

FIRST 5 LA

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES  
Commission Meeting  
July 12, 2012

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:**

**Commissioners:**

Nancy Au  
Jane Boeckmann  
Philip Browning  
Jonathan Fielding (Vice Chair)  
Sandra Figueroa-Villa  
Neal Kaufman  
Marv Southard  
Antronette Yancey  
Zev Yaroslavsky (Chair)

**Ex-Officio Commissioners:**

Patricia Curry  
Arturo Delgado  
Duane Dennis  
Deanne Tilton

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Craig Steele, Interim Chief Executive Officer  
Yolanda Bosch, Chief Administrative Officer  
Antonio Gallardo, Chief Program Officer  
Armando Jimenez, Director of Research & Evaluation  
Elizabeth Iida, Director of Program Development  
Raoul Ortega, Interim Finance Director  
Maria Romero, Executive Assistant

**LEGAL COUNSEL:**

None

**CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL:**

1. Chair Yaroslavsky called the meeting to order at 1:37 pm. Quorum was present.

Chair Yaroslavsky welcomed Sandra Figueroa-Villa to the Commission as Supervisor Molina's newly appointed representative from the First District.

**CONSENT CALENDAR: (Items 2 – 4)**

2. Approval of Commission Meeting Minutes – Thursday, June 14, 2012

**M/S (Jonathan Fielding / Marv Southard)  
WITH NO DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,  
THE ITEM WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

Approval of Commission Meeting Minutes – Wednesday, June 27, 2012

**M/S (Jonathan Fielding / Marv Southard)  
WITH NO DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,  
THE ITEM WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

3. Approval of the Monthly Financial Statements for the Month Ending May 31, 2012

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

Interim Finance Director Ortega presented the regular financial statements for the month ending May 31, 2012 and the transaction reports for the month ending June 30, 2012 for the Commission's review.

**M/S (Jonathan Fielding / Marv Southard)  
WITH NO DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,  
THE ITEM WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

**COMMISSION: (Items 5 – 11)**

**NOTE: The items are listed in the order in which they were discussed during the meeting.**

5. Announcements by the Commission Chair

Chair Yaroslavsky reminded the Commission about the special Commission meeting scheduled for Friday, August 3 at 9 am to continue the selection process for a permanent Executive Director. The meeting will be taking place at the Hall of Administration, Room 821.

6. CEO Report

The written report was received and filed as submitted.

Interim CEO Steele announced that the regular meeting of the Commission scheduled for August 9 was cancelled.

8. Receive and File the Homelessness Children 0-5 in Los Angeles County Report

Item 8 was folded into the discussion of Item 9e.

9. Approve the Individual Elements of the Proposed First 5 LA Expanded Strategic Funding Plan and Adopt Necessary Amendments for the FY 2012-13 Programmatic Budget

**NOTE: Commissioner Fielding announced for the record that he would be abstaining from voting on issues that relate to the Department of Public Health.**

**Commissioner Southard announced for the record that he would be abstaining from voting on issues that relate to the Department of Mental Health.**

Interim CEO Steele reported that a few months ago, Chair Yaroslavsky asked for staff to start working on a plan that was an expenditure plan for moving forward in the wake of the threat of AB 99 being eliminated; as well as, the administrative changes experienced at the end of 2011.

Interim CEO Steele made a few introductory remarks before staff presented the details of the proposal. Staff was asked by Chair Yaroslavsky to come up with a plan for streamlining investments and putting First 5 LA's ample funds to work in Los Angeles County as quickly as possible, consistent with the Commission's strategic plan and consistent with the principles of transparency and accountability.

## SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

A good part of the delay in putting First 5 LA funds to work in recent years is directly attributable to the legislature. Interim CEO Steele reminded the Commission that the legislature adopted and the Governor signed AB 99 in March, 2011. It was a bill that purported to hijack almost \$450 million of the First 5 LA revenue for State purposes. AB 99 was not a surprise as threats to First 5 funding were part of the budget discussions in Sacramento as far back as the fall of 2010. At that time, staff and Commissioners began strategizing about how to address those threats. New spending was stalled and even approved spending delayed throughout that time. The court invalidated AB 99 in December, and the judgment was final in March, 2012 when the State decided to not appeal. With the court's decision, the doubt about the status of First 5 funding that had been created was removed. It was that consequence of events that gave birth to a plan to get the Commission's investments moving again and get its money on the street serving kids.

It is no secret that First 5 LA has a very significant current fund balance. Although much of those funds are allocated for use in future years, staff have shared with the Commission that it projects a very large fund balance of approximately \$160 million at the end of FY 2015-16. This plan is a start at addressing both of those issues.

Everyone has frequently heard that First 5 LA is overly bureaucratic and not nimble enough in its administrative processes. This plan is aimed at changing that perception—maybe at changing that culture, if it exists. Staff, together with partners from the agencies involved in these projects, has done tremendous work in getting these plans put together on a very aggressive and demanding schedule. Commissioners may question the aggressive timing, may feel that a lengthy discussion is necessary to iron out the details of the plan. Interim CEO Steele commented that such was certainly within the purview of the Commissioners.

The philosophy of the package is to put First 5 LA's funds to work providing programs and direct services in the most expeditious way possible while still maintaining oversight and still holding the partners and contractors accountable. The plan depends on taking programs and services off the shelf and trying to put them into play as soon as possible. Staff is not proposing to design new initiatives part of the plan, although elements will not have been done before in Los Angeles County.

Interim CEO Steele also commented that a lot of the inspiration for this plan resulted from conversations with the Executive Director of the Orange County Commission, who faced the same problems and challenges that First 5 LA has faced. He came up with this kind of plan in order to get spending moving and money into the hands of people who could make things happen in the community. Interim CEO Steele thanked the colleagues in Orange County for helping to show that this type of plan works, it is viable, and it addresses the unique challenges created by First 5 LA. The plan is something that already works in another county.

The development of targeted multi-year agreements with selected public agency partners that will manage funds advanced by First 5 LA is consistent with approved program budgets and scopes of work. This is a change in philosophy for the Commission in terms of long-term contracting by advancing funds that will be separately accounted for and separately held by public agencies that follow the same accounting standards that the Commission follows, in order to let them be quicker about administering these projects. This equates to approximately \$110 million in immediate spending but it is spending for items already approved by the Commission. The Commission has previously considered and approved these initiatives, within the context of the \$110 million, and no changes are being recommended. There are an additional \$69.1 million being proposed in new investments for things that have not been previously allocated for such as Items 9c, 9d and 9e consisting of

## SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

\$40 million for an expansion of a dental care program, approximately \$4.1 million for the provision of new County-wide vision services, and \$25 million to provide permanent supportive housing for homeless mothers and families.

As part of the approval of the various agreements, staff is requesting authorization to enter into such agreements. Scopes of work for Items 9a and 9b were included in the meeting packet. For Items 9c, 9d and 9e, the request is for approval of new allocations.

Interim CEO Steele directed the Commissioners to the three schedules provided as part of the staff report: (1) a schedule showing an increase to the FY 2012-13 proposed programmatic budget resulting in \$33.8 million; (2) a restatement of the forecasted July 2012 fund balance reducing it by \$69.1 million; and, (3) updated multi-year forecast reflecting the pending new commitments of \$69.1 million and a forecasted ending fund balance of \$95.6 million, of which approximately \$35 million will be for new spending.

- 9a. Approve Proposed Multi-Project Agreements Between First 5 LA and the County of Los Angeles to Administer and Implement County-wide Initiatives; Authorize the Interim Chief Executive Officer to Finalize the Agreement and Execute on Behalf of First 5 LA.

Christina Altmayer reported that there were no programmatic changes being proposed. The recommendation is for a contractual arrangement change. These programs have all been approved by the Commission, and these commitments were reiterated as part of the adoption of the FY 2012-13 budget. In sum, the proposal is an administrative and contractual change as opposed to a programmatic change. There are three benefits to the multi-project agreement with the County: (1) administrative streamlining; (2) increasing the visibility of First 5 LA's investment at the County and making more transparent the amount of funding that has been allocated to the County for program administration; and, (3) opportunities for the County to leverage additional federal/state funds as a match to First 5 LA funding.

The County Auditor-Controller will set up a special fund for this funding and act as the fiscal agent. The funds will be disbursed by the Auditor-Controller to the County departments as services are rendered through a claiming process. This claiming process mirrors the process and practices of federal grants, which are already in place.

The County will continue to report quarterly on progress against their workplan. The Commission will continue to collect outcome data that is included within the scope of services. On an annual basis, each County department will be submitting a scope of work and workplan for how they will continue to expend funding on an annual basis.

The funds will be segregated for each program and each department. The contract does provide the opportunity that should future programs be determined by First 5 LA to be executed and administered by the County, those programs, at the Commission's discretion, could be added to the master contract.

Commissioner Au commented that there needed to be more detailed discussion. In reference to creating the special reserve fund, she asked what role First 5 LA would have on the use of unspent dollars and interest earned. She also asked what track record existed for the successful implementation and monitoring of programs by the County.

## SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

Interim CEO Steele responded that programs that are new do not have track records. What has been done in the past, is that the Commission has entered into a one-year contract with required reporting of outcomes. This will still be done under this proposal—quarterly reporting to the Commission and oversight by the Commission. What is being changed is the contracting process and the fiscal agent process to try to streamline the process, not having to go through contract negotiations every year. With regard to decisions on unspent funds and the investment of interest that is earned, the contract will specifically provide that the Commission will need to approve any proposal to spend those funds. The contractor has to come back to the Commission with a proposal to spend those funds. The Commission retains control of this issue although the money is being held off-site.

Commissioner Dennis commented he was interested in knowing to what degree would County departments be obligated or will need to work with community-based organizations in the performance of the tasks. The domain is not in County government around such areas as obesity and substance abuse. There are many entities in Los Angeles County who have stake in these issues.

Ms. Altmayer responded that each of these programs rely on subcontracts with community-based agencies that are partnering with the County departments to execute those services. For example, the Department of Mental Health will be contracting with other community-based health centers, and mental health providers that will be trained to provide community-based services through the PCIT program. Included in the scope of work are subcontract arrangements the County would be having with those agencies that would be both training and providing direct services. One of the advantages from this arrangement is that it allows the County to more quickly and execute some of those agreements.

Commissioner Au commented that in principle, she has no problem with what is being considered by the Commission and looking at the County as a strategic partner in addressing some of the issues in the community. She also commented that she did have areas of concern. Specifically, she felt that she has not had the opportunity to truly get into a conversation and discussion about the proposals. In reviewing the materials, she had concerns regarding staffing costs and cost per client of services rendered. Without having more detailed information and discussion, she felt uncertain about moving forward with approval. Commissioner Au asked if the proposal could be approved in principle, moving some components of the motion, but wanted to have an opportunity for the Program & Planning Committee to weigh in on the proposal with staff and County representatives being part of the discussion. She also suggested having a Commission meeting in August as there was a level of urgency that she wanted to respect.

Chair Yaroslavsky commented that he understood this point of view. Of the items that are before the Commission, there really is not anything new. These are programs that have been previously approved by the Board. There has been a lot of discussion on these items prior to his tenure as Commission Chair. From his perspective, what is being proposed was nothing new. He felt it was not necessary to hold off on taking action, especially on the ones that are already happening. The issue is where the money is parked and accounted for. Regarding the new initiatives, specifically the child homelessness initiative, the Commission previously commissioned a report on child homelessness. The report is excellent and sets out what the problem is, quantifying it in a way that is stunning and stark. This is an

## SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

initiative that he would like to move forward as quickly as possible. The proposal in Item 9e outlines the most ambitious and achievable timetable. Any delay would create considerable timeline issues.

Chair Yaroslavsky stressed the importance of approving Item 9e; and, during the pendency of the development of the NOFA, the Program & Planning Committee can meet to discuss and engage staff to ensure that the NOFA reflects what the Commission wants and desires. This is a way for the Program & Planning Committee to be engaged in this issue without losing valuable time. He said it was critical to get this initiative done before the end of the year.

Chair Yaroslavsky commented that he felt the Commission did not need to debate or discuss the merit of this category of expenditure as everyone agreed on the importance of the issue although there might be some criteria issues. Chair Yaroslavsky commented that he has taken this issue over the last seven or eight years very intensely and very personally. He said that he did not believe that a child should be sitting on the streets of Los Angeles County today and have to wait for three or four months while the Commission deliberates. Chair Yaroslavsky urged Commissioners to deliberate while simultaneously taking action. Every day that a five-year old or a three-year old or a one-year old is on the streets of Los Angeles County is one too many.

Furthermore, Chair Yaroslavsky stated that he wanted to resist the cultural trait of the Board of Supervisors and of the Commission of putting this off for another month or so. He asked for the Commission to be ambitious and to bring about change—now.

Chair Yaroslavsky praised staff for developing a plan that addressed the concerns of the County and of First 5 LA. This plan is workable. The issue on Item 9a is that it is either done today or not.

Interim CEO Steele commented that it was not the end of the world if Item 9a did not get done. However, if it does not get done, because it has become an issue that is not, then there would be a problem. This is purely an issue about a contracting process. The Commission is not being asked to reconsider whether any of the four items in Item 9a is a good idea. That discussion and process took place in 2010 when the Commission decided that all the County-wide initiatives in various forms were good ideas. Staff was directed to move these ideas forward specifically with the County as the only entity, in each case, that could provide the services and programs that the Commission wanted to implement. In the context of a contracting discussion, the Commission never looks at budgets. The Commission has never engaged in a level of detailed review of budgets. This data is available to the Commissioners because of the policy decision that needs to be made of whether the Commission wants to contract with the County in this way.

From his perspective, Interim CEO Steele commented that it was not the place of First 5 LA to tell County departments what staff compensation should be. This is not the role of the Commission. The Commission is responsible for approving an allocation and relying on the expertise of the County for provision of direct services. If there are performance issues, then those issues will get addressed as it is done with other contractors. The proposal is about contracting and the mechanisms for getting it done.

## SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

Commissioner Kaufman requested that in addition to receiving the regular reports, he would like to see a leveraging report on a periodic basis since the County has the capacity to leverage First 5 LA funds.

**M/S (Philip Browning / Neal Kaufman)  
WITH NO FURTHER DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,  
ITEM 9A WAS APPROVED**

- 9e. Adopt Resolution 2012-09 to Approve an Allocation of up to \$25 Million to be Made Available via Notice of Funds (“NOFA”) to Provide Permanent Supportive Housing for Homeless Mothers/Families with Children Aged 0-5 that were Previously Involved in the Child Welfare System or Those Existing Foster Care and At Risk of Homelessness

Commissioner Yancey stated that, specifically as it related to Item 9e, she acknowledged the leadership of Chair Yaroslavsky and his staff. This is a critical issue and one that is critical to the Second District. Depending on which reports are being used, anywhere from one-third to two-thirds of the impacted kids reside in the Second District. This is very much in alignment with doing something about the issue and its urgency.

Commissioner Yancey commented the report was very much data-based and the recommendations were all data-based. The report did not make the leap into intervention. There is a big difference between stating the problem and identifying what the solutions are. Commissioner Yancey stated she wanted to make sure the Commission had the best evidence for pursuing this.

Commissioner Yancey proposed amending the motion introduced by Chair Yaroslavsky and being considered by the Commission. Several amendments were presented for consideration. Commissioner Tilton also proposed including pregnant women in the motion. The following motion reflects the proposed amendments accepted by Chair Yaroslavsky and mutually agreed upon by Commissioners Yancey and Tilton.

*I, therefore, move that the First 5 LA Commission adopt Resolution 2012-09 approving an allocation of \$25 million to provide permanent supportive housing for homeless mothers and for families previously involved in or transitioning out of our child welfare system and families at risk of homelessness with children aged prenatal-5, subject to the following conditions:*

- 1. Proposals for funding to be solicited through NOFA to be released not later than September 14, 2012.*
- 2. The funding be allocated according to geographic need, where feasible.*
- 3. Projects/proposals will be considered for funding ONLY if the proposer can be under contract and in progress by December 1, 2012.*
- 4. Funding parameters and eligibility of grantees to be strictly monitored by the Commission and, if necessary, the Program & Planning Committee.*
- 5. First 5 LA and County staff to convene a panel of independent experts to meet as soon as feasible to advise regarding funding parameters, definitions, priorities, proposal evaluation, eligible types of projects, and grantees.*
- 6. Funded programs may include administration and be coordinated with the Family Solutions Centers being funded by the Los Angeles Homeless*

## SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

*Service Authority in conjunction with the County of Los Angeles and the City of Los Angeles.*

A question was raised regarding the scoring and weight of proposals from those agencies that have previously done this type of work. Chair Yaroslavsky suggested that the Program & Planning Committee further discuss this option in the weeks prior to the NOFA being finalized.

Commissioner Dennis commented that there is some semblance of homeless infrastructure in the County. He suggested that coordination take place with existing services and that the motion incorporate this. Chair Yaroslavsky commented that was covered in the motion, implicit as it needed to be.

Chair Yaroslavsky commented that there was a lot of work being done by providers, non-profit housing corporations, and County departments. The reasons for structuring the motion as a NOFA and not as an RFP is to minimize the amount of work that needs to be done by the Commission other than to lay out what the objective is and to invite the people who are doing this for a living to make proposals. A panel of experts will then help the Commission identify the best projects.

Chair Yaroslavsky commented that there was a role for the Program & Planning Committee to oversee, engage and be a sounding board for staff and Commissioners so that the NOFA that is implemented is what the Commissioners want.

Commissioner Tilton commented that the homelessness initiative is really exciting and long overdue. She appreciated Chair Yaroslavsky's efforts on the issue. Commissioner Tilton encouraged approval of the motion.

Commissioner Au asked if there was an opportunity for the Commission to identify a strategic partner regarding the homelessness project. The issues are very challenging and complex. As there are multiple agencies dealing with homeless issues (DMH, DPH, Housing Authority), she asked if there was agency that could do the coordination and also be able to work with the Commission on a NOFA process.

Interim CEO Steele commented there was no way of finding out if a strategic partner existed that could work with the Commission prior to having an allocation. There may be agencies that may be well suited to do this but as with all initiatives, the Commission must first approve an allocation and allow staff to initiate the process.

Chair Yaroslavsky commented that the NOFA will generate several strategic partnerships as the service delivery component will be provided through community agencies, the Department of Public Health, and the Department of Mental Health. From his experience, all of the permanent support housing projects are developing partnerships with various agencies to fund the services. Permanent supportive housing is comprised of physical living accommodations and the wrap-around services such as mental health, substance abuse, and child welfare.

**M/S (Neal Kaufman / Philip Browning)  
WITH NO FURTHER DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,  
ITEM 9E WAS APPROVED AS AMENDED**

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

Public Comment:

Kris Freed, LA Family Housing

- 9b. Approve Proposed Multi-Year Agreements Between First 5 LA and LA Care and First 5 LA and UCLA

CAO Bosch reported that staff was requesting Commission approval for multi-year agreements between First 5 LA and LA Care, and First 5 LA and UCLA. The proposed action would approve multi-year agreements with LA Care and UCLA to administer and execute the Healthy Kids program and Oral Health and Nutrition projects, both of which have been approved as multi-year projects by the Commission. The intent of the proposal is to contract and fund the projects for the remainder of the allocation time. By advancing all of the approved funds, each contractor will be given flexibility needed to ensure that the funds can be used to accomplish the scopes of work set forth for this fiscal year but also to leverage other opportunities. For example, LA Care proposes to use \$500,000 and up to \$5 million of unspent funds to increase eligibility for Healthy Kids to families with incomes of up to 400 percent of federal poverty level as opposed to the 300 percent currently in place. If any unspent funds are available, and either contractor wishes to use these funds, they would be required to follow the Commission's regular process of securing Commission approval to use those funds for a particular project. In order to ensure accountability for the funding, each contractor has also agreed to establish a special revenue fund, provide quarterly reports accounting for the spending to date, and reinvest any interest earned on the funds back into the program.

Interim CEO Steele reiterated that the Commission was not being asked to approve the use of unspent funding by LA Care. The illustration provided was an example of what LA Care would do if there were unspent funds available.

Commissioner Kaufman asked how First 5 LA received recognition for the many contributions it makes. He asked for staff to explore branding opportunities so that First 5 LA is recognized for the contributions made because it is important for public image and sustainability.

Commissioner Yancey was in agreement with Commissioner Kaufman and asked if First 5 LA had a branding manual. CAO Bosch responded that there was a branding publication provided to all grantees and contractors. She said this issue would be further discussed with the Public Affairs Department to look at branding opportunities with these two contractors.

**M/S (Marv Southard / Jonathan Fielding)  
WITH NO FURTHER DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,  
ITEM 9B WAS APPROVED**

- 9c. Approve Findings to Establish Strategic Partnership Grants with University of California Los Angeles, University of Southern California, and Western University to Implement First 5 LA's Children's Dental Care Program and Allocate an Amount Not-to-Exceed \$40 Million Over Five Years; Approve Resolution 2012-07

CPO Gallardo reported that staff was requesting the approval of findings to establish Strategic Partnership contracts with University of California Los Angeles, University of Southern California, and Western University to implement First 5 LA's

## SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

Children's Dental Care Program and allocate an amount not-to-exceed \$40 million over five years.

The need for children's dental care is clearly demonstrated by the evidence of high levels of tooth decay among disadvantaged children in Los Angeles County, with 64 percent of children in the two- to five-year old age group requiring dental care. Furthermore, 72 percent of children were classified as needing dental care within 15 days and another nine percent needing immediate dental care (within 24 hours). Based on US Census information and corroborating pediatric dentistry research, there are nearly 400,000 children, ages 0 – 5, in Los Angeles County requiring dental care.

First 5 LA's current investments in addressing the needs of dental care for disadvantaged children will provide comprehensive services to approximately 138,000 children ages 0-5 years over the next three years, leaving more than 300,000 children with the potential of receiving no support.

A comprehensive approach is needed to solve the children's dental crisis in Los Angeles County as there are a myriad of challenges to overcome, including a lack of access, parental education, prevention and awareness.

First 5 LA has acknowledged this need and is working to combat these barriers. It has created the Oral Health and Nutrition Expansion and Enhancement Project and funded over 17 different projects in this area. This is not enough to satisfy the tremendous need faced by 400,000 children ages 0-5 years.

The proposed First 5 LA Child Dental Care Program aims to expand the existing dental care investment to provide an additional 100,000 children (ages 0 – 5) with continued dental care over the next five years. The program aims to reach these children with similar initiatives than the ones in the existing portfolio. These strategies are very comprehensive, and are the result of the recommendations of the OHN Ad Hoc committee that the Commission established in 2011. These include services such as prevention, treatment, parent services, the link to Dental Homes, care coordination which ensures that children referred receive care, professional development, and the use of emerging technologies to increase access.

There is an additional component that has been added to increase capacity and that is a Residency and Post-Residency strategy – aimed to provide at least 25 dental residents for the County over the next five years.

In order to expedite implementation, staff is proposing to work with University of California Los Angeles, University of Southern California, and Western University by establishing strategic partnerships. Among the three schools, the prospect partners have expressed confidence that they can achieve the program objective of providing direct services to 100,000 children (ages 0-5) over a five-year period.

While each school has different capacities and slight variances in program delivery, they share a general philosophy of early and regular interactions with children; a strong demand for family, parent and care-giver education; the need to meet the children and families where they are (such as schools, at home, through primary care providers); including trusted members (teachers, school nurses) in service delivery; and the need to take into consideration societal factors, such as socio-economic and racial disparities.

## SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

Referencing page 359 of the meeting packet, the proposal to establish the strategic partnerships fulfill all the criteria required by the Commission to approve such partnerships. Upon approval, staff will start contract negotiations, and develop a detailed scope of work and budget aiming to start implementation in September 2012.

Commissioner Yancey commented that she needed more details. Specifically, how will services be provided to 100,000 children for \$35 million, when First 5 LA's investment in oral health provides services to 50,000 children for \$20 million. She asked if there was that much existing infrastructure that would help get a greater return on investment for the Commission. Furthermore, Commissioner Yancey asked what was the existing evidence of the productivity of the existing investment.

CPO Gallardo responded that the numbers being provided were national figures. Under the Commission's current investments, more than 50,000 children will be served. This was a preliminary figure of \$400 per child since as many as 80,000 children can be served with the current allocation.

Commissioner Yancey asked if there was any data on how many children have been served for the amount spent to date. CPO Gallardo responded that the figure being used was an average of the national figure because the Commission's investments were at different stages and some were just beginning. CPO Gallardo commented that the universities can provide assurances for the projected children to be served at the specified investment level.

Vice Chair Fielding asked how much of the services would be for prevention versus treatment. He also asked how much of the investment was geared toward an adequate parental knowledge as it was not clear.

CPO Gallardo said that the proposal included elements for prevention (education, screening, fluoride varnish), treatment (emergency, restorative, special needs, sedation), and education of parents/caregivers. In this proposal, the concept of 300 Dental Homes in community clinics was being introduced to expand access to children.

Vice Chair Fielding commented that he did not know how much of the requested allocation was going to be designated to general education of parents of young children, what the mechanisms would be, and who were the best organizations to engage. He also commented that he did not know what percentage of the total funds would be roughly allocated to the various categories within direct services such as screening. To him, the proposal lacked that kind of definition and needed greater clarity with respect to the issues he raised because the return on investment and costs are different for different aspects. Vice Chair Fielding also asked if there was going to be any prioritization and what the basis would be for it. Although his questions would not deter him from approving the proposal, Vice Chair Fielding made it clear that such questions should be answered not only for this proposal but for any future proposal coming to the Commission for consideration.

Commissioner Au commented that she shared the need of Vice Chair Fielding and Commissioner Yancey for having further details that can be utilized in constructing and developing the contract so that there are clear expectations. Commissioner Au asked if there would be other opportunities for organizations providing dental

## SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

services to be able to participate as a potential subcontractor. This would optimize access because Los Angeles County is so huge and there are entities currently involved in the provision of these types of services embedded in a number of communities. She also asked if only the universities listed in the proposals would be the sole providers of services. If this was the case, she had concerns.

CPO Gallardo responded that staff was asking for authorization to start working with three strategic partners to detail out scope of services and distribution of funds as a priority. The universities, by themselves, cannot be able to accomplish the target of serving 100,000 children on their own. The universities are fully aware of this and have already established a network of providers, clinics and community-based organizations that can be subcontracted to accomplish the goal of reaching out to 100,000 children.

Commissioner Au asked if the universities would be open to subcontracting with new entities. The response was in the affirmative.

Commissioner Yancey asked how the money would be disbursed among the three universities. CPO Gallardo responded that it would be based on capacities and the number of children served. No funds have been committed to each of the universities. The initial step is to get approval for the allocation. CPO Gallardo also stated that as the details of the proposals are further defined, these would be shared with the Commission.

Vice Chair Fielding proposed amending the motion to redirect \$2 million of the total requested allocation of \$40 million for a public education campaign on the benefits of drinking tap water.

Commissioner Southard asked if the \$2 million allocation would be sufficient. Vice Chair Fielding responded that based on his experience, the allocation would be a good starting point at changing norms, if the campaign was done carefully.

CPO Gallardo clarified that with the \$2 million reduction, the new outreach target would be 95,000 children as only \$38 million would remain to reach out to the targeted population.

**M/S (Jonathan Fielding / Antronette Yancey)  
WITH NO FURTHER DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,  
THE ITEM WAS APPROVED AS AMENDED  
WITH \$2 MILLION BEING REDIRECTED FOR  
A PUBLIC EDUCATION CAMPAIGN ON DRINKING TAP WATER**

(Per Commission's Activity Break Policy, the Commission took a break to perform Instant Recess.)

- 9d. Approval of Findings to Establish a Strategic Partnership Contract with University of California Los Angeles to Implement First 5 LA's Children's Vision Care Program and Allocate an Amount Not-to-Exceed \$4.1 Million Over Five Years; Approve Resolution 2012-08

CPO Gallardo reported that staff was seeking approving approval of findings to establish a Strategic Partnership contract with University of California Los Angeles (UCLA) to implement First 5 LA's Children's Vision Care Program and allocate an amount not-to-exceed \$4.1 million over five years.

## SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

Nearly 75 percent of early learning is visual. One in five preschool children has a vision problem, which impacts a child's ability to learn and his or her academic performance. Impairments such as amblyopia affect up to four percent of preschool children, putting them at risk of permanent vision loss if left untreated. For Los Angeles County, there are 451,000 children between ages three to five years, which represents a potential need of 90,200 children with vision problems and 18,040 at-risk of permanent vision loss. This proposed strategic partnership and new funding allocation would create a new initiative that would provide vision care services to 90,000 children aged 0-5 over five years, beginning in September 2012, at a total cost of \$4.1 million.

First 5 LA recognizes the importance of access to vision care, and seeks opportunities to expand its impact on vision care to a much larger scale throughout the County. To do so, it seeks to implement a Children's Vision Care Program through a strategic partnership with UCLA.

Given that all four justifications for strategic partnership are met, and its alignment with First 5 LA's FY 2009-2015 Strategic Plan, it is recommended that a Strategic Partnership be pursued with UCLA to implement the Children's Vision Care Program. UCLA appears uniquely to be positioned to meet First 5 LA's criteria in a comprehensive manner and help implement the Children's Vision Care Program. An open solicitation process would most likely result in UCLA being chosen as the eventual partner. Therefore, by establishing a Strategic Partnership, First 5 LA will save resources required for a full solicitation process. Also, the partnership will allow the program to begin implementation by September 2012, a significantly earlier start-date than would be possible through open solicitation.

Over the next five years, First 5 LA seeks to provide 90,000 children with vision care services, with the program aimed to:

- Provide initial vision screening at pre-school locations.
- Provide full eye exams for those who fail screenings (conducted by pediatric ophthalmologists through a mobile vision care vehicle).
- Provide referrals to partner network of vision specialists, for the small percentage of children that require special medical attention.
- Provide (and replace) glasses for children who need them to treat impairments, ensure cognitive development, and prevent permanent vision impairment.
- Collaborate with school teachers and parents on follow-up and compliance.
- Build on a proven University of California, San Diego (UCSD) vision care program, which has been successfully implemented in San Diego with First 5 support.

The proposed scope of project would span five years at a cost of \$4.1 million, in order to serve 90,000 pre-school age children (approximately \$45 per child).

Vice Chair Fielding commented that all children ages 0-5 in Los Angeles County are either covered or eligible for insurance coverage. Given this, he asked if the Commission would better use this money to make sure that children are getting appropriate vision screening as part of routine medical care as opposed to separating a mobile vision clinic.

## SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

In response, Dr. Stuart Brown from the UCSD Shiley Eye Center, stated that this has been the hope for the last 50 years but has never been realized. Pediatricians do not examine children under five years old for vision—they do not know how, do not have the time, and also state they do not have the resources.

Vice Chair Fielding commented that he was concerned with vision screening being totally separate from the rest of medical care for the foreseeable future. In response, Dr. Brown stated that under the proposed program, children are ensured access to vision screenings by bringing these services directly to children, with staff trained specifically in childhood vision care. In addition, the program uses a custom-built technology infrastructure that allows for extensive automation of scheduling, coordination, and data recording and a connection would be made with the child's medical home. While it is ideal to have all medical screenings and assessment be done in one place, research shows that that the vision screenings are not being done by the pediatricians.

Commissioner Au suggested that perhaps the Commission's health programs cover dental and vision care to try to reach to as many children as possible. To her, this was a broader policy discussion for the Commission to undertake.

Vice Chair Fielding suggested that staff look at what, if anything, the Commission might be able to do to increase aid in the pediatric practice as it related to vision screenings.

Commissioner Yancey stated this would be a great opportunity for the Program & Planning Committee to weigh in on what models might be useful in trying to accomplish the proposed goals.

**M/S (Jonathan Fielding / Marv Southard)  
WITH NO FURTHER DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,  
THE ITEM WAS APPROVED**

7. Approval to Establish a Strategic Partnership with the California Community Foundation for a Previously Approved Total Allocation of \$2,075,000 in Order to Create and Administer a Recoverable Grant Fund to Bridge Payments to Center-Based Child Care Operators that Serve Approximately 50,000 Low-Income Children in Los Angeles County

Director Nuno reported that staff has identified a timely leveraging opportunity to partner with the California Community Foundation to establish a recoverable grant fund to bridge payments to center-based childcare operators in Los Angeles County.

First 5 LA's investment in this Bridge Fund will help maintain the critical childcare infrastructure in Los Angeles County by allowing childcare providers to maximize their limited financial resources, and will also raise awareness and support among the broader early childhood funding community—specifically private funders.

Staff is requesting approval to enter into a Strategic Partnership with the California Community Foundation in the amount of \$2,075,000 to establish the Bridge Fund, which will leverage private resources held by California Community Foundation at a 1:1 rate.

## SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

Investment in the Bridge Fund meets the Community Investments criteria and supports the Commission's priority goals that children are ready to enter kindergarten and efforts to ensure children are safe from abuse and neglect. It is also complementary to First 5 LA's current countywide investments in early care and education and workforce development.

The purpose of the ECE Recoverable Grant Fund is to bridge payments to childcare operators—who contact with the California Department of Education and serve low-income children in Los Angeles County—during delays in the disbursement of contracted payments. Access to temporary funds until State funds are dispersed can prevent local contractors from taking extreme measures that suspend, reduce or eliminate services to hundreds of families, and jeopardize employment for parents and childcare providers. Given the need for temporary gap funding, the California Community Foundation engaged the Low Income Investment Fund (also known as LIIF) to explore the feasibility of establishing a recoverable grant fund for Los Angeles County that would replicate similar bridge funds successfully administered by LIIF and funded by First 5 Commissions in Alameda and San Francisco Counties. These recoverable grants were provided at zero interest to child care contractors, and each year 100 percent of the funds were repaid, with no defaults.

Last year, the California Community Foundation Board approved an investment of \$1,075,000 to create a Bridge Fund, contingent upon securing funding commitments totaling at least \$1 million from other funding partners. By First 5 LA investing in \$1,075,000 in the Fund, the Commission positions the California Community Foundation to meet its match requirement and immediately implement the Fund.

Further, staff recommends First 5 LA invest an additional \$1 million in the Fund, with the condition that other funders match these funds at a 1:1 rate within a four-year “challenge” period. This challenge grant would increase the total Fund value to \$4 million and allow for up to 40 recoverable grants annually to center-based childcare operators, serving approximately 1,200 to 5,000 children ages 0 to 5.

The fiscal resources leveraged through this partnership will establish a robust Fund that can more fully respond to the demands of childcare providers in Los Angeles County.

First 5 LA funds will be held and managed by the California Community Foundation, who is contracting with LIIF to administer the Recoverable Grants. Moreover, this is a grant to the California Community Foundation and the funds are not returned to First 5 LA.

Eligibility criteria for the initial round of Recoverable Grants has been established with input from the Los Angeles County Office of Child Care and LIIF; and is based on the projected Bridge Funds available, the size of existing contracts and the financial needs of contractors.

The Bridge Fund is expected to operate for up to four years. The outcomes that will be track for this investment include: (1) the number of child care slots preserved; (2) the number of child care staff positions preserved; (3) fiscal resources leveraged; and, (4) and grants repaid.

## SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

Vice Chair Fielding asked what happens when this type of bridge funding is no longer needed. Staff responded that the fund and need for it would be assessed annually. During the third year, an analysis would be done of lessons learned and outcomes to determine if there was a continued need for the funds after the fourth year or if the funds should be used for another strategic purpose. The funds would then revert back to the Commission.

Commissioner Browning clarified that the bridge funding was actually a loan and that it would be repaid. Staff responded in the affirmative. However, the loan becomes forgivable if is not repaid. Given this, Commissioner Browning asked if a risk assessment was done of applicants. Staff replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Dennis commented that the Commission has set precedent by the Stage 3 funding to the State, which was repaid. Given this, he urged the Commission to support the staff recommendation.

**M/S (Jonathan Fielding / Jane Boeckmann)  
WITH NO FURTHER DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,  
THE ITEM WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

10. Approve Implementation of the Evaluation, Communications and Partnership Support Components of the Community Plans for the 14 Best Start Communities

CPO Gallardo reported that the purpose of this request is to provide time and resources to allow Best Start Communities to continue build capacities and strengthen parent/resident engagement until the communities bring to the Commission the project-related components of the community plans. This approval will release a portion of the \$ 1.7 million the Commission has already approved for each community.

The initial intent was to bring the community plans to the Commission for approval in three phases, starting on June 14. As that did not happen, and in order to continue the work in the communities, three components are being presented for approval that are not project-related but capacity-building related.

- **Evaluation:** Supported by First 5 LA's Research and Evaluation Department, community partnerships will work with a community evaluator to be engaged at the initial stages of designing Best Start activities and developing mechanisms to measure progress toward the changes the community wants to achieve.
- **Communications:** Community partnerships will further plan and participate in communications efforts that engage other community members, spread awareness about the vision of Best Start, its activities and promote action.
- **Partnership Support:** Community partnerships will continue to receive partnership coordination, facilitation, and meeting support.

This approval will enable staff to continue providing community capacity building where communities can continue to foster the involvement and ongoing commitment of parents and residents, maintaining momentum and commitment of the community partnerships while working on the plans. This is among the most critical of the decision points as it directly impacts how resources will be mobilized and contracted for the community-specific project components of the community plans.

## SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

First 5 LA staff will look across all plans in order to determine commonalities across community plans to avoid duplication of programs, efforts and community investments that other service providers might bring to the table. In addition, staff will also identify possible opportunities for leveraging other First 5 LA investments (i.e., County-wide projects) and other potential funders (i.e., The California Endowment, Promise Neighborhoods, California Community Foundation). Staff will also hold discussions with Commissioners about vision and expectations of Best Start implementation and determine funding mechanisms to inform the implementation of family strengthening and community capacity building strategies.

Vice Chair Fielding commented that he was tired of not being able to see clear plans for each of the communities. General amounts are going to each community without any kind of definition of what is really going to happen and how they differ from each other. He expressed concern that Commissioners did not have the level of clarity with respect to what is going on. As a result, Vice Chair Fielding stated that he would have difficulty voting on this item without clarity and specificity.

Commissioner Browning stated that he had a similar concern. After having sat through three community plan presentations at the Program & Planning Committee meeting, he felt the communities were all going to be doing the same thing. He said he was not sure how he was going to get the clarity referenced by Vice Chair Fielding and that he, too, needed.

Commissioner Au, as the Best Start Liaison, commented that the Commission needed to go back to the original intent of the place-based effort. This effort was about building community capacity in terms of community empowerment. The goal was to have families, parents and neighborhoods participate in wanting to make significant impact in the support and outcome of children as they related to the Commission's four goal areas. The approach focused on community engagement. Many of the models utilized showed to be quite effective through the work of the Neighborhood Action Councils.

Commissioner Au commented that what has occurred over the last 18 months, is the clear realization that as the Commission began implementation, further clarification as to expectations needed to take place. The usual Commission practice of allocating grant dollars would not work with the place-based approach. The communities would not be able to meet the standards and requirements because they are not organized as a non-profit organization. If a different approach is taken, such as community capacity for neighborhoods, they would be able to provide the kind of support for their neighbors and articulate what kinds of challenges are being encountered in the community.

Commissioner Au also said this was a critical time for the Commission to revisit the place-based effort and to get further clarity as to what are the expectations. Her initial thought is to separate the community engagement component and empowerment piece from the allocation of dollars for direct services. Commissioner Au stated that she did not envision the community really thinking along the lines of fiscal responsibility, developing programs, and having outcomes for which they will be held accountable.

Vice Chair Fielding commented that he certainly appreciated communities wanting to own the process; but he would like to see community plans. Specifically, he was concerned about continued allocations, such as the \$210,000 being requested for each community, without knowing how it will be spent.

Commissioner Au responded that the funding was for staff costs as staff is out in the community as well as, for meeting logistics such as transportation and childcare.

## SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

Vice Chair Fielding stated that without any details on how the funds were to be expended, as a fiduciary, he felt uncomfortable approving the request.

Commissioner Browning commented that the place-based effort was nebulous and soft. Given this, the return on investment was not quantifiable.

Commissioner Au reiterated that it was critical for the Commission to engage in a discussion on separating the community engagement component from the empowerment piece.

Chair Yaroslavsky asked what was the specific amount being requested. CPO Gallardo responded that funds being requested were for the community capacity component so that communities could continue to meet. This amounted to \$210,000 per community per year.

Chair Yaroslavsky recalled an earlier conversation where communities would be assessed in terms of which had the prospect of success and which were going nowhere. There was a feeling that a substantial number of communities were going nowhere. He asked what happened to that idea.

CPO Gallardo commented that through the community plans, the Commission would be able to assess whether the communities were moving in the direction intended by the Commission. Since the plans were not presented, the assessment has not been done.

Chair Yaroslavsky stated that 18 months is a long time without having any results. He asked how many communities had a prospect for success; and, if six, seven or eight communities did not, then now was the time to have the conversation of jettisoning those communities, as unpopular as that may be, and focusing on the communities that will be successful.

Chair Yaroslavsky said that not knowing the measure of success made things difficult. CPO Gallardo responded that staff had developed a tool to assess the effectiveness in the partnership readiness. Chair Yaroslavsky asked what specifically was meant by partnership readiness. CPO Gallardo responded that communities start at a certain point, at different levels, and then move forward. CPO Gallardo commented that a tool has been developed in the past year. There was not tool when he was hired.

Interim CEO Steele commented that the problem was that there was no one definition or vision of Best Start. There is no articulation of what Best Start is and how to successfully implement it in the communities.

Chair Yaroslavsky commented that the program is set up for failure if there is no agreed articulation of what Best Start is among the Commissioners.

Chair Yaroslavsky suggested providing 25 percent of a year's funding and having the more in-depth discussion in September. The place-based effort continues at the current pace until the discussion. Either one of two things will happen, the place-based effort will fall on its own weight because it is too nebulous or it is going to get hijacked into something no one anticipated.

Commissioner Yancey suggested that two quarters of funding be approved because the communities as well as, the Commission has been floundering. There have been leadership issues which have contributed to the situation. There is a fragmentation that, in some

## SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

ways, the Commission has participated in. Now that the Commission is moving toward hiring an excellent and outstanding Executive Director, it should just bear a bit longer to give the new Executive Director a couple of months to grasp the place-based effort and come up with an action plan. Chair Yaroslavsky agreed with providing funding for six months. He did stress that he wanted the Commission to have this discussion in either September or October.

Commissioner Dennis commented that the Commission should revisit the core discussion about the place-based effort. He said the Commission needed to know if it was still supportive of the place-based effort that was adopted five years ago. To him, he was not sure if the Commission was still at the same place. If the Commission was still willing to embrace the place-based effort, then metrics and measures of success needed to be defined.

Chair Yaroslavsky said that the scale of the place-based effort was also an issue. Perhaps trying to reach out to 14 communities was a leap and the Commission could have been better off with funding seven of the communities with the greatest potential.

Commissioner Browning asked what would happen if the Commission just stopped funding the place-based effort today. Specifically, what would be the impact in the communities aside from the Commission losing its investment. He asked for these questions to be considered for the more in-depth discussion.

Commissioner Au commented that no longer funding the communities would send the message that the Commission no longer had the commitment to empowering communities. From her vantage point, this was a public relations disaster.

Vice Chair Fielding commented that he had a fiduciary responsibility as a Commissioner. From the recipients' perspective, he wants the Commission to be fair. Expectations need to be clearly defined by the Commission.

Vice Chair Fielding said that he would like the questions raised to be presented in a decision memo format so that it can help to frame the discussion and have an outcome that is satisfactory.

Commissioner Yancey stated that the field of place-based has progressed in the five-year period since it was approved. Information should be provided to answer the questions raised.

Chair Yaroslavsky asked that Vice Chair Fielding participate in the discussion of the Best Start Liaisons. The discussion regarding place-based by the full Commission should take place no later than October.

**M/S (Philip Browning / Antronette Yancey)  
WITH NO FURTHER DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,  
THE ITEM WAS APPROVED AS AMENDED FOR SIX MONTHS OF FUNDING**

4. Approve Proposed New Agreements, Amendments and Renewals Approved in the FY 2012-13 Programmatic and Operating Budgets and Authorize Staff to Complete Final Contract Execution Upon Approval from the Board

Interim CEO Steele reported that based on the action taken on Item 10, the contracts on pages 147 and 148 of the meeting will be changed to reflect the Commission's decision.

SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

**M/S (Philip Browning / Antronette Yancey)  
WITH NO FURTHER DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,  
THE ITEM WAS APPROVED AS AMENDED  
BASED ON THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE COMMISSION ON ITEM 10**

11. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

Interim CEO Steele reported that the Program & Planning Committee would be rescheduled between July 26 and August 23 to further discuss the NOFA.

The Board of Supervisors will be receiving a quarterly report from First 5 LA highlighting the adoption of the annual budget, adoption of expenditure plan, completion of the Harvey M. Rose audit recommendations, and Civil Grand Jury Report.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

With the conclusion of the agenda, Chair Yaroslavsky asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

**M/S (Nancy Au / Jonathan Fielding)  
WITH NO FURTHER DISCUSSION OR OBJECTION,  
THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED**

The Commission adjourned at 4:53 pm.

**NEXT MEETING:**

The next regularly scheduled Commission meeting will take place on September 13, 2012 at 1:30 pm.

First 5 LA  
Multi-Purpose Room  
750 N. Alameda Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Meeting minutes were recorded by Maria Romero, Secretary to the Board of Commissioners.