval of Commission Meeting Minutes – Thursday, March 10, 2011

M/S (Jonathan Fielding / Marv Southard)
APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED
3. Approval of Monthly Financials – February, 2011

M/S (Jonathan Fielding / Neal Kaufman)
APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED

NOTE: The agenda items were discussed out of order. The following represents the order in which items were discussed during the meeting.

5. Executive Officer’s Report

In addition to the written report, the following items were highlighted:

- **Dutton Bill** - Senator Bob Dutton’s bill, SB486, which aimed to eliminate the Proposition 10 County Commissions and redirect all funding to the State’s general fund, was pulled from a Senate Health Committee agenda this week and converted to a two-year bill because of a lack of support.

  Stakeholders for First 5 County Commissions throughout the State, including First 5 LA, were set to testify against the Dutton Bill at the Senate hearing. In addition, staff had worked with several members of the Senate Health Committee to educate them about the bill and how best to advocate against it during the hearing.

- **Status of AB 99** – Four County Commissions -- Orange, Fresno, Merced, Madera-- have filed suit to contest the legality of the Proposition 10 redirection bill signed by the Governor. In addition, First 5 Riverside voted to recommend to the Riverside County Board of Supervisors to move forward with a lawsuit.

- **Government Relations Efforts** - Staff has continued to meet with State-level elected officials to educate them about First 5 LA’s investments throughout the County and to explain how program cuts required in response to AB 99 might impact children and families. Most recently, staff met with newly-elected Senator Ted Lieu of Long Beach and attended policy-related events with Assemblymen Bob Blumenfield of Van Nuys, Isadore Hall of Los Angeles, Mike Eng of Monterey Park, Steve Bradford of Inglewood, and Mike Feuer of Los Angeles.

9. Approval of Motion to Extend the Partnership for Families Contract with the Westside Partnerships for Families Contract with the Westside Partnerships for Families-St. John’s Child & Family Development Center Through December 31, 2011 in an Amount Not-to-Exceed $300,000 for 6 Months

Mayor Antonovich stated that with many of the County-wide funding commitments due to end on June 30, 2011, last month the Commission discussed the unintended circumstances of a gaping hole left in the five-year County-wide network of child abuse prevention services and delivery created by extending the Partnership For Families (PFF) contracts for only those providers located in the 14 Best Start Communities through December, 2011.

The motion before the Commission from Commissioner Neal Kaufman will extend the Partnership For Families contract in SPA 5 to align with the contract termination dates of the remaining providers.
Vice Chair Jonathan Fielding commented that he thought this was an important program but also thought that it intersected with the Commission’s issues of how to maintain programs sustainable over time. Vice Chair Fielding further commented that he did not believe the Commission should be the funder forever. This program is very important to child abuse prevention and he did not understand why DCFS was not deciding that this was central to their mission. Unlike other initiatives that have asked for continued funding, this specific program has a realistic potential of having very substantial sustainable support. He hoped that the Commission, as part of the County family, would be able to move ahead with this program. Vice Chair Fielding expressed his support for the motion.

Commissioner Kaufman provided context for the motion. The PFF initiative was designed in such a way for it to be a County-wide partnership. When it was decided to extend the PFF grants that were within the Best Start Communities, this particular PFF grantee was not extended because it was outside the 14 target communities. The economic part of the motion is to maintain the unfunded PFF grantee for the next six months, just like all of the other PFF grantees. The second part of the motion is to set up an ad hoc committee and come back with a sustainability plan in 90 days.

Commissioner Alma Martinez asked about the demographics of the program. The PFF program serves 14 percent of the African American population which is greater than the nine percent that DCFS serves. Additionally, the PFF programs serve at-risk pregnant women (substance abuse, domestic violence, mental health problems) and referrals from DCFS. The referrals are for families who have a child age five years or younger, rated as high or very high risk on the structured decision-making tool that DCFS uses but the allegation is unfounded or substantiated.

Commissioner Duane Dennis commented that the impact of the PFF program has been significant but felt that the motion was a month premature as the Commission is looking into the process of looking at an overall reduction plan that will impact PFF, SRI and other grantees that will have funding end on June 30, 2011. He suggested that the motion be continued until May as the Commission still needed to have a discussion on the overall reduction plan.

Commissioner Deanne Tilton commented that the referrals to this PFF program were of those families that were evaluated by DCFS and felt it made sense to fill this gap in funding.

Commissioner Harriette Williams disagreed with Commissioner Dennis’ suggestion of continuing this item until the May Commission Meeting since it did not provide the organization with any transitional period.

M/S (Neal Kaufman / Michael Antonovich)
APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED

Public Comment

Barbara Arvi, SPA 9
Katherine Reuter, Saint John’s Child & Family Development Center
4. Announcements by the Commission Chair

During the February 10\textsuperscript{th} Commission Meeting, the Commission authorized an ad hoc full independent fiscal audit. On April 6\textsuperscript{th}, the contract was awarded to the Harvey M. Rose Associates for the agreed upon audit procedures on the Commission’s financial records. The contract was being executed today.

Phase I will review the Commission’s reserve and available funds, which will be anticipated to be completed within four to six weeks. Phase II will be an in depth evaluation of First 5 LA’s resource management and service level compliance with Proposition 10 as compared with Commissions of up to 10 other comparable California counties. This is anticipated to be completed within seven to 10 weeks following completion of Phase I, sometime in August. Mayor Antonovich stated that he was confident that leadership and staff will join him in their full support.

During the March Commission, as part of the revised bylaws, the Commission adopted the ad hoc structure for the Executive Committee formerly known as the Operations Committee. This will increase Executive Committee participation and the Chair will be able to designate different members to serve on each separate ad hoc Executive Committee meetings throughout the year for a designated purpose. Each ad hoc Executive Committee will consist of the Commission Vice Chair, the Chair of the Program & Planning Committee, and two voting Commissioners. All First 5 LA Commissioners will be notified when ad hoc committee meetings will be called and will receive copies of minutes of those meetings.

Mayor Antonovich made the following appointments.

**Public Affairs Liaisons**
Alma Martinez
Deanne Tilton

**Program & Planning Committee**
Neal Kaufman – Chair
Nancy Au
Marv Southard
Jane Boeckmann
Harriette Williams

**Executive Committee**
Jonathan Fielding – Chair
Neal Kaufman
Antronette Yancey
Angie Stockwell
NOTE: Mayor Antonovich combined Items 6 and 7 into one action item.

6. Report, Continued Discussion and Requested Follow-Up from the Special Workshop Meeting of the Commission Held on April 5, 2011

7. Approval of Motion for Applying Framework to the AB 99 Decision-Making Processes

Mayor Michael Antonovich thanked the Operations Committee and the First 5 LA staff for their efforts in developing the financial documents that have been provided to Commissioners. Mayor Antonovich also thanked Maria Romero for documenting the April 5<sup>th</sup> meeting discussion, capturing its progress in great detail, enabling the Commission to continue the discussion at today’s meeting.

Mayor Antonovich reported that on March 24<sup>th</sup>, Govern Jerry Brown signed AB 99 into law which began a two-year, two-pronged planning approach. At today’s Closed Session, as reported by Legal Counsel Steele, the Commission unanimously voted to take legal action against the State. In accordance with the Commission’s fiduciary responsibilities to comply with the law, the Operations Committee and Board of Commissioners engaged in the preparation of planning for AB 99 implementation, which is the subject of two items on the agenda.

Plan A will prevail the legal challenge of AB 99 and avert the return of the dollars, with legislation for the creation of new childhood programs at the level that connect children and their families’ education, health and social services. Plan B is the fiduciary responsibility which began last month and continues through Items 6 and 7 to systematically and objectively plan reductions in the Commission’s current spending and future budget allocations; and, to perfectly align resources and programs with the Commission’s goals and objectives in accordance with those requirements of AB 99.

In the midst of this unprecedented financial crisis, one need to be addressed is the need to increase coordination between the Commission and the County involving future financial investments targeting the well-being of the shared clients.

First 5 LA is neither a philanthropic organization or foundation, or a County agency or a department not entirely independent from the County. Its Commissioners represent each of the five Supervisorial Districts as well as County Departments, County offices, or an influential County affiliated body established to enhance the well-being of the County’s children and families. A financial and programmatic disconnect between the Commission and County does pose a significant contracting detriment. A good example is the School Readiness Initiative consisting of a variety of programs including early learning activities, higher education, mental health services and domestic violence, and child abuse prevention programs. Timely coordination and integration of parallel First 5 LA and the County’s administered programs can only lead to a marked improvement in the development of First 5 LA’s four strategic plan outcomes, along with not only helping to better serve the child but also to save resources.

To prevent reoccurrences of the difficulties the Commission is experiencing in ending its current funding commitments, the Commission must first establish the fact that First 5 LA’s investments fall under one of three project types: (1) short-term projects with a defined measurable outcome through one-time funding; (2) innovation projects with or without
secured future funding sources, in which a time-limited short-term investment front loads but diminishes over the time of the project when evidence of its well defined measureable public impact emerges; (3) high impact innovation programs involving few or numerous direct service contracts, and if successful, requiring ongoing sustainability through external funding sources. For the first two, Mayor Antonovich urged the Commission to consistently compile categorical investment data to guide and inform future investment decisions. For the third project type, the high impact innovation contracts, Mayor Antonovich recommended that First 5 LA policy mandate financial sustainability planning expertise be added as standard operational procedure during the initial program planning phase.

To say that high impact innovation contractors knew that their contract would end is shortsighted. As Commissioners, the responsibility to the children and families is to achieve efficiencies and reduce impacts posed by interruptions or to the extent possible, by identifying service similarities or duplication, revising and integrating First 5 LA programs without City, County and State/Federal programs; and creating seamless service delivery systems leading to less bureaucracy and no wrong door accessibility for families.

AB 99 is now law and in accordance with Item 7, Mayor Antonovich stated that it provided a framework to review the budget and make decisions about current spending and future budget allocations. The recommended framework consists of three investment categories: County-wide projects; place-based investments; early learning. The motion further recommends capping general administrative expenses by establishing a maximum allowable percentage of total expenditures within the overall budget. Budgeting programmatic operational expenses by reflecting the additional expense under the respective investment category to which a specific program pertains and evaluating the merit of all active high impact innovation contracts such to terminate on June 30, 2011 and December 30, 2011. If meritorious, determining the funding level investment category to which the Commission needs to continue funding until alternative sustainability is established. Another important document of the agenda packet, is the preliminary fund balance worksheet, distributed during the workshop on April 5th. It provides a financial overview of all allocations either under consideration or adopted by the Commission and projects revenues and operating expenses over the next four years in the aftermath of the $424 million take away required by AB 99, leaving a fund balance of $145 million by 2015.

The resource allocations within an organizational budget or its investment portfolio reveals what the organization’s priorities and values. If applied correctly, the framework of investment categories in the motion will ultimately reveal First 5 LA’s true investment portfolio; yet, there is an important distinction that needs to be pointed out. Within the three investment categories and the funding sources of the preliminary balance worksheet, it is noticeable that there is some overlap in the terminology. The names for the three investment categories are not to be confused with the funding sources on the worksheet, whether from the previous or new strategic planning initiative, the County-wide augmentation funding, or the place-based funding. For example, there is a list of 16 County-wide augmentation projects totaling $252 million. Of these $252 million, $96.2 million across five projects are for purposes related to early care and education. To develop an accurate investment portfolio, the investment category under which to classify each of these projects would be early learning and not County-wide projects even though their funding source is County-wide augmentation dollars.
Mayor Antonovich urged Commissioners to closely analyze all the programs, initiatives, projects, allocations, strategies and proposals and classify those according to the purpose within the framework of the three investment categories. Beginning with Supervisor Don Knabe’s and Gloria Molina's chairmanship and then his, the Commission has spent considerable time establishing its new strategic plan and recently amending it. The Commission already has a solid foundation based upon four strategic plan outcome goals and these would be that children are born healthy, maintain a healthy weight, are safe from abuse and neglect; and ready for kindergarten. The work ahead involves many difficult questions regarding the current investment portfolio; asking how does the investment portfolio support each of the four strategic plan outcome goals and should the Commission maintain or revise its current investment portfolio to align those with the Commission’s goals and objectives. Regarding the 16 County-wide augmentation proposals, Mayor Antonovich asked if the programs and services impacted the greatest number of children and targeted improvements in each of the four strategic plan goals equally, if applicable. He also asked if an alternative financial sustainability was already planned. Regarding the place-based strategy, Mayor Antonovich asked if it was the Commission’s decision to transition future investments from a program-based to a place-based approach grounded in a complete comprehensive and sound analysis of all factors contributing to the many returns on its past investments. Regarding the infrastructure, he asked if the Commission at First 5 LA including the leadership and Board of Commissioners candidly analyzed the internal policies, practices, systems process, efficiencies and funding navigation and practices.

Mayor Antonovich encouraged each Commissioner to review these questions and left the Commissioners the last of his global priorities: to align the Commission’s financial resources equally around improved outcomes and the four strategic plan goals with a particular emphasis around preventing child abuse or neglect; preventing children from entering supervision, ensuring proper physical nutritional dental, eye, mental health habits for the children and their families; serving the greatest number of children quickly and efficiently through County-wide interagency service delivery and developing closer private-public partnerships as well. Through this, a process can emerge that will have an optimal financial and programmatic plan so that the April 5th workshop discussion needs to continue as there are follow-up questions as the Commission moves ahead.

NOTE: Mayor Antonovich excuses himself from the meeting. Vice Chair Fielding assumes leadership of the meeting.

Commissioner Dennis asked when the family literacy programs sunset because he was not clear about this. He also asked to what degree family literacy, PFF and SRI talked to each other. Furthermore, Commissioner Dennis asked if there was an exchange between these programs in the same communities.

CEO Martinez responded that family literacy programs were funded through December 31st if they were in the 14 target communities. There were 10 family literacy programs that have this funding out of the 19 family literacy programs. SRI programs will be sunset on June 20, 2011.

Liz Guerra, FLSN Director, commented that the collaborative work between family literacy programs and SRI was on a site-by-site basis. A training was provided by FLSN for SRI
grantees on family literacy, sharing website resources, and sustainability tips on how to get into family literacy.

Vice Chair Fielding commented that he understood Mayor Antonovich’s suggestion of having meetings in each cluster and looking at issues of overlap, coordination and collaboration.

Commissioner Dennis inquired about condensing some of the SRI and family literacy grantees since many of the SRI grantees have an SRI component. Vice Chair Fielding said this was one of the issues that staff could analyze.

Ms. Guerra also reminded Commissioners that they had adopted the federal definition for family literacy that included four components—48 hours of adult education; 10 hours of parent education; 10 hours of parent-child interactive literacy; 48 hours of early childhood education. Families are asked to make a commitment to these kinds of hours.

Vice Chair Fielding thanked all the public comment speakers for the wonderful job of explaining the things that are being done and for showing how the money that has been provided by the Commission has been invested. He praised them for their conviction and support.

Vice Chair Fielding stated that the Commission had very difficult situations and was looking very hard at what choices needed to be made, none of which were good and did not reflect poorly on any programs. These choices just reflected on the condition of needing to prioritize. He asked the members of the audience to keep this in mind as the Commission deliberated over time.

Vice Chair Fielding read a motion that Mayor Antonovich asked him to read about AB 99, which established a framework for decision-making processes. The motion being read by Vice Chair Fielding included Commissioner Antronette Yancey’s suggested amendments. After realizing that the motion was different from Mayor Antonovich’s motion, the Commission moved the motion to open discussion.

M/S (Alma Martinez /Neal Kaufman) NO VOTE TAKEN

Commissioner Angie Stockwell commented that with all due respect to the Supervisor and the motion, she was appalled. The Commission made a commitment, including Vice Chair Fielding at the workshop, where the community at large was told that the Commission would be hearing from them. There would be plenty of opportunities for the community to come and give input and listen to suggestions. Commissioner Stockwell commented that she did not think it was appropriate for Commissioners to act on anything for approval. She said that she was not ready to approve any motion without following through with the commitment made to the community in terms of having work sessions where grantees and the public came in to talk to Commissioners. Commissioner Stockwell said that Commissioners should listen and respect the fact that the community has ideas and something to say.

Commissioner Yancey stated that she did not see the motion as any way in conflict with the Commission’s commitment to grantees and the public. She saw parts of the motion
assessing the effectiveness or merits of current contracts and that entire process being in conjunction with community input.

Commissioner Kaufman commented that what he read from Mayor Antonovich’s motion was a certain amount of staff work with a public meeting to be held prior to the May Commission Meeting, where there would be more discussion and public input, another meeting prior to the June Commission Meeting with more discussion, and a vote at the June Commission Meeting. As he read the motion, he did not see any allocation. It was merely a process to get to those four public meetings that would be scheduled over the next eight weeks.

Commissioner Stockwell commented that she read the motion as putting something forward already without getting a lot of input. She also said that when she read the motion, there were things that were in conflict. For example, the three main funding categories—County-wide projects, County-wide augmentation projects, strategic plan. The strategic plan’s seven strategies were put in to move the Commission forward, to look at systems change to build sustainability into the Commission’s programs.

Vice Chair Fielding commented that the Commission was trying to find a way to move ahead and to get to a decision. There was not a lot of time. He said that the Commission needed to decide how to move forward and also decide what it wanted staff to analyze to try to help Commissioners better understand. There was not just one way to look at things; there are many different things. Commissioners needed to let staff know what lenses they wanted to be able to look at the things.

Vice Chair Fielding suggested reviewing the motion and then deciding what kind of additional analysis would be needed consistent with the kind of questions Commissioner Stockwell raised.

Commissioner Yancey reviewed the suggested modifications to Mayor Antonovich’s motion. Specifically, regarding administrative costs, it was important on how the Commission provided support to the community, implementation and technical support. It seemed quite inconsistent to have administrative costs as a line item percentage. Regarding the development of possible funding proposals on allocation amounts, the Commission needed to develop possible proportionate reductions because there has been a long strategic planning process and a part of how these funding buckets were set up was to ultimately realize system changes. If this was completely thrown out, then it seemed the Commission had lost a lot of what it was planning to do, which was to look at it in terms of County-wide and place-based. She favored proportionate reductions versus funding proposals on allocation amounts.

Commissioner Martinez commented that she did not have a problem with the administrative costs being separate from the three buckets. She thought that once the Commission made programmatic decisions on the three buckets, then staff could then advise the Commission what it would take for staff to support the new goals. An independent cut could then be made based on this staff input.

Vice Chair Fielding suggested that that the Commission separate out what is core administration from what is the staffing and other work necessary to support specific
projects. The supporting of specific projects should be considered as part of the budget for that specific project. There should be a limit on core administration.

Commissioner Williams commented that at the last meeting, there had been mention of the three buckets but also mention about a line item on administration as well as research and evaluation. She said that she was very comfortable with that presentation but was not as comfortable with the current proposal.

Vice Chair Fielding said that one of the decisions to be made by the Commission was whether the research and evaluation part was built in as a budgeted part of each one of the buckets or whether there needed to be a separate allocation for research and evaluation that would be spread across.

Director Armando Jimenez commented that there have been past discussions about identifying the percentage, which has been five percent in the past, to be placed in a separate fund to be used for research and evaluation. He felt very strongly that the research and evaluation work could be done more effectively if a broader approach was applied, identifying various themes across County-wide and place-based. Many of the themes and issues would be the same. It would be inefficient to do separate evaluations of those components when a lot more could be learned across both areas. Director Jimenez commented that if there was five percent as has been in the past, then the research and evaluation piece would be done effectively.

The Commissioners agreed to have research and evaluation listed separately.

Commissioner Dennis commented that he did not know if he fully agreed with the bucket analysis because what has happened is that the Commission is categorically looking at funding in a way that he was not sure if it was beneficial for what the Commission was trying to do. It was his hope that if the Commission was looking at early childhood, that it included health, social issues and every aspect of the child. To separate it, he did not know if this did justice. If the Commission was moving forward with the bucket analysis, he said that he did not know if three buckets was reflective of the whole. Commissioner Dennis stated that there were many more things that were not included in the three buckets. He asked that staff look at these buckets so that they were inclusive of what the Commission does. There were a lot of new initiatives that cut across several disciplines and asked how those initiatives would be categorized using this bucket analysis. This did become quite complicated if the Commission began to segregate its initiatives. It was not going to be easy.

Commissioner Dennis commented that this could not be done at a Commission meeting as it would take time. He was not sure if this was the best way to proceed taking into consideration all of the funding opportunities in the community. Commissioner Dennis said that he was not sure if all of those funding opportunities filled the three buckets; and, many of these opportunities also fit into more than one bucket.

CEO Martinez suggested that another way of looking at the buckets mirrored what staff presented at the workshop, which was by areas of discipline—early care and education; health; behavioral health; social services. These areas of discipline were also linked as part of the strategic plan goals.
Vice Chair Fielding commented these were the types of suggestions that could be considered in addition to what was being proposed.

Commissioner Yancey commented that a framework could be created without actually applying it. The whole purpose was to develop a framework that addressed AB 99. The analysis that was being done at this particular moment may or may not have relevance to a world in which AB 99 was not upheld.

Vice Chair Fielding asked Commissioners if any of them felt that the Commission should plan as if the Commission did not have this money, although a contingency plan should exist if the lawsuit prevails. At the last meeting, there was agreement that as fiduciaries, it was going to be very hard to assume that the take away would be overturned given the fact that there was already a law in California that said it was going to be taken.

Commissioner Marv Southard commented that Commissioner Yancey was proposing the planning as an “as if” scenario but not execute it until actual implementation.

Commissioner Southard further clarified that a plan would be created on how the Commission would execute the curtailments but such curtailments would not be made until the money was gone.

Vice Chair Fielding said that his understanding what Mayor Antonovich was proposing was for the Commission to assume that the money available should be acted upon although a judge could overturn AB 99. An appeal of the decision could further delay the release of the funding for months or years.

Vice Chair Fielding stated that Mayor Antonovich’s proposal was to take the $424 million and bank this aside, assuming the Commission did not have this money going forward.

Commissioner Martinez said that the Commission will have a $145 million deficit. Vice Chair Fielding said that it could be up to $300 million depending on what assumption was taken into consideration.

Commissioner Martinez commented that the Commission needed to start making cuts now in order to be able to balance the books. This was the debate right now. However, this did not mean that as the decisions are being, that the Commission might consider making cuts to programs that are not even funded as of yet so that no one was being harmed. These new programs could be funded at lower levels or could be started a year later so that savings could be realized from projects that Commissioners proposed.

Vice Chair Fielding stated that all Commissioner proposals were on the table. Commissioner Martinez also stated that the early education endowment which was $87 million was sitting in an account. She suggested that the Commission take action and that these $87 million should be immediately applied to the problem. This money is in an account that does not impact anybody and will probably not be used since it requires a match. If these $87 million are factored in, then the cuts do not have to be as great or the Commission may not need to be as aggressive with the cuts given that there is hope that the money might be saved.
Vice Chair Fielding said that what the Commission needed to do was to figure a way to go forward. He did not think the Commission was prepared to make specific decisions but Commissioner Martinez's comments suggested that the staff analysis assume the $87 million be available for early education.

Commissioner Martinez said this was the kind of thinking that was needed. There would be a soft landing and a hard landing. The staff should come back with these two recommendations for the Commission to decide how deep to cut and how fast.

Commissioner Yancey clarified that she was not suggesting waiting until the outcome of the challenge of AB 99 was known. She was suggesting that the final application of the cuts was to be executed when the money was actually taken away.

Commissioner Martinez said that the cuts would be a lot harder if the Commission waited until 2012.

Commissioner Williams commented that when Commissioners began working on the additional augmentation proposals to County-wide, there was a plan at the time. There were place-based strategies, County-wide strategies, and a total figure that represented what the Commission started with. Then Commissioners thought there was extra money and engaged in building some additional thoughts on how to spend this money. She would like to see the Commission go back to that point in time where everyone was in concurrence about place-based and County-wide strategies. Once at this point, then decide what comes next.

Vice Chair Fielding personally opposed this suggestion but said that staff could certainly provide this analysis. He also stated that the Commission was where it was and had approved additional augmentation. There is a lot of concern that the Commission was disproportionately focused on place-based, not doing enough to try to impact all of the kids in the County. This was what led to the County-wide augmentation proposals.

Commissioner Williams commented that the Commission had a consensus at the point she referenced. Vice Chair Fielding commented the Commission had a consensus after it passed the additional County-wide augmentation proposals.

Commissioner Southard asked that if the Commission was taking the $424 million now, the most prudent thing to do would be not to contract for any new services that the Commission had not made a commitment to. He further stated that Vice Chair Fielding seemed to not want to do this. Commissioner Southard commented that staff needed to know if the Commission was going to move forward with current commitments or not. If the Commission was presuming that the $424 million was gone right away, then the Commission should not be making any new commitments because why would the Commission start something that would need to end before finishing the contract.

Vice Chair Fielding said that contracts would not necessarily need to end. This was the kind of analysis that the Commission needed to have done. If the Commission did not do any of the things it had not started, then no County-wide augmentation projects would take place.
Commissioner Southard said that there was an inconsistency in the argument. Vice Chair Fielding said that the Commission would look at the analysis both ways.

Commissioner Williams also commented that there was no guarantee that the Commission will be free of liability. But, if the Commission stopped what it has not contracted, then the Commission was on safer ground. If the Commission found that it could do a little of the County-wide augmentation projects or not, this was fine.

Vice Chair Fielding commented that if the Commission wanted to be timid and not worry about liability, then legal counsel should be asked what the potential liability was.

Commissioners Williams commented that she did not consider herself to be timid.

Commissioner Kaufman said that the Commission had several contracts and staff had included this as an obligation with the expectation that such contracts would be maintained. The Commission had made priorities toward place-based, 14 communities, with some contracts in place. There have been contracts for County-wide augmentation and ideas for other ones that have not been contracted yet. If the Commission took everything that it has contracted and went forward, looking at how much revenue was coming in over the next four years, with the take away of $424 million, there was still $744 million to allocate. If the Commission spent what it had contracted, this would equate to a couple hundred million dollars. The Commission still had a lot of money to support programs. To him, the question was what were those things going to be. The Commission needed to understand what these options were and then come to a consensus, assuming the $424 million was lost.

Vice Chair Fielding stated that there:

- was not agreement on when to implement the framework;
- was agreement on the administrative costs;
- was agreement on research and evaluation being a separate allocation which could be incorporated as the fifth bucket; and,
- was no agreement on the final application of the cuts being executed when the money was actually taken away.

Regarding having proportionate reductions rather than funding proposal and allocation amounts, there were different suggestions for staff to review. A lot of the suggestions were not just proportional. Once again, Vice Chair Fielding did not feel there was broad support.

Commissioner Dennis commented that the reason why the County-wide augmentation proposals were submitted was because the Commission knew there would be an exorbitant amount of money left. This variation, to some degree, had gotten the Commission into the current situation. There was an $800 million fund balance and now the State was trying to take First 5 LA money. He stated that he did not want the Commission to be in this position any more. The Commission needed to know what was the fund balance that it wanted to carry on an annual basis. This would obviously not be $800 million any longer.

Commissioner Dennis stated that the Commission needs to look at the endowment fund, and the uptake of place-based. He asked if the Commission could be less ambitious in developing the four-year plan. A percentage reduction of all initiatives needed to be
determined to get to the $424 million reduction. This is what he proposed as a possible way to look at the cuts as opposed to other plans that have been proposed thus far.

Vice Chair Fielding commented that staff should look at proportionate reductions.

Commissioner Dennis requested that staff identify three or four different scenarios, present them to the Commission, identifying what was in the best interests of the Commission’s mission.

Commissioner Southard said that it seemed to him that one of the ways to approach this was by defining the principles the Commission was trying to accomplish through the curtailment process. Each Commissioner had their own particular areas of interest and concern. If the Commission agreed on principles that served outcomes to be accomplished rather than any particular subsection of the Commission's investments, this might lead Commissioners to a consensus more quickly than having piles of different formulae.

Commissioner Stockwell asked what was meant by proportionate. When the strategic plan was approved, the Commission was committed to place-based and County-wide. This was the direction the Commission took when it approved the strategic plan and subsequent roll-out. The County-wide augmentation proposals came later. Commissioner Stockwell liked the idea of assessing the County-wide augmentation proposals since these did not impact the strategic plan but rather enhanced it. She suggested proportionate cuts to this area.

Regarding Commissioner Yancey’s suggestion of not taking a final vote at the June Commission until after the process terms out, Vice Chair Fielding commented that some decisions needed to be made, if possible.

CEO Martinez asked for clarification if the hold on taking a vote impacted the operational budget or whether it only applied to the programmatic budget.

Vice Chair Fielding suggested that the Commission take a vote at the June Commission meeting, especially for staff to have an operational budget going forward because the new fiscal year starts July 1st.

Commissioner Stockwell commented that assessing the effectiveness and merit was going to be tremendously labor intensive for staff because contracts, initiatives and proposals were direct services and others were system change things. This would take a lot of time and hard work on the part of staff.

CEO Martinez commented that since this has been brought up before, staff was already looking at the effectiveness of the initiatives that were part of the previous strategic plan like PFF, Healthy Births and Family Literacy. What would be difficult for staff would be to make recommendations on continued funding. CEO Martinez expressed this was not a staff function but a decision of the Commission. Staff would be bringing the information requested but the Commission needed to make decisions based on that information. CEO Martinez said she would not be making recommendations on who would get funded, at what level, and for how much.

Commissioner Martinez commented in her prior experience with other Commissions and elected officials, it was the staff who brought back the recommendations and the Board
made the difficult decisions. However, it is the Commission who would be setting up the principles and criteria. For instance, the Commission could take the endowment to lessen the hit and then look at allocations for each individual bucket. Staff would then make a recommendation on a percentage reduction per bucket for final approval by the Commission with options within bucket.

Vice Chair Fielding said that as part of the motion, the Program & Planning Committee was requested to meet, have a staff presentation and look at next year’s budget. The Program & Planning Committee would then make a recommendation or provide options to the Commission.

Commissioner Kaufman asked if the process laid out in the motion was appropriate. To him, a process needed to be put into place that would allow the public, Commissioners and staff to talk to each other, understand what was going on, to hear what the options were and to make the decision of what the reduction percentage should be.

Commissioner Stockwell said that she would like to hear from the public, grantees and experts in the field. They might have some ideas that the Commission has not considered. The Commission might be able to take pieces from this feedback to build the skeleton. It would be more meaningful because the public would feel like they had a say and would better understand the Commission’s position since they provided ideas and suggestions.

Commissioner Stockwell commented that ideas would come forward from the workshops having sessions where the public could provide feedback and input.

Commissioner Kaufman asked if having break-out sessions would yield the type of input that was needed from the public and not have entities just request funding.

Commissioner Williams commented that a friendly meeting format would provide information to the Commission from the public’s perspective on how the job of the Commission could be made easier. It would be made clear to the public that funding requests would not be constructive to the process.

Commissioner Stockwell asked for staff to create a series of questions for each bucket to initiate the discussion. These questions would help frame the guidelines for discussion.

Commissioner Martinez said the Commission needed to be very disciplined with what was being asked of the public. People needed submit something ahead of time or some form that specifically said what was it that was being proposed which would save funding. This question needed to be answered in advance and vetted so that the comment could then be made. She also expressed concern with the bucket for the County-wide augmentation proposals being skewed in one direction because potential grantees do not know that the funding is available through these proposals submitted by Commissioners for various reasons after moving toward a place-based funding approach.

Vice Chair Fielding suggested that staff should do outreach to potential contractors so that they could come and speak about the County-wide augmentation projects.

Commissioner Dennis stated that this Commission had a responsibility to adhere to the commitments with PFF, SRI and family literacy grantees and sunset them at their
designated time; or, should staff factor in extending some of those contracts. It was up to the Commission to make these decisions.

Commissioner Martinez commented that the Commission’s projected deficit assumed that these grantees would not get continued funding. If these grantees were to be extended, then the projected deficit would need to be updated to reflect this scenario.

CEO Martinez commented that she did not know what the Commission hoped to accomplish by having the individual meetings because Commissioners were polled for the next workshop, and it was scheduled for Wednesday, April 27th, from 2 pm to 5 pm. CEO Martinez asked for clear direction from the Commission regarding what it expected from staff and the public to prevent the wrong impression or level of expectation to presenters. It was not clear what the Commission wanted to accomplish with the smaller meetings that could not be accomplished in the larger workshop.

Commissioner Martinez commented that the April 27th meeting could create a different structure that was much more people friendly rather than having Commissioners sitting at the formal meeting table.

Commissioner Williams commented that there were a number of grantees that were going to be sun-setting and the Commission needed to address this issue.

CEO Martinez clarified that SRI was a State initiative with First 5 LA agreeing to provide generous matching funds. Grantees have known that the State Commission would not be renewing this grant and it would end on June 30, 2011. SRI has had appropriate notice.

Commissioner Williams asked what it would cost to fund SRI through the end of the strategic plan. Vice Chair Fielding said that part of the issue was that First 5 LA was paying 35 percent of the total cost. CEO Martinez said there was a 65 percent shortfall in funding for the 42 grantees.

Commissioner Martinez asked for clarification on what deficit was being addressed—$145 million or $300 million.

Vice Chair Fielding said no decisions could be made without having staff prepare the requested information under both of these scenarios.

Director Hause asked for clarification on what financial information was to be prepared. Commissioner Martinez commented that it should be taking into account the two projected deficits.

CEO Martinez asked if the Commission wanted information on what it would cost to continue funding of SRI and family literacy programs outside the target communities through December 31, 2011.

Commissioner Martinez stated that the funding for these grantees was ending and if a motion was brought forward for funding, it would be considered on its own merits. She felt this was a different issue and should not be included in Mayor Antonovich’s motion.
Commissioner Southard suggested adopting those elements of the motion for which there was consensus and moving these items forward.

Vice Chair Fielding commented that the motion as originally provided remained the same with the exception of adding administrative overhead costs and research and evaluation as separate buckets, which now totaled five buckets.

**AMENDED MOTION:**

Approve motion for applying framework to the AB 99 decision-making processes as stated in the full text of the motion as submitted by Mayor Michael Antonovich with the addition of two more buckets for (1) administrative overhead costs; and, (2) research and evaluation allocation.

M/S (Marv Southard / Jane Boeckmann) APPROVED AS AMENDED

Commissioner Tilton commented that the Commission needed to figure a very clear way of saying what the workshop on April 27th was designed to do. It requires for staff and the Commission to take position that there is no additional funding or less funding, and these grantees need to let the Commission how they are willing to work with others or are willing to take reduction; or what suggestions they might have on collaboration but they should not come to advocate for their programs.

Vice Chair Fielding stressed that staff would create guiding questions for the discussion based on the direction provided by the Commission.

Commissioner Yancey distributed an abbreviated decision support tool that was based on a health impact assessment. The tool compares different interventions to promote obesity prevention. Commissioner Yancey felt the tool would be helpful in getting input both from the community partners as well as grappling with this internally. The categories of criteria to assess which projects were delivering the greatest return on investment were divided into feasibility, evidence, population impact and disparities reduction. The tool ranked a particular intervention into high-medium-low and determined whether a criterion should apply. This tool could be used in the future to help focus the discussion on how well something matched with the Commission’s mission and strategic plan versus a program by program assessment.

Commissioner Dennis said this tool may not be applicable to early childhood education because the science of his field was not as defined as in health.

**Public Comment**

Anna Alvarado, Parent
Zenaida Ambrosio, Hope Street Family Literacy
Eloise Appel, Family Literacy Evaluator
Ernestina Alvarado, Parent
Kim Barker, Wilsona Family Literacy Program
Corinne Ho, The Village Ready for School
Sue Kujawa, Mother’s Club
Hicela Magallanes, Family Literacy
Jasmine Mirfakhraei, The Village Ready for School
Sandra Munoz, Valley Village Canoga Park
Patti Oblath, Connections For Children
Rick Overdori, Wilsona Field Director
Ilsa Reyna, Wilsona Family Literacy Program
Edwin Rosales, The Village Canoga Park
Susan Savage, Child Care Resource Center

10. UPDATE: Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP) Sustainability Plan

This item has been postponed to the Commission Meeting of May 12, 2011.

8. Approval of Motion to Ensure Pregnant Low-Income Women Have Uninterrupted Prenatal and Post-partum Care in an Amount Not-to-Exceed $2.8 Million Over 5 Years

Director Carol Baker introduced the motion as a policy related County-wide augmentation proposal that would ensure pregnant low-income women having uninterrupted prenatal and post-partum care. The motion was originally Proposal #22 in the list of County-wide augmentation proposals and introduced by the office of Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas in November and is comprised of two components – policy advocate component and peri-natal hotline component.

Christina Altmayer, from Altmayer Consulting, conducted the analysis on this proposal and worked with senior Policy Department staff to respond to the Board’s questions, specifically:

1. What are the barriers to uninterrupted care for pregnancy, delivery and postpartum care?
2. What would be the objective of the advocacy efforts: what legislation would be targeted; who would be target audiences for the advocacy efforts?
3. What are options for implementing the proposal?

Commissioner Yancey commented that this motion was a part of earlier discussions and recognized that it was coming back at this very bad time given the earlier discussion on the status of the Commission’s funding. However, Commissioner Yancey felt that the motion should not be held hostage because the proposal was very central to the mission of First 5 LA. Commissioner Yancey commented that she felt the consultants had done a really good job of addressing some of the issues that were raised in terms why this was really needed since the proposal really does address some of the challenges that women are facing.

Commissioner Yancey referenced the synthesis of the data that was identified by the consultant and staff. The Los Angeles Mommy and Baby (LAMB) Project data was used and identified several barriers including no Medi-Cal card, no money or insurance to pay for visits, and not knowing where to go. A substantial proportion of the barriers that were identified were issues that are covered by the proposed services of the proposal. The other piece in some of the 2007 LAMB data identified women who did not know that they were pregnant as one barrier and not getting an appointment as early as these women wanted as another barrier.
The policy advocacy component attempts to have seamless or uninterrupted Medi-Cal healthcare coverage for all low-income pregnant women and their children. The peri-natal hotline is really more of an information helpline and would not be operated 24 hours a day. As a part of this component, training could be done of the 211 operators. The training would be very focused to help women navigate a specific set of barriers that are creating major challenges.

Vice Chair Fielding asked what would constitute success. Commissioner Yancey commented that success would be achieved by an increased demand for prenatal services such that there had to be a response to that demand. Presently, there seems to be sufficient capacity to respond to the demand. The ultimate goal is to get women into pre-natal care earlier.

Ms. Altmayer commented that another element of this proposal would be policy advocacy that focused on addressing some of the Medi-Cal provisions which can create a barrier for women accessing pre-natal care. There is presumptive eligibility for pregnant women under Medi-Cal but this presumptive eligibility is temporary and requires women and their providers to re-enroll while in transition from presumptive to permanent eligibility. Another component of the proposal would be to address a policy change that would have to occur at the State level in order to change some of the eligibility requirements for reducing barriers and the re-enrollment procedures, which tend to lead to some fall-off.

Vice Chair Fielding commented that this aspect was going to change by 2014. Commissioner Yancey commented that one of the considerations of the proposal was to look at healthcare reform and make sure that opportunities to support pre-natal, maternity and post-partum care throughout were, in fact, implemented appropriately.

Vice Chair Fielding asked why the peri-natal hotline could not be part of the 211 helpline as opposed to setting up another hotline given all the work that has gone on to advertise the 211 helpline throughout the County for the full range of health and social services.

Director Baker commented that using the 211 helpline was an option. With additional training, the 211 helpline could provide the services in the proposal. Ms. Altmayer commented that the 211 helpline did have the infrastructure available, did indicate a willingness to update their database for referral sites and engage in staff training. However, the helpline being proposed in the proposal offered more dedicated services.

Commissioner Williams asked if the Commissioners had to make choices, which of the two components would have the greatest impact; or, was this a package that could not be divided. Commissioner Yancey commented that there come be some latitude in terms of how exactly the information line was implemented to make best use of the 211 helpline.

Ms. Altmayer reported that the proposal, as submitted, could be funded either as a County-wide augmentation project or as an addition to the anticipated new policy advocacy grant fund. She reviewed the following three options.

- **Option 1: Proposal as Submitted**
  
The proposal, as submitted, could be funded either as a countywide augmentation project or as an addition to the anticipated policy-advocacy grant fund. The appropriate
funding level is unclear as there was not a specified budget included in the proposal. The project would focus advocacy efforts at state and/or local policy makers. Advocacy efforts would focus on the legislative issues outlined above in the context of the federal health care reform implementation. Advocacy efforts on the state level would likely be in partnership with other organizations actively involved in maternal child health issues and health care reform. Local advocacy efforts as outlined above could supplement state-level advocacy.

The proposed hotline would be both a referral network and an opportunity to collect data on challenges and barriers to early access to prenatal care and postpartum follow-up. As indicated in the prior report to the Board of Commissioners, creation of a new hotline may be administratively cumbersome and redundant, as referral services are already supported by First 5 LA through 211 and through the First 5 LA parent helpline. Additionally, First 5 LA may also be able to collect information on challenges to access and care through existing data collection and survey efforts by the county Department of Public Health (see LAMB Project outlined above).

- **Option 2: First 5 LA Public Policy Agenda and Policy-Advocacy Grants**

  First 5 LA has a public policy agenda with 10 goals. One of these, “Promote Comprehensive, Affordable Health Insurance for All,” would be a clear fit for work on continuous coverage for pregnant women.

  First 5 LA currently funds agencies for policy-advocacy work which support goals on the policy agenda through the Community Opportunities Fund. Three cycles of these grants (12 total) have been awarded at up to $500,000 each over a period of up to 5 years. Additional policy-advocacy grantmaking in support of the public policy agenda is anticipated this calendar year. Policy advocacy related to uninterrupted care (including any and all of the work efforts described in Option #1) would qualify for consideration under these grants based on the clear relationship to the goal of “Comprehensive, Affordable Health Insurance for All.”

- **Option 3: Leveraging the Universal Screening Program**

  The Commission previously approved the Universal Newborn Screening Program. It provides for a screening of all mothers/newborns while in the hospital after birth and prior to discharge and, based on risk assessment factors, connects mothers with follow-up supportive services. While this program does not address early enrollment for prenatal care, the program could be used to solicit data regarding mothers’ participation in early prenatal care and barriers to accessing that care. Additionally, this partnership with local hospitals could be the platform for 1) advocating for implementation of policies and procedures to reduce incidences of interrupted care and 2) ensuring postpartum coverage and newborn coverage by implementing protocols that ensure the PE coverage is renewed prior to hospital discharge and/or that a Medi-Cal application is submitted.

Vice Chair Fielding asked if staff had a recommendation. Director Baker commented that this was a Commissioner-driven proposal and staff’s charge was to provide the Commission with options.

Commissioner Kaufman commented it seemed this proposal fitted into the services that were being provided through the 211 helpline. It also seemed to fit in with the policy
agenda. Commissioner Kaufman inquired about an implementation budget as it was not included in the proposal.

Vice Chair Fielding asked if this should be one of the issues that could be discussed as part of the process that the Commission has been discussing in terms of the buckets. He commented that staff could come back after that process and have a more specific recommendation on how much funding is needed as the Commission is looking for efficiencies throughout all programs and initiatives.

Vice Chair Fielding stated that the Commission agreed the services to be provided by the proposal were important but asked, incrementally, what was necessary. He asked staff to come back with a recommended allocation and a more specific recommendation.

Commissioner Kaufman commented that moving forward with this proposal could be less complicated. Staff has spending authority within a policy budget and also have the capacity to enter into contracts. Unless the policy budget was already completely allocated over the next five years with all the other policy projects, there was no need to come back to the Commission for approval.

Director Baker commented that policy grant-making was a County-wide strategy. This proposal could be one of those County-wide policy grants. These grants are for a period of five years with a maximum award of $100,000 per year. This could be a strategy that could be included in the RFQ for this proposal specifically. The cost of the current proposal was unknown as staff and the consultant were not provided with the budget detail of the proposed $2.8 million. However, a significant portion of the $2.8 million cost would be for the peri-natal dedicated helpline whose focus would be women’s issues and collecting data related to the barriers of care.

Commissioner Alma Martinez asked why something was being discussed that did not have a budget detail for the requested funding allocation. She said that this item should not be discussed without having all the necessary information.

Director Baker commented that no budget detail was received from the office of Mark Ridley-Thomas where this proposal originated back in November. In discussions with staff from the Supervisor’s office, the budget detail information never rose to the level of a full priority. The 211 helpline could augment their services to the population defined in the proposal for approximately $30,000 in short-term costs.

Vice Chair Fielding suggested that the best thing to do is to approve this proposal in principal and then come back at a later time with a recommendation on how this proposal could get adequate attention within the policy budget, probably after June when the Commission decides how much is available for each bucket.

Commissioner Yancey suggested approving the proposal and placing it with the other County-wide augmentation proposals for further review with the understanding that the allocation may be reduced.

Commissioner Martinez commented that the reason why this proposal was not originally approved in November was because it was not thought out and there was no budget when it was presented. She said it would be unfair to include this proposal with the other County-
wide proposals that had been vetted by the Commission. Commissioner Martinez also stated that approving this proposal for $2.8 million without any budget details was quite generous and this was not the standard that was used for the other proposals.

CEO Martinez suggested approving the proposal in concept while continuing to work with Supervisor Ridley-Thomas’ office to develop and come back with a refined budget. At that point, this proposal would be included with the other County-wide augmentation proposals.

M/S  (Antronette Yancey / Jonathan Fielding)
APPROVED IN CONCEPT

Public Comment

Maria Peacock, Citrus Valley Health Partners
Ellen Silver, Northeast Valley Health Corporation
Celia Valdez, MCH Access

11. UPDATE: LACOE Contract

At the March, 2011 First 5 LA Commission meeting, Commissioner Yancey’s motion to reinstate the LACOE contract for work on the CDP Project was approved. The Contract had previously been terminated due to significant overlap of the project with the ECE Workforce Consortium countywide augmentation project.

The motion requested that staff return to the Commission in April with an update on progress made in reinstating the contract, including revising the current scope of work to identify a focus for the CDP Project that is complementary to, but does not overlap with the work of the Consortium. The Commission also directed that a memorandum of understanding (MOU) be developed between Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP) as the primary contractor for the ECE Workforce Consortium and LACOE to ensure ongoing integration of efforts between the two projects.

Based upon the Commission’s direction at the March 10, 2011 meeting, staff met with LACOE and the subcontractor, Strategic Counsel, on March 24, 2011 to discuss revisions to their current scope of work for the ECE CDP Project FY10-11 contract, and to identify next steps in moving the project forward. Staff and the LACOE project team discussed key opportunities based upon the current ECE workforce environment and the interest in aligning but not overlapping with the work of the ECE Workforce Consortium.

Staff and the LACOE project team are exploring the following two strategies as effective approaches to meet the objectives of the CDP Project and to complement the work of the Consortium.

1. Engaging the business sector in ECE workforce policy issues. Identified stakeholders would include the city and county Workforce Investment Boards (WIBs), the Chamber of Commerce, financial institutions, and others; and,

2. Engaging policymakers at the local and state levels regarding issues that are raised through the work of the ECE Workforce Consortium.
First 5 LA, LACOE and LAUP met on April 6, 2011 to discuss the general direction of the CDP Project and its complementary approach with the Consortium. This meeting initiated the development of a MOU between LACOE and LAUP as directed by the board at the March 10, 2011 Commission meeting.

Agreed upon next steps include amending the contract with finalized revisions to the current FY 10-11 scope of work, finalizing a MOU between LAUP and LACOE, and developing a performance-based contract with LACOE for FY11-12.

12. Public Comment

Kathy Love, CCRC

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 pm.

The next regularly scheduled Commission meeting will be on:

May 12, 2011 at 1:30 pm
Multi-Purpose Room
750 N. Alameda Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Meeting minutes were recorded by Maria Romero.