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COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Ladies and gentlemen, we appreciate your presence today at the regularly scheduled meeting of the Commission for First 5 LA.

I'm going to call on the secretary to call the roll.

(Roll called)

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: We thank you for your attendance.

The next item on the agenda is approval of the commission minutes from the last regularly scheduled meeting. The Chair will entertain a motion to that effect. Is there such a motion?

It is properly moved by Dr. Fielding and seconded by Commissioner Figueroa a/k/a -- well, I'll tell you about that later.

Are there any objections to the minutes as submitted from our meeting of Thursday, July 11th?

Hearing none, please record a unanimous vote.

We'll then move to Item Number 3 and hear the report of -- from the finance director. Please proceed, ma'am.
MS. CHOUGH: Good afternoon, Chairman, and members of the board. I'm here to present the monthly financials from June and July. I would like to share really quickly, however, that we're expecting -- we are in the financial stages of our audit with the external auditors, Mavernik, Shrine, Day (phonetic spelling). We did conclude our onsite review. And after that onsite review, we had a preliminary exit interview. And I do want to share that the findings with quote/unquote looking good. So we're optimistic, but those were preliminary findings. We will be back, too, next month to give you a full report on the findings of that audit.

In the interim, I'm presenting to you the unaudited soft closing numbers for June and July. You'll see in your documents that we began June with a cash balance of $756,000,000, and closed with 729.

July, consistent with years past, because it's the first month of the fiscal year, we -- the change. we started with 729 and closed with 728. And that small difference is primary due to the fact that revenues experience a two-month lag and expenditures experience a one-month lag. So there's very little activity in the first couple of months of the fiscal year.

That concludes my presentation.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you for your
presentation. The matter is before us. It's been properly moved. Is there a second? It's been seconded.

If there's no objection, we will then accept the report from the finance director and file the report for the appropriate audit at the time deemed appropriate.

Let's then move to Item Number 4.

Ma'am.

MR. WAGNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: I beg your pardon, Mr. Ambassador. It's the Honorable. I saw a distraction over there and -- thank you.

MR. WAGNER: Just a couple very brief comments in context for this item that's going to be presented. When the program and operating budgets were passed by the commission this past June, there were several items that the board was considering and discussing and -- including Best Start. We were having conversations about our policy and advocacy agenda and, some other things like L-3.

Earlier this year, the board did approve priorities for our policy and advocacy in the area of home visitation and early child education. So this presentation is very consistent with those priorities. And what we are seeking is to increase spending authority and contract authority for two contracts in the policy arena. These will also be -- the contracts themselves
will also be considered on the consent calendar. So this
is -- if you take action on these items to increase the
spending and contract authority and then the consent
calendar would approve the contracts.

So with that, I'll turn it over to Stacy. Thank
you.

COMMISSIONER THOMPSON. So moved.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much.

Ma'am.

MS. LEE. Thank you. Good afternoon,
Commissioners.

As you will recall, the staff and consultant team
from California Strategies and Advocacy provided detailed
plans, near and long-term goals for the policy and
sustainability efforts, which were approved by the board
at the July 2013 meeting.

At that time, staff presented the rationale for
additional activities to support the goals and an initial
estimate of augmentations required. Further staff work
and analysis have refined the augmentation requests in the
amounts before you. Consistent with the direction
provided by the board, staff is requesting an additional
$154,000 to be added to the policy advocacy fund line item
for both spending and contract authority for FY 2013-14.

As part of the strategic planning process
associated with the State policy and sustainability plan, we identify opportunities to, one, engage in advocacy to support the Los Angeles County School Districts in developing local control accountability plans that are inclusive of early education programs;

Two, engage the State Board of Education in advocacy around the local control funding formula in Sacramento.

The second request before you also consistent with direction from the board in July is a request to increase by $100,000 spending authority for the policy department, policy agenda/agency advocacy line item for FY2013-14. Additional contract authority is not required at this time. Sufficient authority exists within our existing line item.

Staff is requesting an augmentation for the CalStrat Contract to, one, enable the consultant team to dedicate additional time and resources to help identify and coordinate near-term advocacy opportunities related to the local control funding formula;

Two, develop and implement longer-term strategies related to communications;

And, three, secure high-level Title 19 Medicaid expertise to support First 5 LA's efforts to explore Medicaid funding opportunities that align with First 5 LA
priorities.

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

I did hear a motion from Commissioner Fielding and I would designate that Commissioner Au is going to second this item. She's been conscripted to second. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER AU: Yes.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Is there any discussion on the matter before us?

Dr. Fielding and --

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I was very interested in watching the President in one of the many interviews he did about Syria today saying, you know, I'd rather be spending this money on early childhood education.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Appropriately so.

Commissioner Au, did I notice your hand?

COMMISSIONER AU: Yeah, if I could -- I'm just going to assume, but I want to just -- there's always a danger in assumptions, but if we -- embedded within our contract with CalTrans strike that they would give us at least a regular reporting, not only in terms of what their advocacy work is entailing, but also in terms of the -- their read as to the -- the feasibility of success, if that is possible. I know it's like reading tea leaves
sometimes, but sometimes they're able to get a sense of how successful we will be in our policy works. So I would appreciate that.

MS. LEE: Sure. Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER AU: Yeah. Is there a particular time frame in which they're going to be doing this?

MS. LEE: We check in with them biweekly and they give us written reports on a monthly basis and then we will work with Kim and the Board to provide updates to the full commission.

COMMISSIONER AU: Excellent. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Any further discussion? Anymore questions at all at this point to clarify matters?

It's been properly moved and seconded. Seeing no objections, then please record a unanimous vote.

Thank you. We'll move to the next item, which is Item Number 5.

MR. WAGNER: Good afternoon, Commissioners. What I am speaking to is Item 5 in the board book. It's this month's consent calendar. You have before you 29 contract and just a few points to call out before we go through these items.

First of all, as is the case with the consent calendar, all of these items have been approved by the
board in the past, the funding for these items. What we are bringing forward to you are the contracts that we have negotiated with these entities. And similar to the action you just took on policy, all of these items have been approved for spending authority and contract authority.

Second, within the 15 new agreements that you have before you -- and there are 15 new agreements, four contract amendments, and 10 contract renewals. Within the new agreements, you'll recall that there were three new county-wide initiatives that had been considered and we had deferred consideration of those items for staff to do some additional analysis following Board discussions about establishing a framework for Best Start called the -- called the Building Stronger Families Framework. Specifically, we needed to look at how that framework applied to these new initiatives. That analysis has been done, which is contained in Item 8 of your board book as part of the Best Start item, and specifically it's spelled out in attachment C that memo.

Just to call out those three that had been deferred for consideration, the public health foundation's one-step ahead initiative, the peer support group for parents, and the veggie voucher initiative with the ecology center have all been examined now through the lens of the Building Stronger Families Framework as articulated
in Item 8, Attachment C. And given the alignment that is spelled out in that memo, staff is now recommending approval of these contracts.

In addition to that analysis, the Board has discussed the one-step ahead strategic partnership this past April, taking action and approving it in May. However, there were some additional questions and requests for information that the Board asked to us come back with. And so you will see that additional information as an addendum to the consent calendar in Item 5 of your board book. And specifically the additional information you asked for involves criteria for location of sights and cost per client.

In addition to these item, there is a contract for vendor services for public affairs. The contract with the LA Trust for six community wellness centers, five new baby-friendly hospital contracts, and several research and evaluation and technical assistance contracts contained in initiatives previously approved by the board.

Under the four contract amendments, in addition to the two policy contracts that Stacy just presented and you approved, there is an amendment to our current contract with the Intercommunity Child Guidance Center and an amendment with our researcher, Harder & Company, in order to provide more time to complete data collection for
our healthy births initiative.

And, finally, under the ten contract renewals, we are recommending renewal of eight baby-friendly hospital contracts, an extension of the memorandum of understanding with First 5 Orange County that allows us to use -- provide vista volunteers for Best Start and a research evaluation contract covering data compilation.

So that concludes my remarks, and we appreciate your consideration of these items.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Indeed. Questions or comments for our chief operating officer on Item Number 5?

COMMISSIONER AU: May I?

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: You may indeed if you wish to be heard, Commissioner Au.

COMMISSIONER AU: I know that I was the one that posed the question about how all of this fit into our Best Start and our Building Stronger Families. The other question I had raised I think -- I'm not sure. My memory is a slowly leaving me sometimes, but -- is having to do with building upon established infrastructure and not redoing what we already have in place. And I especially -- not only in terms of -- I understand the One Step Ahead program because we had done some previous piloting with them. So it is building upon what they have achieved and
it's expanding and enhancing.

With the children's institute, with the peer support, those two components, that's the one that baffles me in some ways because it's -- it's again -- unless there is further explanation as to how that would integrate with our previous strategic partnership with the United Way and the Neighborhood Action Council, relationship-based organizing work, is there some conversation or embedded in the contract some way to -- to integrate the two because, again, I'm thinking in terms of long term. What is the sustainability of these initiatives and what is the plan beyond First 5 LA funding?

MR. WAGNER: Yeah. So I'll have to ask someone from programs to come up and provide a little bit more information.

MS. NUNO: On One Step Ahead. I think it's Renee.

MR. WAGNER: You're asking about the Peer --

COMMISSIONER AU: No, Peer Support.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Is there someone here you wish to call on to address the Commission questions?

MR. WAGNER: As program staff comes forward, what is before you are two pieces: One for technical assistance and one for the actual sights. And one of the
things that staff has looked at is, as we begin to, you know, in the out years, add additional sights and look, do it through the lens of where Best Start communities are and also the degree to which communities are identifying similarly high priority areas.

And so I'll ask program to address specifically your question about the kind of infrastructure that you're asking about and how it aligns to best Start.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you.

Ma'am.

PROGRAM REPRESENTATIVE: Yes. With the Peer Support Groups For Parents project, the program would be implemented through a lead agency which is Children's Institute, but the work would be occurring through the five CBOs that are on the ground. And those CB -- of the five CBOs, all of them serve at least one Best Start community. And so that interaction between Best Start and this program, you know, we'll be coordinating with the team to insure that that occurs.

COMMISSIONER AU: I'm talking about building upon already established connections in terms of the relationship-based organizing work. And I do know that the current Best Start communities have -- through the senior program officers, have already worked on a
establishing many of those relationships. So -- I -- I guess what I'm after is not another new entity coming into play and starting from the ground up again to -- to rebuild what is already in place. Do you see where I'm going with this? Because we all know that a startup of a new initiative, the ramp-up or the beginning of a new initiative always takes tremendous amount of resources and a delay in the actual work.

So, again, what I'm after is what is the plan or what is the intent of in terms of building upon what is already there.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.

MS. BELSHE: If I can offer a couple thoughts and observations. As we discussed with the commission in earlier meetings, there were a number of county-wide initiatives that reflect board-approved policy and allocations that were in the pipeline over the course of the past, in this case, couple of years. And so in an effort to look at that work that was already in process through competitive solicitation processes, we wanted to make sure that the work that we were bringing back to the Board consent with earlier policy direction was, number one, look at the extent to which it's aligned with the core family and community level results that are at the heart of the Building Stronger Families framework; and
then, number two, where there's an opportunity to geographically align that work.

What we found with the Peer Support Group for Parents initiative was a very strong alignment in terms of the goals and objectives and the activities contemplated through previous Board direction to staff with the core results of the Building Stronger Families framework. Our intent and expectation is to work very closely with the contractor who we are recommending Board support to emerge through this competitive process to work very closely with that contractor and with the Best Start community partnerships and other infrastructure and services in the community that, taken together, offer the most potential and power to advance those core results.

So we want to build upon infrastructure. We want to tap upon what exists. The community partnerships represent an opportunity to bring more cohesion and coordination informed by the results of those communities identified as important. We are trying to take what was in the pipeline, Commissioner Au, and focus it and target it in a way that helps enhance and strengthen the new work and the new direction that the Board has identified.

Does that -- yeah. I mean, this is a 2010 county-wide initiative supported by the commission that staff, I think, had -- very diligently had been
endeavoring to advance and do so consistent with our
public transparent competitive processes. What emerged is
a recommendation to support the children's institute. And
as a result of the work we've undertaken in recent months,
we want to make sure that that work is maximally aligned
with the core results. We would -- with the Board's
support, we would be entering into a six-month needs
assessment and planning phase of that contract and that
could provide an opportunity to bring additional focus if
that's what you're looking for in terms of how that
activity will be best integrated with the neighborhood
action councils and other similar activity, some of which
this Board has already supported, other already exists in
the community.

PROGRAM REPRESENTATIVE: And to also add to what
Kim said, a large part of this contract has also to do
targeted outreach in hospitals and community health
centers. And through that initial six-month planning
phase, we'll be building on, you know, inventorying our
Welcome Baby hospitals and baby-friendly hospitals to look
at ways in which we can make those connections and
continue, you know, the referral agreements, et cetera.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.

PROGRAM REPRESENTATIVE: If I can add --

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: You may.
PROGRAM REPRESENTATIVE: -- one other thing, which is to answer --

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Ma'am, you're going to have to take full advantage of that microphone so that -- so that Commissioner Au could hear you. Yes.

PROGRAM REPRESENTATIVE: So if I could just add to what Kim had mentioned and also Rena, your question comes at a very timely process because actually we have been working with the Best Start communities. We've had several meetings around this particular project in terms of how this county-wide program could align with the Best Start's place-based activities.

And yesterday's was -- yes, we had a meeting with the Best Start team. And one of the recent conversations that we had is about this notion of looking at the inventory, what really exists currently so we really start this work in a complimentary way. So the -- the jobs that we know that have been working in the Best Start community is certainly one of the groups that we're going to be looking and working with during this initial phase of looking at what the communities would need in terms of topical areas related to parent education and support. so The intent is really to come together to work and initiate this project based on what exists.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.
COMMISSIONER AU: I just feel that there needs to be further conversation. I'm not convinced that there's clarity here. And when you mention Welcome Baby, it's on the agenda today as well for us to focus. And I almost feel that the -- the folk that are providing the initial pilot with Welcome Baby are already in the know as to how to establish peer support among the mothers and having babies.

So, again, I guess I'm still not clear. So I respectfully ask if these two items could be tabled until I -- I can get further information and clarity? I don't know whether the other commissioners agree with me, but I'm still confused.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you very much for your questions and comments.

Other commissioners on the matter at hand, a request has been made by Commissioner Au to table the matter until further clarification can be afforded.

Do I see Commissioner Kaufman wishing to be acknowledged?

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: I guess we've been talking about these for a long, long time, and I think it will always be a work in progress. And I understand, Nancy, your concern about making sure that it doesn't duplicate,
that it integrates, that it does that. I -- I think the
staff will make sure that happens. We can always have
them come back and report to us how it's being done, how
they're evaluating it, what ways can we improve it.

I just worry that to continue to not -- staff
needs permission to do things. And talking in the
abstract without the permission to do things which a vote,
if it were delayed, would sort of still keep them at this
never-never land. So I would prefer that we, you know,
impose, if that's the right word, on staff a time frame of
getting detailed information on what it would look like,
how integration would occur, being able to work with the
two different contractors to help to define that.

And I think if you -- if you or any other
commissioners want to get more detail on that, that would
be fine, but I would prefer to vote on it and then try to
work out the details afterwards.

COMMISSIONER AU: Then it's almost like lets the
-- closing the gate after the folks have left.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: No because --

COMMISSIONER AU: The thing is, I truly feel that
the staff needs to be able to articulate to me what the
plans are in terms of the integration and to move towards
not duplicating the efforts and to build upon established
infrastructure that we have invested in over ten years
COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Let me intervene at this point now, Commissioner. I think that's a fairly straightforward request. And do you feel as if you sufficiently understand the request and if in fact there's already been an answer supplied that we can point Commissioner Au to that she may have overlooked or may not have been presented in a way that was completely discernible, comprehensible, whatever the case may be? I'm trying to close the gap here and now. This is an outstanding question. Do we have the answers now?

MS. BELSHE: I think if the Commissioner is questioning the investment and whether or not to move forward with this additional First 5 LA investment in this -- this initiative, I'm not sure if that's what I'm -- I'm hearing.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: That's not what I'm hearing.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: We ought --

COMMISSIONER AU: We did authorize that.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: That's not what I'm hearing.

MS. BELSHE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: I'm just asking -- what I am hearing is a specific question that would speak
to how in a very specified way there is building on
preexisting infrastructure or investment. Is that a fair
representation of what you're after?

COMMISSIONER AU: Yes.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: So can we answer
that now or can we answer that in a definitive way or
would that take more time or more work? Is there
something that's being overlooked in the presentation --
the written presentation before us? What say ye?

MS. BELSHE: So what we endeavor to do in the
presentation is provide in the written material, again,
summarizing the solicitation process that First 5 LA went
through that resulted in the recommendation for the
Children's Institute a program that is -- that we try to
then articulate more in how does it align the Building
Stronger Families framework. And this is a very important
and well-aligned program in terms of building the
knowledge, the confidence, the efficacy, and parenting
skills. In my mind, this is the kind of activity, whether
it be through Children's Institute, though Knacks, through
others that really speaks to the core of what we're trying
to do with the Building Stronger Families framework, which
is strengthening the knowledge, the resiliency, the
nurturing of parents relative to their children. So I
think there's very, very close alignment and I think staff
has done a nice job making that point relative to the core results.

In terms of alignment with Best Start, there clearly is more work to do there at a community-by-community level to make sure that these parenting support programs and other like programs are aligned and coordinated to the maximum ability possible in the context of our Best Start communities that are also going to be focusing on how do we strengthen parents, how do we build knowledge, resiliency, parenting skills. So I think there's a very strong alignment of effort.

There's obviously a lot of work to do in terms of rolling up our sleeves with Children's Institute, with the Knacks, with the community partnerships to maximize that alignment and integration. But that is certainly the intent in terms of how we would implement and in terms of content. I think there's very, very strong alignment in terms of the contract we're recommending approval related to knowledge, resiliency, and skills of parenting.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: I don't know that in the question I'm hearing an absence of alignment. The question is more basic than that because I think conceptual clarity here has been afforded us all. I don't know that I hear any challenge of that point.

The question was really rather specific: How is
that which is before us building on whatever predicate or
what ever preexisting infrastructure there is so that we
are building on that which we've done. In other words, is
there a sense of continuity and how is that continuity
evidenced beyond that which is conceptual. In other words
-- and I'm trying my best to understand and further
explain the question that I'm not the authorize of, which
is always pretty dangerous.

COMMISSIONER AU: You're doing a marvelous job.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you so much.

I'll continue to embarrass myself. So it really is --

MS. BELSHE: -- operationalizing.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Precisely. Not the
conceptual, the operational.

MS. BELSHE: I understand. And it's that
six-month needs assessment and planning phase which would
be the focus of our work over the next six-month period
with the Board direction support, and that's work we're
eager to get going on.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. So the
answer.

MS. BELSHE: -- direction is consistent with the
feedback on integration, coordination, building upon
infrastructure. That's what we would be reporting back on
as a product of the planning.
COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. So let me continue to display these remarkable interpretive skills that I'm being employed to -- Commissioner Au, the staff is saying that they're not ready to answer that because, if they can have six months, they'll be able to do so. All right?

I mean, that's, essentially, what I just heard.

MS. BELSHE: That's what I said.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All that heard the same thing, just raise your hand, will ya? Thank you so much.

MS. NUNO: So my next supervisor and Commissioner, Commissioner Au, I believe that the staff understands, as has been explained by our executive director and the supervisor. I think it's clear that what you're asking us -- and I agree that it's in a six-month period that we have an opportunity to be very clear in the way that we are articulating specifically how we're going to build upon existing infrastructure to make those connections happen. And I think we can bring that back up to you to inform you on how we're making progress to assert that.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: So the realignment, Commissioner Au, that has been undertaken by the staff with the Board's involvement would afford the staff a more
confident opportunity to answer your question with greater clarity. Now, it is to be appreciated that the staff then must understand that the continuity of the work and the investment that has previously taken place needs to be built upon to the extent that it can show promise consistent with the conceptual clarity that we engaged in at the retreat and that we continue to do on a go-forward basis.

I think that's pretty much the best that we can do at this point in time, but I think your questions kind of push this to a further degree of clarity for other Board members, certainly myself. And I trust that the staff then has a fuller appreciation for what might be specifically needed in terms of how it comes back to explain what is then being done to move with a sense of continuity in the context of right sizing and clarifying the issues particularly in terms of the efficacy of the programs that are under consideration.

Do not assume that this is as apparent to others as it might be to those who are the drafters and are the presenters. I think that's some of what's coming forward.

Good enough?

MS. BELSHE: Yes. So just to assure you, the first six months of the needs assessment is not only to understand the needs of the communities in terms of
topical areas --

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Yes.

MS. BELSHE: -- related to parent education and support, but also do an inventory of what resources exist such as the knacks so if we can build off of that as we initiate the project.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you very much. Any further question or comments?

The matter is before us. Is there a motion to move forward to Item Number 5.

It's been moved by Commissioner Kaufman and seconded by Commissioner Figueroa-Villa. Are there any objections to advancing the effort?

Are there any abstentions?

COMMISSIONER AU: Abstaining.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Please note one abstention and the balance of the Board is affirmative in its position of the matter before us.

All right. We thank you for your presentation. We thank you for the discussion. Commissioner Au, we thank you for your pushing forward for clarity.

Our next item is Item Number 6; is it not?

MS. BELSHE: It is.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Okay. I've done well up to this point in interpreting others. Let's see
how well I can interpret myself.

There are a couple of things that I think are worthy of our consideration. They are as follows: It was this week that some of us stood before -- or in front of Twin Towers in solidarity with other elected officials, activists, and child care providers to essentially send a message to the governor and the legislature that, from our point of view, the mantra, the cradle, the focus ought to be zero to five and not 25 to life. I said, zero to five, not 25 to life. If we were in a different context, that is, if anybody in here would say "amen." But since we are not, we will proceed with my self-interpretation.

So it's pretty straightforward that preschools not prisons is where many of us think public policy ought to be aimed. And that was and remains a significant push, Smart use of resources. We know that incarceration scenarios are important, not only important, but necessary. But to the extent that they dominate and take us in a particular direction, there is a sense in which an argument can be made about self-fulfilling prophecy. Therefore, this prison -- from cradle to prison pipeline is clearly not anything that ought to be ignored. And I think the legislature certainly, the leaders there, called out the Senate pro Tem, Darrell Steinberg, heard that the governor heard those voices essentially calling for a
different way and then to ultimately take the position that the federal courts who are driving the release of prisoners because of overcrowding and the range of other civil rights issues needed to be effectively rethink that. And so we're going to see how far we get.

So a compromise was struck. And indeed it's the view of some of us it should have been. It will facilitate more space for the advocacy of concerns of those of us who embrace an agenda First 5 has, those of us who have that agenda. That's an important place to take our position and advance it.

A little data is worth our being mindful of. Some 1,600 youth are in LA county juvenile camps at any given day in LA county. There are probably 19,000 adults in county jails at any given time, 133,000 adults in state prison, and there is a propensity toward incarceration that I just wish we had commensurate drive with respect for programs that speak to reducing recidivism. I think we can do better in that area. And we as a community, as a state, and even as a nation would be better for it.

There's a lot to do on today's agenda. I want to call your attention to a motion to increase the number of housing subsidies for families and children at a relatively modest level. We'll get to that a little later, but don't lose sight of the fact that many of these
issues are related. Quality of life is fundamental.

And then, finally, earlier there was an article in the LA Times for a black infant. The title is "A Precarious Start in Life." I'm going to ask that we distribute this article for the benefit of the board. I'm please that First 5 is doing its part and perhaps could do more with the programs aimed at black babies initiative. This is important stuff to put it mildly. The point to be made is that black women disproportionately have preterm births and higher rates of infant mortality. I can tell you without fear of contradiction what that means. It means that the quality of life for those youngsters will not be what it should be. And it is our job to educate ourselves and make sure that we do a better job for all of our children. And this particular population is one that deserves attention.

So we need to do the reach in this area and programs to reduce the risk factors and I thank God that there is a First 5 LA who's in the business of doing precisely that.

That will conclude the sermon for the day and then we'll proceed to the next item before us, which is to hear from other members of the Board in terms of any brief remarks they might have from the committee work that they've done. And I know that Commissioner Kaufman has a
few comments.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Thank you, sir. Just a very quick one. We had a closed session of the executive committee. No action was taken. It was to discuss the process for evaluation of the executive director. Just so commissioners will know, the process we're going to use is that, prior to the October meeting, we'll have a closed session of the full commission in which we'll have our consultant give us feedback from each of the commissioners on the performance executive direction. That will then transmit that information to Kim sometime after that meeting. And then in November we'll have another closed session in which she'll present to us her personnel goals and objectives and other issues around contract and the like. And so just wanted you to know that that's what the schedule is. October, November we'll have closed session before each of those.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All Right. Thank you very much, Commissioner Kaufman. We look forward to the followup on that report. The committee is doing well and moving that agenda forward.

Any other commissioners? Commissioner Fielding calls to my attention by way of reminder his current state of fear and trembling, that is trepidation at the presence of a newly-appointed commissioner to the Los Angeles
Police Commission, and it would be none other than Sandra Figueroa-Villa.

If you take note the difficulty I have in pronouncing her name, it is only because I'm intimidated by the po-po. You understand that. Commissioner, do you have something to say?

COMMISSIONER FIGUEROA-VILLA: Thank you, Commissioners and thank you our -- my public. You know, my passion, my heart has been -- is with this commission because this directionally affects the children so they don't end up incarcerated, in juvenile hall, in jail. And so now I get to represent our community on the police commission to make sure that they're not just -- that they're -- they're -- and it's probably really big charge in working with the Chief and making sure that they are respecting our community and that they are implementing their policies the way they should and that they treat us with respect and dignity as we so deserve, and that we do the same to the LAPD. So it has to work both ways.

I'm learning a lot. I'm coming in from the other side, and -- but I'm really looking forward. It's a great commission. We have good leadership. And our chief has done a great job in coming into our communities and really trying to work -- well, actually, working in my community.

So thank you for that.
COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER FIGUEROA-VILLA: And he's been referring to me at all our committee meetings as Commissioner Po-po.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Yeah. She flashed her badge on me, too, so you know what that means.

Madam, executive director.

MS. BELSHE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm going to reserve my comments for introducing the Best Start item. But before I do that, I do want to draw commissioners' attention to material that the commission's counsel, Craig Steel and his firm presented or developed and left relative to conflict of interest.

Craig, you want to just give us a little bit of context, please?

MR. STEELE: Thank you, Kim. In the FYI folder, I have put a brief sort of primer on conflict of interest issues, just the three types of laws that commissioners need to be aware of and the factors that apply in those laws. It's staff's intent over the next couple of months to try to hold a training session for you all, just to give you -- the new commissioners an introduction to this item and a refresher for those who have been with us for a while. Hopefully, this kind of cheat sheet will give you
some information to think about in the meantime. Thanks.

MS. BELSHE: Thank you, Craig. I apologize.

And did you mention, in addition to the written material, the idea of providing opportunities for --

MR. STEELE: I did.

MS. BELSHE: I apologize. My bad. I would blame it on the Chair, but that would be inappropriate. Oh, it's the chair.

Okay. As our Best Start colleagues stand up, I want to open with a couple of comments because the last time -- actually, the last time we met was in early July. And I want to acknowledge the staff's gratitude that there was not August meeting. It gave us an opportunity to take a little bit of a deep breath, maybe a shallow breath, apropos of my comment to the Board in July about the words of pace and recalibration. We had a very, very busy summer, and it has been a very, very exciting time for Best Start and our work in the 14 communities. We're going to hear this afternoon about where we are to move forward in a very robust way with implementation of Welcome Baby and Select Home Visitation, which we're very excited about. And it's also an exciting time as we transition our community-based work to the new results-focused Building Stronger Families framework, which has been the focus of a very intensive summer for
our staff.

So today's presentation is going to provide the Board and other members of the larger First 5 LA community with an overview of the various strands of implementation activity that have been underway in recent weeks. This is work that is really foundational to the development of a more fully-developed implementation plan and funding approach that we would be presenting to the Board most robustly and completely in November.

I want to underscore a lot of very significant progress has been made in our work since the Board retreat both within First 5 LA as well as in partnership with our community partners. We recognize that transitioning Best Start from where it has been over the course of the past couple years to where we aspire it to be, which is consistent with the results-based framework endorsed by the Board in late June. That transition, while good progress is being made, isn't going to happen overnight. And as a part of our transitional efforts, we know it's important that we work very collaboratively and respectfully and productively with our community partners throughout this transition to the new Building Stronger Families framework and more results-focused partnerships.

So I want to underscore, as you'll hearing from Marsha and some of our Best Start team colleagues, a lot
of work has been done, a lot more work remains to be done. But one of the things I think you will hear, I really want to underscore as you listen to the staff presentation, is that a number of very important changes about Best Start have already occurred consistent with the direction that we received from the Board in late June. You will hear, again, about the very clear focus on specific family and community level result for First 5 LA, as well as for the community partnerships. You'll hear about a structured method for how we would intend to identify and track partnership capacities. You'll hear about an intentional connection between partnership capacities and actions and the results we seek at the family and the community level. And finally, you'll hear more about a funding approach that's intended to promote this focus on achieving family and community results.

Finally, while we're not going to discuss it this afternoon, I do want to underscore with the Board that we recognize that our ability as an organization to contribute to meaningful and measurable change, not just in our Best Start communities but really countywide, is not going to be the product just of the work that is done in a community-based context. Our ability to really contribute to more meaningful and sustainable change is going to require much closer alignment between the work in
our Best Start communities and our countywide investments building on Commissioner Au's comments and I know the whole Board's recognition.

So that's some additional and very important analysis we are doing now in terms of how to incorporate these core results and future grant making a lot more intentionally and explicitly, again, anchored in the results we seek for families and strong communities countywide.

So let me turn to Marsha who is going to lead off and we're going to hear from a number of our Best Start colleagues throughout this presentation.

MS. ELLIS: Thank you, Kim. Good afternoon, Commissioners, community members, and staff.

Before I begin the presentation, I'd like to introduce my co-presenters. They are Leanne Nagrone and Manuel Feirro, and they're senior program officers in our Best Start Communities department. And they will be joining me in providing today's update on the Building Stronger Families framework.

Today's objectives for the presentation are to recap some important decisions made at the June 26 special commission meeting where staff outlined a framework for Best Start in response to the Board questions related to results, measures of progress, and strategies. Today we
will be providing an update on where we are with
implementing the framework, including our current work,
how we are accessing partnership capacities, the
learning-by-doing approach, and a recommended funding
approach. We will also highlight some key milestones for
the partnerships, particularly over the next few months,
and we will review a draft implementation timeline through
June 20, 2015.

As you are aware, the current strategic plan
represents a major paradigm shift in First 5 LA’s
transition from an initiative-based grant maker to one
that focuses on long-term sustainable change in specific
high-need communities for a place-based approach.

Best Start focuses on strengthening families and
the social and physical environments where they live,
work, and play. Best Start is not a program or set of
services that focus on specific problems that individual
families face.

As a reminder, at the June 26, Board retreat, the
Board made several decisions including endorsement of the
Building Stronger Families framework, which includes six
core results: Three at the family level and three at the
community level. At the family level, the core results
include family capacities, which are that parents are
resilient, they have knowledge about child development,
and includes as well the social, emotional confidence of children, and social connections and concrete supports in times of need. At the community level, the core results are coordinated services and supports, a common vision and collective will, and social networks and safe spaces.

The Board also approved a criteria for selecting activities that would be supported. And the criteria includes that the activities be in alignment with the framework's core results, that they are evidence-based and reflective of promising practices, that the outcomes can be achieved and measured within five to 10 years, and that they offer the potential to connect with existing resources and be sustainable.

And, lastly, the Board approved an accountability framework which outlines what we'll be using to measure progress.

Before I review some of the work that's under way, it is important to highlight what's different between the first two years of Best Start implementation and now working under the new framework. The framework positions the commission to work with communities so that, as partners, we're more effective in achieving the results that we seek for families and children. As mentioned earlier, the framework is not about direct services, but it focuses on achieving results through building human
capital and systems change. Using the framework we now have a structured and consistent method to identify and track results-focused partnership capacities, as well as an intentional linkage between those capacities and actions to achieve results.

The funding approach that you will hear about from Leann will review how focusing on — I'm sorry. The funding approach that Leann will review also focuses on achieving results and we're building into the implementation of the framework a continuous learning system that will be utilized by First 5 LA and partnership.

As Kim mentioned, over the past few months, staff and community partners have mobilized an aggressive timeline to both understand and implement the framework. Shortly after the Board's endorsement of the framework, an interdepartmental team of staff and key consultants was assembled in the seven areas that are listed on the slide. Staff will work directly with the Best Start community partnership, have also participated in a number of learning institutes to date in order to further their knowledge about place-based work, components of the framework, including the protective factors, and to build their skills in taking a leadership role in helping the communities to transition to using the framework. We are
applying the framework to First 5 LAs countywide efforts as well.

Included in your packet as attachment C or page 246 is an analysis of four countywide projects, and they include One Step Ahead, The Peer Support Groups, The Healthy Food Access Initiative, and the P to Five Sector Workforce Development Project. Staff is also beginning a parallel exploration of aligning future grant-making with the framework.

In addition, we are establishing learning opportunities so that the partnership members across the communities can develop relationships with each other and learn from each other, and so that First 5 LA can learn from the partnership as well as connect with other local place-based efforts that are underway throughout the county.

To date, all partnerships have been provided a general overview about the framework via orientation sessions and will participate in working sessions during the month of September in order to take a deeper dive into what the framework means in terms of how Best Start will be implemented in the communities moving forward.

Leann will now walk you through how we are is assessing partnership capacities.

LEAN: Thank you. As Marsha noted, we are
working differently to achieve better outcomes for children and families. As we know, our overarching goals are broad and aspirational. Partnerships will now focus their work in the family and community-level core results Marsha just referenced earlier, which is the pathway to achieving our overarching goals.

The focus of my presentation today is on the initial findings regarding partnerships' current capacities to become results-focused partnerships. I'll first provide some background information on the importance of partnerships in relationship to comprehensive place-based initiatives and the process for gathering information about partnership capacities.

Partnerships are an important aspect of community's capacity. They lead community change processes and influence and mobilize people and resources to achieve results. And this is why partnerships are an important part of our broader community capacity strategy. Partnerships' effectiveness to achieve results depends on their capacities. Best practices and research tells us that results-focused partnerships must possess six essential capacities in order to become strong and effective in mobilizing people and resources to improve a set of results. These six capacities and their measures are captured here. And there's also a handout in your
folder.

And as you may recall, these capacities were provided at the Commission retreat in June. We're not intending to go through this in detail in this presentation, but we wanted to provide it as a reference for our general awareness of the capacities I'm about to reference.

We know it takes time to fully develop these capacities. It's important to understand the current levels of capacity for each of the 14 partnerships.

To identify the partnerships' current capacities, we are implementing a learning and development process that includes working collaboratively with partnerships. Through this process, we will Garner information -- baseline information about partnerships capacities and what needed -- what's needed to support their ongoing development in functioning as effective partnerships to lead a community change agenda to achieve desired results.

To support this process, we developed, in collaboration with the Center for the Study of Social Policy, a results-focused partnership and learning development tool. This is based on more than ten years of experience in implementing place-based partnerships, extensive research, and it's informed by local and national experts, and it's been piloted in LA area.
The process is intended to support learning and development and not be punitive or evaluative.

The initial capacity review focused on the first of the three capacities because these are considered foundational for the other capacities to build upon. The findings I'm about to present are cumulative across the 14 partnerships. Overall, partnerships possess the foundational capacities to develop into results-focused partnerships. For the first capacity, keepers of a vision, the findings show that partnerships are committed to First 5 LA's vision. Despite the pause we needed to take to gain more clarity about the results we seek, the progress measures, and integrated strategies to achieve, results, partnerships maintained a commitment to better outcomes for young children. This is a foundational capacity and a valuable asset for partnerships because having a common vision is critical in helping multiple and diverse stakeholders be in alignment to reach results.

For the next measure using the Building Stronger Families framework, the review show that partnership's knowledge regarding the framework is not deep enough to anchor their work yet. This is to be expected as the capacity review was conducted at a point in time when partnerships were just being introduced to the framework through initial orientations. The capacity review also
indicated that those partnerships that showed stronger understanding of the framework had already received the orientation. So this is a good indication that there's positive moment to support the framework.

For the next capacity, effective collaboration, the findings show that for the measure of parent and resident leadership that the majority of partnerships understand the importance of having parent resident leadership in partnerships. And this is evidenced by the extensive leadership roles parents and residents have in partnership discussions and decision making. This is a critical aspect to possess because partnerships must have and reflect the firsthand knowledge and experience of families to appropriately and adequately address community conditions.

For the next measure, meaningful collaboration, almost all of the partnerships understand the importance of meaningful collaboration, and this is demonstrated through partnerships' active role in reaching out to traditional and nontraditional partnerships to collaborate on promoting the importance of having strong families and children who are healthy, safe, and prepared for school.

This foundational capacity positions partnerships to take a lead in mobilizing multiple and diverse people and organizations and leveraging and influencing resources
to pursue a common agenda that achieves family and community results.

For the last capacity assessed, inclusive governance, the findings show that partnerships have varying levels of understanding of the importance of the -- of having a comprehensive and integrated plan. The partnership -- the partnership working sessions, being led by staff will address this. And we believe that once partnerships begin a learning-by-doing approach, which Manuel will speak to in just a moment, they will quickly gain the collection understanding for the need to have a comprehensive and integrated set of activities to achieve desired results.

For the last measure, strong bylaws, partnerships have varying levels of understanding for the need to have stronger bylaws to help partnerships function effectively. With the pause in the full implementation of Best Start noted earlier, partnerships' decision making has not required robust bylaws. However, as partnerships move into a learning-by-doing approach and become more results focused, it will be strong -- in a stronger position to take action and influence resources that will call for a deeper understanding and application of strong bylaws to function effectively.

Through the review, we learned that partnerships
possess the foundational capacities to build upon and are eager to align the work that they're familiar with with the framework and what additional areas of training and technical assistance are needed. And with appropriate capacity support, partnerships are poised to lead a community-change agenda to achieve results.

For next steps, staff and the partnerships will collaboratively work to further identify partnerships' current capacities and these results will inform the partnerships' learning-by-doing activities.

Manuel will now present more information regarding learning-by-doing approach and its connectivity between partnership capacities and action.

MANUEL: Thank you, Leann. So now you heard Leann talk about the partnership capacity and being very intentional about sort of their capacities. I'm going to be focusing on the learning-by-doing approach, which is the way in which we hope we work with the communities to focus them on the results, the three family core results and the three community core result. So this learning-by-doing approach is a philosophy in which the learner directly experiences and reflects upon and is able to understand what they're actually doing and, by virtue of doing that, develop skills.

As Aristotle states, "The things we have to learn
before we doing them we learn by doing them." This
approach is deeply rooted in our strategic plan in terms
of the community capacity building strategy. It also
allows community partnerships to build upon existing
capacities that they already possess, as well as cultivate
additional ones. More importantly, it allows the
community to move into action as it relates to the three
family results and the thee communities results. At this
early stage of implementation, it is important for
communities to select a core result that either resonates
with them or builds upon the work that they've done up to
now.

Given that the three family core results and the
three community core results are so interrelated, movement
into one core result has the potential of impacting the
others and we will be able to see that and track that from
the very beginning.

This next slide summarizes the approach that
we're talking about. And I'm going to be presenting an
eexample to kind of highlight it. So let's assume that a
community has selected social connections because it's
grounded in evidence and they know that the lack of
connectivity or isolation is associated with child neglect
and higher levels of anxiety, anger, and depression.

So the next thing they would do is actually, in
an effort for them to be successful, is allow them to select a target population. This will be informed by both data which includes empirical evidence as well as the community's wisdom in terms of what's happening with social connections.

So let's assume that the community then figures out that they want to focus on parents of infants -- parents of infants and toddlers who are recent immigrants to the U.S. and to the current neighborhood. And by virtue of going through the information, they also realize that this population is very vulnerable because many times these folks do not have extended family, they do not know the language, they do not even know that resources exist that can potentially help them. It is at this point that they're ready to really develop objectives in terms of how they want to -- what is it that they want to accomplish.

So let's assume that they come up with three objectives. The first one would be that they want to insure that families are connected to social networks and that they determine that the faith-based community seems to be a place where these folks kind of go. The second one would be to insure that these young families are connected to resources that are existing within the community. It is at that point that they start articulating and finding out, so what activities can we
actually do and start developing a list of those.

This is where First 5 LA staff as well as other organizations can help identify those things that are evidence-based and promising practices. And this is one -- I do want to note that this is a criteria that was adopted at the Board retreat for selecting activities to be supported. And so that's -- that's when they start articulating all those activities they want to do. Perhaps they want to do parent cafes, for example, they want to do fairs, they want to have play and learn groups that kind of come together. And during that phase, they'll also come up with performance measures in terms of how many families do they really want to attract, how do they know that they're really making a difference. So they start articulating all that.

It is at that point that they will also start identifying both the partnership capacities and the community resources that are really needed for them to be successful in executing all of this. It is at that time, too, that they begin to prioritize, given that there may be a lot of things they want to do, but really prioritizing those things that are either low cost or no cost and that have the potential to leverage and built upon existing efforts that are already going on within the community. As they begin implementing, they will also be
able to track and report progress to themselves but also to the Commission. This will allow them to also be able to see if what they intended to do is actually making a difference or if they need to refocus. So through this example was just intended to show you how this will actually occur within the community.

Now I would like to pass it back to Leann who will discuss the funding approach to support the implementation of the framework.

LEANN: In November, we're going to bring back to the Board a more comprehensive plan that includes a funding approach recommendation spanning from January 2014 to the balance of the strategic plan. For results-focused partnerships to be effective and track results continuously, they need a stable infrastructure and resources and supports.

Typically, partnerships are initially sponsored and support financially to address a specific set of results. As partnerships develop strength within a community, they need the capacity to leverage, influence, and redirect resources towards the results they seek.

We wanted to develop a funding structure that promotes the focus on achieving results. So we first developed three principles to consider when determining a funding structure. The first is, does the method promote
a primary focus on results and high quality implementation and performance rather than focusing on a funding level. Second was, the does the method minimize competition among partnerships for First 5 LA resources. And the third principle for consideration is, does the method minimize a premature conclusion regarding the partnerships' capacities.

So based on a review of other funding structures that support partnerships in place-based efforts, we developed three funding approach options. The first is a tiered funding based on current partnership capacity. This consists of funding would be provided to support each partnership at one of three levels, determination of which funding level partnerships would have access to would be dependent on their individual capacities. The second approach is Best Start department total allocation to support all partnerships. And this consists of First 5 LA would manage a single funding level to support partnerships, a specific funding level to support each partnership would not be provided. The third approach is to provide equal funding to support each of the partnerships with phased access to funding based on performance. The same level of funding would be made available to support each partnership, and access to these funds would be dependent on partnerships' measurable
progress and performance toward achieving Building
Stronger Families results.

As next step, staff is in the process of
assessing the funding approach options in comparison to
the principles and will provide a funding structure
recommendation to the Board in November.

Marsha will now provide more information
regarding the resources needed in the near term.

MS. ELLIS: Thank you. As you've heard from
Leann and Manuel, a lost work has occurred since the
Board's -- I forgot I can't see with these on. I'm
nearsighted.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: There you go.
That's also so you can hear better.

MS. ELLIS: A lot as occurred since the Board's
retreat and we have a lot more to do between now and
November where staff will come back with a comprehensive
implementation plan and funding requests to support Best
Start through the balance of the strategic plan. As a
reminder, at the March 14th commission meeting, the Board
approved $150,000 for each of the Best Start community
partnerships. This funding was authorized for six months
and is scheduled to end on September 30th. Staff is
projecting that there will be approximately $326,000 in
unexpended funds at the end of September.
In response to the Board's request at the June 26 meeting, we are presenting for your consideration three options for bridge support through December 2013 -- December 31st, 2013. Under option 1, the Board would not approve use of unexpended dollars, and all financial support to the Best Start partnerships would end September 30th. For option 2, the Board would approve use of unexpended dollars which will allow the partnerships some level of continued support until the commission makes the decision regarding the Best Start allocation. It should be noted that under option 2, staff is projecting that there will not be enough dollars left at the end of September to support the community partnerships through the end of December. For option 3, the Board would prove the partnerships to access any unexpended funds and an additional $510,000 that will be needed to help support the transition activities such as the self-assessments and other work related to implementing the framework. Staff is recommending that the Board approves option 3.

I'd like to reiterate that all activities supported by the requested resources is anchored in the implementation of the new results-focused framework. And with regard to the funding distribution, over a third of the requested funding is previously-approved partnership funding and over half of the new funding requested is for
contractors and consultants to support First 5 LA staff and the partnerships to further development and implement the framework.

Here we've outlined some key milestones and activities through the fall. In August, staff completed framework orientation sessions for the 14 partnerships and commission staff completed the initial partnership capacity review that Leann discussed.

During the month of September, we'll begin the working sessions with the partnership which again focus on taking a deeper dive into the framework, the protective factors, and the self-assessment process.

For October, we will be working with the partnerships to conduct the self-assessments around the six elements of effective partnerships. And, again, you have a handout which outlines those elements in your packet.

And for November I'd like to highlight the staff will be bringing back again a comprehensive implementation plan and timeline as well as ad funding approach, a funding request to provide support to the partnerships through the end of strategic plan. And that's June 30th 2015.

On this next slide, we present a draft timeline which outlines the dates that we anticipate coming back to
the commission to provide updates on our progress with the implementation of the framework and where we project we will need the commission to make key decisions about Best Start. The timeline also reflects activities that will be undertaken in the communities through June 2015. And this is a living document for us. It's being updated as we further develop implementation plan for Best Start or -- and the BSF framework.

So again, regarding the tree options presented for bridge funding, staff is recommending that the Board approve option 3 and we welcome any questions or feedback you have about the information that you've heard, particularly regarding the funding and learning-by-doing approaches. And Leann and Manuel will join me at the podium to address your questions. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much for that thorough presentation, the whole team.

Members of the commission, what is your pleasure with respect to moving this item forward? Are there questions that you wish to pose to the staff on Item Number 8?

MS. BELSHE: Mr. Chair, if I might just point of clarification. And thank you to the staff. I know that was a lot of information and the material and the Board member -- Board packet is quite extensive and substantive.
We had an opportunity -- staff had an initial opportunity to share our work that's in progress with the program and planning committee meeting at its most recent meeting about a week ago. My recommendation -- and Duane and I have had some conversations about using our P and P committee structures an opportunity to do a deeper dive, if you will. I appreciate this is a lot of material and limited time and opportunity to really engage with the Board. So, obviously, we're eager for feedback, comments, questions today, but I'm hopeful that we can dedicate Commissioner Dennis a fair amount of the agenda for P and P this month and encourage Board members broadly to participate in that conversation.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: I just want to reiterate that, you know, again, Marsha and Leann, great job on the presentation and it is an extensive amount of information. And I do encourage all commissioners who want to delve a whole lot deeper to come to P and P. It's just a lot of stuff. It's just a lot of stuff and it's heavy reading.

So -- but it's -- it is -- as I said to Jonathan just a few minutes ago with regards to where we are with Best Start compared to where we were 18 months ago, I believe it's a lot more focused, a lot clearer, and there are clearer outcomes. And I think, you know, we are tying budget to performance, and I think that is a very positive
thing and I think it resonates well within the communities that are served through Best Start.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much, Commissioner Dennis. It may be the case that Commissioner Dennis expresses the sentiment of the Board in terms of the summary remarks he offered being affirmative of the staff's report and then gives the opportunity for further examination in the context of the program and policy committee that meets on a regular basis. So we hope that it is appreciated that this is not an exhaustive discussion today although it might give the appearance of such. It is not. No editorial remark to be interpreted there. It is simply our desire at this point to dispose of the matter before us.

Is there such a motion?

Commissioner Kaufman. Commissioner Au.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: To clarify, I was looking at the timeline, and I think what it says, is that for the November meeting would you bring planning and funding allocations that would cover for the year after that. Is that the way to think of that? Just trying to figure out extending -- I'm fully in favor of extending it, but I presume what that means is that, come November you'd come back and show us more detail of how we fund it in the future.
MS. ELLIS: Yes, that's correct.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.

Commissioner Au. Follow the example set by commissioner Kaufman. Thank you. Proceed.

COMMISSIONER AU: I will attempt to do that.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you so much.

That's all I can ask.

COMMISSIONER AU: First of all, I just want to commend the staff. I mean, truly repeating Commissioner Dennis' comment about having this level of clarity just given the work that has transpired, this is truly refreshing and encouraging. So I thank you all for your hard work.

The second piece is that I -- I guess we -- there's so much that was embedded in this. It's really pretty thick stuff. So I -- I look forward to the program planning committee meeting to really get -- delve into more of the details of this because I'm truly committed and invested in Best Start and the work that we're -- we're hoping to achieve through this -- through this initiative.

The other is something really nitty-gritty. You are -- Marsha, you stated that there is going to be certain consequences if the commission did not approve the funding that is being requested. Option one, of course,
essentially shuts down operation. What do you mean by
shutting down? I -- does it mean that the Best Start work
in place-based essentially stops, staff is then released?
I need to know.

MS. ELLIS: Well, it's more so related to the
current support that we're providing to convene the
partnerships. So when the commission approved the March
14th allocation, that included partnership support around
child care facilities, facilitation, interpretation. We
do a lot of interpretation and translation at the
meetings. It also included things like C-bar, which some
partnerships are currently implementing, and our
communications work, particularly moving forward that
would be related to the implementation of the framework.
So those activities would stop.

COMMISSIONER AU: I see. So option 2, which
allows you to expend the unexpended dollars remaining in
the budget, would that maintain those activities?

MS. ELLIS: Well, our staff has projected that
with options two, we would not have enough dollars to go
through the end of December.

COMMISSIONER AU: Okay.

MS. ELLIS: So that's why we would in option 3 be
asking for additional funding.

MS. BELSHE: So those additional funds are
requested to insure sufficient support of the partnership activities along the lines that Marsha just spoke to, again, with a specific focus of further orientations and work around the new results-focused framework, as well as Marsha noted to secure the support that we need, frankly, as a staff in terms of insuring we have sufficient capacity to work constructively and effectively with the partnerships in terms of moving the framework forward.

So that's why option 3 is really critical to enabling us to take the next steps over the next -- course of the next three months.

COMMISSIONER AU: So without the approval of option 3, the -- going back to the time -- timeline, the self-assessment process that's been scheduled tentatively for October, that would no longer be -- you would -- we would no longer be able to do that?

MS. ELLIS: Yes. Yes.

COMMISSIONER AU: All right. Thank you.

MS. ELLIS: You're welcome. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Commissioner Fielding, please.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Excellent presentation. I think for the first time I think I understand what we're trying to do.

MS. NUNO: That's a big compliment.
COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Maybe I'm slow, but --

COMMISSIONER AU: Five years.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: We had five years. But I think we have clarity in terms where we're trying to go.

So is my understanding correct that, with this additional funding, you're planning to allocate equal amounts to each of the Best Start communities but that providing that -- releasing that will depend upon the level of progress they make because, as you said in your presentation, they're not all at the same point, particularly as we have passed the first foundational capacity.

LEAN: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Would I certainly move approval on that -- on that basis of option 3.

MS. BELSHE: Excuse me. Can I clarify an important distinction here, because Commissioner Fielding's raising -- what I'm hearing you raise is a question that was -- or an issue that was presented in the context of funding approach options for the January 2014 through the balance of the current strategic plan. So that is anchored in the new framework, the learning-by-doing approach, and really accessing resources based upon progress.

So what you just described is the funding
approach for January 2014 through the balance of the fiscal year. We want to come back -- balance of the strategic plan. Excuse me. We want to come back to the P and P and --

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: So every one of the Best Start communities would get the same amount from --

MS. BELSHE: During this bridge period, which is really about rolling up our sleeves with the partnerships, doing those very detailed working sessions, grounded in the framework, grounding in community capacity, self-assessments, working with us, all of that core implementation work that's foundational.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Just seem that some need more foundational help than others. Every sleeve is not the same length to roll up.

MS. BELSHE: Jonathan, you're absolutely right. And that's where the self-assessment and our assessment of capacities will help inform kind of where each of the partnerships is, and that will inform the funding approach going forward.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: So are you saying -- I'm still confused. Is it going to be equal funding for each of the Best Start communities during --

MS. BELSHE: During this bridge period, yes, because it's very similar work with each of the
partnerships in terms of self-assessments, in terms of the
learning by doing, in terms of this early implementation
work.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Got it. Thank you.

MS. BELSHE: That's three months.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: It's a three-month
period.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: That's fine with me.

MS. BELSHE: That's why we're calling it a
bridge.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Commissioner Dennis,
please.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: First, I would second
Jonathan's motion.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: And then the question -- I
mean, many communities engaged in the C-bar, and do we
have any preliminary findings within those communities
would who are engaged in C-bar as to what's going on as a
result of this the self-assessment?

Good afternoon, commissioners. As of today --

MS. BELSHE: Introduce yourself.

RUBEN: Oh, yea. I'm Ruben (inaudible). I'm the
senior parole officer in the Best Start Communities
Department, along with my colleagues here.
As of today, only -- I just want to remind that we gave the option for the -- for the partnerships to select C-bar. As of today, only three of the partnerships have been fully engaged in C-bar activities as of today. They're currently in the stage of -- many of them -- there was three phases of C-bar. One was to start with sort of an identification of the research question and then it would move to implementation. Right now, they're currently identified -- of the three, they're identifying the research question. So they -- and one of the -- one of -- we're trying to also -- as Tim mentioned, we're also trying to relook at how C-bar could also be sort of fused in with the new -- with the new framework. But we only have three of the partnerships.

MS. BELSHE: But we'll learn more, if I may -- and thank you, Ruben.

We'll learn more about where the partnerships are relative to their ability to use data to gather information both quantitative, qualitative, wisdom of community, et cetera, to inform decision making. So that's one of those six core competencies of a results-focused partnership that we'll be learning more about through our assessment and through the self-assessments of the partnerships.

THE COURT: All right. Any other questions or
Commissioner Au, we're about to dispose of the matter.

COMMISSIONER AU: Well, just for clarification again, I just got confused with the motion.

My understanding is that the motion on the table based on the memo presented is that they're asking the commission to approve the additional funding up to -- by $510,000.

MS. BELSHE: Right.

COMMISSIONER AU: That will bridge Best Start place-based work from September through the end of December.

MS. BELSHE: Correct.

COMMISSIONER AU: And that the question about tiers in terms of how -- how the various Best Start communities would be -- their activities would be funded is something that is going to occur in January?

MS. BELSHE: We will come back to the Board -- that's part of the longer-term funding approach, distinct from this three-month bridge.

COMMISSIONER AU: Okay.

MS. BELSHE: So what Leann shared with you is some of our initial thinking about a long-term funding approach, and that's -- that would take effect January of
2014 through the balance of the strategic plan. We'll come back in October -- or this month's P and P, October and November, with a final recommendation, but that's future funding.

COMMISSIONER AU: Okay. Then I'm clearer. Then what's on the table is really the approval of the additional funding request.

MS. BELSHE: Exactly.

COMMISSIONER AU: But the tiering question will be -- will be addressed later --

MS. BELSHE: Correct.

COMMISSIONER AU: -- based on the staff's assessment.

MS. BELSHE: Correct.

COMMISSIONER AU: Okay. Thank you.

MS. BELSHE: And to be clear, we have not made a recommendation of a tiering approach. Leann offer three different funding -- long-term funding approaches that we're kicking around and we look forward to getting more discussion and feedback from P and P. And we look forward to you coming. We know you will. We hope you will.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. The matter is before us, been properly moved by Commissioner Fielding and seconded by Commissioner Dennis. Is there any further discussion on Item Number 8 as it has been
discussed and presented per the request of staff for bridge funding?

Are there any objections?

We see no such objections; therefore, record a unanimous vote and we will then proceed to the next item, which will be Item Number 9.

Once again, with thanks to the staff for their presentation. And now on to Number 9.

All right Item Number 9, going once, going twice.

Item Number 10, going once, going twice.

MS. BELSHE: Mr. Chair, I believe Item 9 is a motion that you brought forward relative to a proposed augmentation of on First 5 LA's homelessness initiative.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All in favor, please give the usual sign of aye. All those who are opposed have the same privilege.

Let me just simply say on Item Number 9, this is designed to in some ways augment the work that has already been undertaken. And it seems to me that we have a chance to do more for this particularly vulnerable population.

It was last year that $25,000,000 was approved at the behest of Supervisor Yaroslavsky as he chaired the commission, and the concern at that time was articulated that we could -- should do all that we were capable of doing. We salute that which was done in the previous
years. Now it's time for this commission to take the next step.

Good work has been done. We put this motion before you to allocate an additional $10,000,000 for rental subsidies and supportive services to families who have no particular connection to DCFS. That is to say, there may not have been an allegation of abuse or neglect. Nonetheless, homelessness is real and we don't wish to exclude any children who are vulnerable who are homeless to the extent that we can provide the appropriate support systems that cause them to be made whole, to cause them to reach the fullness of their potential as human beings.

You might consider this a part of an effort to bring into coordination and reprogram homeless prevention initiative funds. A lot is being done in the county. This simply adds to that work in a rather sustained and focused way.

I want to acknowledge the fact that there are persons who wish to be heard on the item that is before us. I don't know if there's an additional staff presentation to be made at this point.

Seeing none, then we'll take up the item and then hear from these individual and the Board will have an opportunity to deliberate and exchange views with each other.
Christine Renee Taylor, if you would come forward. Libby Boyce to follow. Christine Risco Glasgow, Dhakshike Wickrema, Chris Fred Shari-Weaver, Karen Folly, and finally Booker Pearson. In that order if you could come and be heard. Please pay attention to the time that you are being afforded.

You may proceed, ma'am.

MS. TAYLOR: Thank you, commissioner and the staff. I first want to thank you for -- for this motion and for your consideration of it. It's because it's much needed. The -- the thing that I want to talk about is the -- I'm Christine Taylor, and I represent the Los Angeles House of Ruth. And we've been successful with a lot of families. However, the challenge that I'm facing are families who do not meet the criteria of having a DCFS case, either past or present, but are still in great need of being -- of receiving assistance to -- to have sustainability in a home.

They -- I have two families now, right now who are a family of five. Both moms have an income of $600 per month. They had to flee a domestic violence situation, get themselves and their children to safety. There is no way that they can, you know, obtain housing with $600 a month. The concern for us is that, if we're unable to help these two families, that these mothers may
consider returning back to the abuser to have a home for their children. And so we don't want the children to not have their right to have a thriving environment to live and to grow.

So -- so that's what all I wanted to say. And I thank you for your time. My time is up.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. We thank you for your testimony. We'll take the next speaker.

Please come forward.

MS. BOYCE: Good afternoon, commissioners. My name is Libby Boyce. I'm the homeless coordinator for LA County's chief executive office.

I just want to let you know about some county efforts that are going on that puts this in a larger context. This motion is aligned with several models being explored or that are currently underway in LA county and around the nation. They use short- and medium-term rental assistance partner with supportive services to get homeless individuals and families rehoused as quickly as possible. Rental assistance is a critical puzzle piece to reducing homelessness and has been shown to be very effective at getting families permanently housed. Several county departments are working to establish a local source of funding for rental assistance for single adults because it is a glaring gap in meeting the needs of homeless
individuals and families.

We're also examining ways to better align other county homeless programs and resources to greatly increase permanent housing outcomes for families throughout LA county. And this funding being presented in this motion today will really greatly assist us in those efforts, and we appreciate your taking it up today.

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

MS. GLASGOW: Thank you. Good afternoon, commissioners. My name is Christine Risco-Glasgow. I'm the executive director of Outward Bound House. First of all, I would just like to start by thanking you; thanking you for taking the time and the money to allocate to homeless families. This was a first on your behalf and we are very grateful for it. It has indeed been a lifeline for families. And the lashonda family is an example of that. Lashonda became homeless as a result of domestic violence. She has three children. She moved in with her mother. She stayed there for several months. However, she couldn't stay any longer because her mother's tenancy was in jeopardy.

She moved into a shelter and shortly thereafter she got assistance through the First 5 program. She was employed. She just needed a hand to get back into the
housing and be stable. And today she's housed and she actually just got a promotion to be a manager. So we are very grateful for that. However, there are many, many other families that could benefit from this that right now do not and simply for the reason that they do not have any involvement with the child welfare system.

So this motion is going to be really helpful for families like Kimberly's family. Kimberly is a first-time homeless person. She's never been homeless before. She has three children. She works part-time. She's going to nursing school. She's actually going to graduate in a few months. And she has no history with the system. She's homeless right now. She's living in a shelter. Now this is a family that would typically be housed really quickly because they really don't have a history of homelessness. So we are hoping, with the expansion of the project, this families like this can be assisted and the experience of homelessness can be very, very short.

So I urge you to pass this motion and I hope that we'll expand it to other families as well. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you. We take note of the discipline of the speakers staying within two minutes. Thank you.

You may come forward.

MS. WICKREMA: Good afternoon, commissioners. My
name is Dhakshike Wickrema. I'm senior project manager at Shelter Partnership. We are policy and planning nonprofit and we provide policy and planning advice on homeless issues to government and CBO service providers.

First of all, thank you once again, commissioners, for taking the lead on ending family homelessness today, and I want to applaud the supervisor in particular for this potion today.

Last night there were thousands of homeless families sleeping on the street and in cars and in shelters throughout LA County, and tonight, there will be thousands of families doing the same. This motion would provide rental assistance coupled with supportive services, resources as you heard which are urgently needed by these homeless families. This motion would fund an evidence-based, results-focused approach that provides an average six to nine months of rental assistance and combines that with services that helps each family find affordable rental housing of their own and then stay permanently housed.

Many families, as you've heard, can quickly exit homelessness with this rapid rehousing intervention. This motion will build on proven success and will also enhance existing CBO infrastructure that the First 5 commission has already funded.
Thank you for your support.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: We thank you for your testimony. We'll take the next speaker, please.

MS. REED: Good morning or afternoon -- late afternoon. My name is Chris Reed, and I am the director of homeless services for familiar for LA Family Housing.

This motion is very much appreciated and LA Family Housing thanks you for your leadership, for your action on this motion. LA Family Housing is one of the seven agencies funded for the family solution centers. So I'm here to give you a little bit of statistics about what we've seen so far in Phase 2.

To date, we are enrolled 167 families since February first, homeless families. 108 of those families have children between the ages of zero and five, which accounts for 157 children. Only 28 percent of those were deemed eligible and referred and assessed by a First 5 provider for enrollment and assistance. But a total of 65 percent of all families that we've seen have had children between the ages of zero to five. Therefore, 37 percent were left without assistance they so desperately needed.

Our stats are consistent with the CDC's recent findings insofar as only a small percentage of this vulnerable population are receiving the valuable and much-needed financial assistance while the vast majority
are turned away.

So, again, we are really thankful for your

tremendous support, attention, and efforts towards finding
solutions to end homelessness. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: We thank you for
your testimony. Next speaker, please.

MS. FOLLY: Hi. Good afternoon. My name is
Karen Folly. I am the director of family programs for Be
Out Shelter, and I am here as -- in agreement in support
of this motion as well as to also support that there's
definitely a high need of rental assistance subsidies.

I am here to actually tap into your emotional
side. I have a compelling story that I would like to
share. One of my families who basically became homeless
due to the loss of their older son on our local freeway,
our I-5. During that time, they exhausted their savings
in burying their child. The father as well lost his job.
And they began sleeping in their van. The process that
they had to go through as a homeless family, they used to
warm up their frozen burritos on the dashboard of the van.
They utilized the local Laundromat for their hot water to
warm up noodles. They also paid a very low fee with the
local YMCA so that the family can shower Monday through
Saturday. This service was not offer on a Sunday.

Today this family does have a child zero to five,
does not have any interaction with DCFS, and is in high
need of assistance. To add insult to an injury, the
family just found out that the father has now been
diagnosed with stage 4 colon cancer.

So I am here as an advocate for the families that
we serve. We have been doing this now since 1988. And I
support this and I thank you for your time.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: We thank you for
your testimony And we'll take the next speaker.

MS. WEAVER: Good afternoon. My name is Sherry
Weaver. I'm from Harbor Interfaith Services in San Pedro.

First, I'd like to say that we are excited about
this motion and would like thank Mr. Ridley-Thomas and the
First 5 commission for their good work helping homeless
families.

At Harbor Interfaith, we continue to see a
significant need for funds to help homeless families
obtain permanent housing. Through our current First 5 LA
funding, we have enrolled 38 families with DCFS
involvement. Of those, 14 have obtained permanent
housing, three have been assisted with past due rent that
helped them to maintain their housing, four are receiving
monthly rent subsidies while we work with the families
towards increasing their income. We have another seven
families that are scheduled this coming Friday to be DCFS
screened and enrolled in the First 5 program. The remaining 21 households we are continuing to assist with housing search and negotiation with local property owners.

I would like to share just briefly just two stories, one with DCFS involvement and one without, and how the funds help -- do and do not help at this time.

The Acosta family. Two parent household with three children, ages three, six and eight, were homeless and sleeping in their car. They first became homeless in 2010 after the husband had just lost his job. They stayed with various friends, families, temporary shelter in Los Angeles. The father was a 13 year Navy veteran who was honorably discharged and deployed during the Gulf War.

The Acosta family was screened for eligibility the First 5 LA program in 2013 services provided including connecting into the Veterans Administration. He received a HUD voucher. He also received assistance with VRAP for his education. He is currently right now in a business management vouchers program. He's maintaining a B plus average. The family, I am happy to report, is now living in a three-bedroom, two-bath home.

The second family, the Garcia family did not have DCFS involvement. It's a single mom with a four-year old son. She was refereed to First 5 in 2013. She's a resident of a local family shelter. Her son and her
became homeless in April 2013. I'm sorry. I'm taking too much time.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: That would be correct.

MS. WEAVER: And she relocated alone before she was born and raised. Ms. Garcia is recovering from leukemia and has periodic blood transfusions for anemia. Long story short, she's a registered nurse. And if she could have gotten just one-time rental assistance, she would have been able to obtain permanent housing and been more stable.

I thank you your time.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you.

Sufficiently compelling. Final speaker please.

MR. PEARSON: My name is Booker Pearson. I'm a founding board member of Upward Bound House, and I'm a member of the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority Commission, and also a member and the new vice chair of the new DPFS commission.

I want to applaud this motion and I want to thank the chair for moving this forward. There's nothing more important than a house for a child. Not nutrition, not education, nothing has a bigger impact. This program is not badly needed. It is urgent. It is immediate. It is necessary. It is vital.
Our honorable chairman recently tweeted -- he may regret this, but I save his tweets. 70 percent of everybody in a prison bed came from foster care. Corollary to that is, 60 percent of everybody in foster care was formerly homeless. Do the math. We cannot afford to build more prisons. I say zero to five instead of 25 to life. But I also say, no more homeless children instead of 25 to life.

Homeless children are the source of all the people sleeping across the street in that park. They're the source of the problems. What we're doing as a society is buying wheelchairs for polio victims when we can give them the Salk vaccine when they're four-years old. We're so shortsighted. LA can and should be at leader for the whole nation on this. With four percent of the world's population, we're 25 percent of the world's prisoners. We're the only industrialized democracy on the face of this earth that has any homeless children.

Can you connect the dots? Ten million is nice. I beg you give a hundred million.

La -- Los Angeles County Office of Education has identified, not checked off, identified 80,000 homeless children in this county. Which means about 36,000 are under six.

Thank you, and I hope you pass this.
COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much. We'll consider that to be the benedictory statement on the matter at hand.

The matter is before us. Please take note of the resolution disseminated by staff that was in your board binders as well as the motion as amended. Members of the commission, what's your pleasure?

I recognize Commissioner Fielding.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I'm extremely supportive, but I do have a couple of questions.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: How much is left from the 25 million that was originally allocated? How fast was that being depleted?

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: That's a good question, and maybe CDC -- any representative from CDC here to respond for that. Professor Rogan, are you coming forward. He's getting dressed. All right. Come forward.

MS. BELSHE: I also saw Professor Wagner reaching for his mike.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Ms. Ambassador, proceed.

MR. WAGNER: As CDC comes forward, First 5 LA allocated 24.8 of the 25 million to CDC. So that money has already left the commission and is at CDC,
COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Sir, name, rank, and serial number.

MR. ROGAN: Sure. Chair, First 5 LA Commissioner Sean Rogan, executive director of the Los Angeles County Community Development Commission.

So I'll give you both the construction-related and the rental assistance. So in November of 2012 is when we had the approval of the money for both the construction projects as well as the rental side. To date, 14.6 million in loans have gone out to produce 232 units of affordable housing on the construction side, and we've got $7.5 million to be used on the rental side. Of that, we have assisted -- and I'll get to the answer of money. Yeah, of that we've -- we've spent 7 -- there's approximately 7.3 remaining which will predominantly be utilized on the rental side for the next year and a half.

Some interesting stats I'd like to share with you is that, you know, as of August 27, we've assisted 104 families with the First 5 rental assistance. And I'll leave the comments specific to the rental assistance program. We've also served over 126 children ages zero to five. We have 194 eligible households currently in the pipeline. As part of this strategy and as part of this NOFA that was issued last year, our goal was 350 families a year, and we're well on our way of exceeding that.
So I think there certainly is a great need for the rental assistance and that, when you look at the fact that they we still have some gaps in the San Fernando Valley as one, and as well as in the northeastern part of the county, a NOFA that would help target some additional providers in those areas will be greatly needed, as well as removing the DCFS connection I think, as you've heard from the speakers before me, will also greatly enhance our ability to serve more families on the street with children zero to five.

So we've got about 7.3 million remaining, and I assume very shortly, within the next year, within our time frames that we discussed about a year ago, that that money will be committed and or expended.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Thank you. I just had one other question, and that is, what's the maximum time when you say short-term rental assistance? Is there any -- you know, what is the maximum time for that?

MR. ROGAN: Well, the maximum time could be up to two years; however, what we've seen to date is about nine months is the average to stabilize housing.

Also keep in mind that part of the money goes for homeless prevention. We've had instances where families have been in arrears for rent or utilities that have then used these funds to pay that rental arrears or that
utility cost to keep them from becoming homeless. But it's about nine months to stabilization on average.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Okay. Great. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Additional question or comments from members of the board? Commissioner Kaufman and then Commissioner Au, please.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: The policy that we had chosen to limit the eligibility to those who were or have DCFS involvement or had it in the past, and this suggestion is that we should open up. Help me to understand how we -- when can we say no. You just mentioned that, if there's an individual who hasn't paid the utility bills for several months, that may get them to be homeless, that they might be eligible. It would seem like the marginally housed, homeless is a fairly fluid definition. How do we know when to say no?

MR. ROGAN: How would we know when to say no?

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Right now if the person does not -- the original proposal, if the person did not -- the family did not have DCFS involvement either present or in the past, we said no.

MR. ROGAN: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: That still left a fairly large population. If we were to take that restriction
away, does not -- do we not open it up to anyone who is
not only homeless but perhaps even marginally housed,
staying with friends, arrears on their utilities and the
like? I recognize that we have lots of need. I'm trying
to figure out how you operationalize that lack of the
restriction.

MR. ROGAN: Yes. Certainly, I think, whether
you're a part of DCFS or not, you're still going to have
that communication and contact with the various service
providers and the various nonprofits that are going to
really make that determination. These are the experts in
the fields, the boots on the ground so to speak in terms
of determining that eligibility.

I don't -- and I get your point, but we haven't
seen an overwhelming response in terms of requesting these
dollars. I suspect that, as we look to develop this new
NOFA and we convene our panel to speak about some of these
changes, we can certainly look to how better address that.
I think it's been an important component, but I haven't
seen or we haven't seen yet today here coming before you
in September that there's been an overwhelming request for
these dollars.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Okay. What impact would
having the expectation of the geographic distribution
based on the description of the number of homeless in
various parts of the county, how would that modify how the
daily business works so to speak?

    MR. ROGAN: Well, I'm not necessarily suggesting
we would geographically do anything different other than
to add providers to areas that are not served. We know
that, with the last NOFA issued last year, that we had
some gaps in our service areas. I think -- and, again, a
lot of this being -- being new and coming up in a
relatively quick order. We would want to look at where we
have gaps and then look to have providers fulfill those
gaps so that those families in those areas and in those
SPAS could be served. And I think you would look to
potentially prioritize that first and then augment the
additional -- the existing providers second, but do it
comprehensively and across all providers.

    COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: My general comment then, I
was pleased to see that we were thinking about how to get
additional people eligible -- or additional money for
eligible. Pleased to see that we extend it from the CDC
the way that we're doing it now. I always assumed that
the CDC was sort of acting the way First 5 LA commission
staff would work if we had the internal expertise to run a
program like this. We made the decision a year ago that
we did not have that internal expertise and, therefore,
partnered with the CDC to provide that. So that's why I
think it's appropriate for you to asking the question and not having to ask our staff that question. Because, normally, our staff would answer that question.

So for that, just to clarify, that's why you're up there and not one of the staff. Just so the staff understands why it's a little bit different, and I think that's an important distinction.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: In other words, earn your money, Sean Rogan.

MR. ROGAN: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: That's true. Our staff would have to earn their money, and they do quite well. So do our contractor in this case.

So I really appreciate the wisdom that you have. And don't feel like I, as a commissioner, for sure and I think the staff might agree, that they as staff do not have the expertise for these nuanced challenges. So I think that that really does make a lot of sense to me. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: We took note of the fact that, when you first posed the question, Commissioner Kaufman, how do we say no wonder, when do we say no. The comparison admonition would be sufficient when you get to a hundred million, then you could say no as one response. Then the other response is when we took note of those who
are engaged in the life of alleviating, that is to say
eradicating, homelessness throughout county of Los
Angeles. They were immediately saying we have eligibility
requirements, we have requirement, we have long-standing
practices, both best practices and promising practices, to
make sure that we are making ourselves accountable for the
resources that are being made available to us.

So it seems to me any of that eligibility data
that was required -- requirements, those protocols, to the
extent that board members, commissioners that is, would
wish to learn more about that -- it would serve a high
purpose, I believe, to cause those of us who want to and
frankly need to learn more about the phenomenon of
homelessness that we be afforded such information. So to
the extent that the executive director could receive that
and distribute it to the Board, I think it would serve a
useful purpose.

Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: My final question -- I
understand exactly what you're saying there.

My final question is, is there a way that the 25,
and if we approved 10, could be leveraged even -- I know
it is on the construction side. But on the subsidy side,
are there other places that are offering for matching
funds if a local entity puts up money? It seems like, if
want to get to that higher number, we've got to get other people's money into the picture.

MR. ROGAN: And certainly, I don't want to speak for the providers, and I'm sure they'd be happy to come up here and answer that, but I can tell you that the money is being leveraged through other sources in which they receive to help serve the families.

As you heard here, currently, whether you're First 5 eligible or not as defined under this current NOFA, you're being served. The same would be true if these families -- and this was part of the NOFA and part of the thinking, is that there are other funding sources out there. So if you're a family that have children other older than five that there still is a network system and still services being provided. So I certainly can assure you that these funds are being leveraged.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: What would be very helpful would be to help report on that because one of the things we like to keep track of is, when we make an investment, are we able to leverage other people's money, are we able to create sustainable methods. And the helps us to see that, not only did our dollar lead to another dollar or two or three, but also lead to changes. So in the reports that we get from you, if there's a way to quantify the kind of leveraging that has occurred, that would be very
MR. ROGAN: Certainly.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: That was an excellent question.

MR. ROGAN: I'll work with our spas and the service providers.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Obviously not today.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: I think Libby Boyce should be prepared to give a little more insight on that either today or in the near term in terms of leveraging these dollars. This is a very, very important issue. Commissioner Kaufman is spot on in terms of how we do more rather than less. So Libby, very quickly, and then we're going to go to Commissioner Au, and then dispose of the matter accordingly.

MS. BOYCE: There are many other homeless family programs that are leveraged. There are family solution centers. We have 11 sites throughout LA county that provide services to homeless families. And we use HPI dollars and we use something called ESGU, which is emergency solution grant funding, from HUD.

And the issue is that, yes, those do provide rental assistance, but it's not nearly, nearly enough for the families that we're seeing. We leverage child care. We leverage education. We leverage the school system. We
leverage substance abuse services. We leverage many, many
resources to help the homeless families.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: I think a more
specific response to the commissioner's question that
would benefit the entire commission as we seek to be more
informed -- and more informed and educated at a higher
level on this. So, Libby, if you would prepare an
appropriate report that gives specific examples as to how
that takes place, I think you will have done us a great
service.

Final comments from Commissioner Au I think, and
then I'm going to recognize Commissioner Curry.

COMMISSIONER AU: Thank you. I guess I -- I have
along the same lines of Dr. Kaufman's questioning, had
concerns about sustainability. But even beyond that, in
fact, given something even more fundamental. In reading
your motion, I don't see CDC or a mentioned here as the --
as the agency, the strategic partner in which the funds
are going to be allocated out. Is that correct, or did I
miss it?

MS. BELSHE: As the Chair noted, if I may, Mr.
Chair. As the Chair noted, Commissioner Au and 12
commissioners, in your manila folder was an updated
amended motion and accompanying budget resolution. There
were copies that were provided to least -- I don't know --
to some who came in. It was also posted electronically earlier today.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: That matter is addressed.

COMMISSIONER AU: So it is going to be through the community development commission --

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER AU: -- that these funds are going to be allocated out. Okay. That's helpful.

MS. BELSHE: It's all in the existing strategic partnership --

COMMISSIONER AU: Right, because that for me lends itself to an ability to coordinate --

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Right.

COMMISSIONER AU: And at least funds are strictly for rental assistance. It's not for bricks and mortars. And so that's an additional clarification that I needed.

The third is the -- back to your last comment, Chair Ridley-Thomas, is that we really truly don't understand the dynamics of why families or -- individual become homeless. And in my -- in my vacation in Hawaii, even there, they're saddled with homelessness. And, in fact, they -- the counsel there passed a motion that said they would fund individuals a one-way plane ticket back to their home state. And so it's a very controversial issue
I think nationwide.

And so -- which raised the question, have we convened a task group for some entity that's really going to delve into the question of homelessness? You know, what are the dynamics? What are the -- the conditions which have led to families and individuals becoming homeless? And that would be extremely helpful I think to illuminate what it is that we need to then focus in on strategically in looking at these issues so that it doesn't become what it seems like, an increasing challenge for communities.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: I appreciate the questions, commissioner Au. And there are any number of persons who did testify today who would be glad to introduce you to the number of meetings and task forces of which they are a part. I'm going to afford you the opportunity to get to know Booker Pearson who sits on one such entity, the joint powers of authority between the City and County of Los Angeles.

And I do think that there was a testimony from one of the witnesses who operates in the context of the fourth supervisorial district who I want to introduce yourself to, Commissioner Au, for the purposes of addressing some of her questions which are both rather basic but equally important. We should make no
assumptions about who understands and who knows what the
issues of homelessness and those concerns that surround
and impact homelessness may be. This in many respects
needs to be seized as a teachable moment. And there was a
point in time where philanthropic dollars were very, very
significantly targeted toward the phenomenon of
homelessness. This would have been the '80s,
approximately. But we noticed a rather sharp decline in
such support in subsequent years. There's an uptick of
sorts now, but this is not to be viewed as a fad:
Sustained, systemic contributing factors. And it's seems
to me that children have taken the brunt of this
particular social challenge, problem, ill -- call it what
you will -- and targeted resources in that regard are
appropriate.

Commissioner Curry, please.

COMMISSIONER CURRY: I was excited last year when
we committed the money for those connected with the child
welfare service, but I think this is also really, really
important. I think that there's a couple of things we
have to realize and not forget; that over the last ten
years, the number of children 0-3 has increased in the
child welfare system. We're spending -- a lot of us are
spending a lot of time and a lot of money looking for
resources once families get into the child welfare system
and trying to figure out how to help those families and keep those families together and provide them with services. We really need to start looking more and more at prevention and keeping them out of system to begin with so that we don't spend so much time on the other end.

   The other thing that I think, besides the increase in the number of kids 0-3 in child welfare is that, I think sometimes we forget that children enter the child welfare system because of abuse and neglect, and neglect is more often than abuse. And neglect often relates specifically to poverty. So I think this is important. I think looking more at how we can help families and keep them from ever entering the child welfare system is just more important that we start developing the prevention programs targeted at these at-risk families.

   COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you, Commissioner Curry.

   COMMISSIONER FIGUEROA-VILLA: I move that we approve the ten million.

   COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. It's been moved by Commissioner -- Commissioner -- one of those designations comes rather quickly to me. I don't know why I'm nervous about all of this today. Commissioner Figueroa-Villa, seconded by Commissioner Fielding.
Any further questions or comments on the matter?

Commissioner Dennis.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: I asked this when we did this initial allocation of the $24.8 million, because that's how everybody on the street, it's $25 million. So I stand corrected. But one of the things I'm interested in are the supportive services and I think we really need to have a report either from the -- the consultants or staff with regards to child care, health and nutrition, and any other supportive services that are being provided to the families because both of these motions talk to supportive services, and that is in my mind extremely essential.

And further, if we -- if our age cohort is zero to five, do we not provide services to other children in the family who are above five. And I don't know what our position is around that. So, for example, if we're providing child care for a two-year old and there's a seven-year old who needs, you know, school-aged child care, are we -- do we do that or do we not do it?

And I don't need the answers to those questions today, but as we move the agenda forward, I would like to know those answers.

CDC: Certainly, we will let you know the type of services provided. I mean, the service funding piece is
key, you know, for a variety of reasons in terms of getting the families housed had getting them stabilized. But we can certainly provide to you what those types of services are.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you, Commissioner Dennis. And we will now hear from Commissioner Tilton.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: I want to agree with Commissioner Curry on what she's talking about in terms of prevention. And I want to take that a little further and ask that we think about the living conditions of families in all of the programs that we have. I'm thinking about our campaign for safe sleeping where we say, put the baby on its back in a crib with no bumper pads. And I'm thinking what crib under the freeway are we talking about in terms of homelessness. We have had some very sad situations where very young children and infants have not survived because they didn't have a home and they weren't in the system yet because they were too young.

So I guess my other question really is, how does this integrate with the system we have now with the other allocation, the 25 million? Is there any difference in terms of the administrative structure or the -- I mean, is this going to be kind of a seamless process of including other zero to five -- families with children zero to five?
COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you for your question. Mr. Rogan.

MR. ROGAN: Certainly, as mentioned, it will be integrated. We recognize, as part of the first NOFA that we do have some gaps in the service areas. So we'd be looking to close those gaps. And we would be also looking to remove the DCFS component so that we could serve more families that are homeless with kids on the streets. Those are the two primary areas.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: But seamless?

MR. ROGAN: Of course it will be seamless. We have an excellent working relationship with First 5 LA as well as our service providers in the spas.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. May I simply state that the matter is before us and it's been properly moved and seconded. Are there any further comments? Any objections? Any abstentions?

Obviously, the advocates have been very persuasive. Please record a unanimous vote.

Thank you. Let's proceed. We have a lot more to do, and we're going to try to do it --

MS. BELSHE: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: -- in a timely fashion.

Now, the executive director has suggested that
the chair will be homeless unless we get this agenda done.
So we're going to take Item Number 10. We're going to
take up Item Number 11. We're going to continue Item
Number 12. We're going to take up Item Number 13.

MS. BELSHE: And 14, Mr. Chair and members, can
be considered a receive and file with the request that
board members look at this information item, connect with
me or Theresa if they've got questions, concerns. We
would bring it back to the board in October as an action
item.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Without objection,
that will be the order.

Madam executive director.

MS. BELSHE: We have an quick information item
around Welcome Baby Home -- Welcome Baby that is
foundational to the action item, and our colleagues are
going to try to be very brief and to the point. So I'm
going to stop there. Armando.

MR. JIMENEZ: This item requires no action. It's
a receive and file. It's a report that's actually
included in your packet. If you have not had a chance to
read the report, I would direct you to the executive
summary. It's a very well-done executive summary which
encapsulates the study results. This is an evaluation
actually of Welcome Baby and it's entitled "Effects of
Welcome Baby Home Visiting - Findings From the 12-month Child Family Survey."

It's always very gratifying for me to bring results to the commission and even more gratifying when those results are actually positive and there are tangible effects -- tangible effects and meaningful effects for families, so I'm very encouraged by that.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: I appreciate the distinction.

MR. JIMENEZ: The summary findings here on the slide, I just wanted to point out that, as a result of the Welcome Baby experience for those moms that participated in metro LA, we found improved attempt at breast feeding and exclusive breast feeding at four months. We found that there were stronger supports and higher quality of relationships as a result of their engagement with Welcome Baby. We found that there was higher quality home learning environments and that parents actually were engaged in learning at home with their children. We found decreased risk of developmental delay as a result of their participation in Welcome Baby.

I wanted to also point out we didn't find some things we hoped to, and one was we didn't find differences in maternal depression. Actually, 30 percent of the women who were a part of the sample had signs of depression as a
result of their efforts, and we found that there were no differences as a result of the 12-month intervention. Yet, there's really -- this particular intervention was not intense enough to really demonstrate or actually show the difference in maternal depression.

We found that health insurance coverage, there was no difference. But that's likely a result of the wonderful work that's been done to actually increase health insurance eligibility and enrollment. And actually many of the investments that First 5 LA has made with Healthy Kids is likely as a result of there's no difference in this 12-month period and health care utilization which in fact that's -- zero to five healthcare utilization is relatively low among this population anyway.

What I wanted to point was the bold. On the slide are bold results. These actually results are directly related to the Building Strong Families framework, and they are representative of core family results. Core family results that this commission agreed to change and we actually -- we are seeing those happen as a result of Welcome Baby.

Overall learning, what we found is that the results are not conclusive but promising. I'm encouraged for two reasons. One reason is that this particular
cohort had an extremely high number of high-risk women participating. Currently, our plan is to refer those high-risk women to intensive home visiting programs, which in the future, will be a part of our spectrum of services. The other reason I'm encouraged that this particular intervention at the time that these women enrolled was not fully developed. It's always best to have interventions measured when they're firing on all pistons and programmatically in full force.

We found that there's a dose response relationship. The more engagement that these women had in the program, the better the outcomes. We also found that, as a result of our lack of seeing the difference in maternal depression, health care utilization, and insurance, what it does is also provides us an opportunity of how we can connect with the work that's being done with Best Start. In other words, these are the kinds of things that relate to the important services and times of need. This is one of the results that the commission approved with the Building Stronger Families framework.

Also, quality matters. It's not just quality of content, but a quality of delivery. And it's important that -- we want to recognize the wonderful work that's been happening with California hospital and maternal and child health access because it matters that the staff and
the in-system is actually high quality.

The other important thing is that we need to be adhering to the model. The important part of is, we can't assume that, once we design something and develop it, that people will actually deliver it in that way.

The last thing we wanted to say in terms of the learning is that there's a whole network of expertise out there, and our engagement and actually our vestment in home visiting has highlighted and brought attention to us from folks that are doing work nationally and statewide. And we should maintain our connection to that.

And if there are any questions of the report, I'd be --

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. We have a question from Commissioner Fielding. We have persons who wish to be heard, and then we have to do 10(b), which is the action item where we can approve some things, and I have an amendment.

Commissioner Fielding.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: It won't bother you too much if I won't go to your head if I said it was a good report?

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: No.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Okay. I'll say it. I think that was a very good -- that's exactly the kind of
reports we need. We got very clear, bottom line what
works, what doesn't.

I have two questions: One, I'm a little
concerned about the control group because my understanding
is the control group may in fact be skewed towards those
with fewer problems. Can you address that issue and the
-- it wasn't anybody's fault except the way you had to get
to them.

MR. JIMENEZ: Yeah. The ideal is to actually
have a control group that is matched based on risk
characteristics. The limitation of the control group was
a group drawn from WIC, which in fact is likely to have
received some services through WIC which would not have
actually made the effects as strong as they could have.
And I would agree that, in future -- in fact, as part of
the presentation following, one of the things that we want
to do is expand the rigor of the research to be able to
possibly do some randomized control trials to be able to
account for those control group weaknesses.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Second is, I was very
glad to hear you talk about taking those at high risk and
referring them to home visiting programs. It seems to me
that, you know, because of the data that we have from home
visiting programs that engage women, you know, before
their 28th week of pregnancy, that that -- that's really
important. And I think the question here is, are there
ways to extend Welcome Baby in general. I know it's not
easy, but going through OB/GYNs or others that use those
hospitals, would it not be possible to go further
upstream?

MR. JIMENEZ: Well, I won't hand that off to my
programmatic counterpart, Barbara, who may actually -- I
don't know if you're going to address that in the next
part of the discussion. But, obviously, the more upstream
the intervention, the more likely you are to find that you
can have a positive effect. And I do want to say -- I
wanted to say that this particular population is extremely
high need. Eighty-three percent of the women that were
participating in Welcome Baby at Metro LA have a family
income of less than 18,000 a year. And, you know we talk
about the population that potentially is on the verge of
needing services like the ones that were just approved,
it's this population.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: Thank you. Very much.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Indeed.

All right. Barbara, you want to come forward?

Your report will be necessarily truncated because of a
couple of things now. Staff has a propensity to give a
lot of information which we respect, but the Board is
governed by a timeline. So whatever improvisational
skills you can apply, we appreciate it.

Now, jazz is improvisational. You know that, don't you? We're going to have some jazz lessons for the staff, madam executive director. I think my point is made. Let me see what you can do, Madam Miles Davis.

All right. Go ahead.

MS. DUBRANSKY: I have a lot to live up to.

MS. BELSHE: And to be clear, this is an action item before the Board. So commissioners, pay attention to this incredibly truncated, incisive presentation. Go, Barb.

MS. DUBRANSKY: So that's a wonderful program I heard Armando talking about. We should do more of that.

So the objective of today's discussion is, as you see up on the slide, the intent is to build on the previous discussions we've about this topic since January and take action.

That was pretty truncated.

COMMISSIONER TILTON: That's it.

MS. DUBRANSKY: This is what we're going to review to do it. That's my truncated version of that slide.

Staff has worked with commissioners to solidify a set of criteria to assist in making decisions about allowing additional hospitals to participate in the
Welcome Baby program. Staff has also collected additional information allowing further assessment of the impact on the criteria of adding four additional hospitals. For this reason, staff has eliminated the previously reviewed options and is able to make a specific recommendation to execute contracts with the four hospitals that responded to the LOI in May.

So staff's second recommendation to authorize continued implementation of the pilot program beyond its initial allocation and grant will result in the pilot joining in their subjectivity to the annual budgeting process.

I will briefly discuss the rationale for adding MLK Community Hospital to the commission's approved list later in the presentation.

Finally, staff recommends suspending the Welcome Baby letter of intent solicitation until after the Board receives further information on the investments implementation, evaluation, and sustainability of progress. Time frames for these components are outlined in your memo and will be briefly discussed in the next steps.

So to support the discussion, this definition acts as a reminder of what we are talking about. We're talking about both universal and targeted or intensive
home visitation programs, both Welcome Baby and what we refer to as select home visitation.

This slide is a brief reminder of how we chose our Best Start communities which drive the opportunity for hospitals to participate in Welcome Baby.

In this slide you've seen as well before. These are the various policy decisions that have yielded you this constellation of programs.

In terms of a brief status on our implementation thus far, we have our pilot plus nine additional hospitals, and together those hospitals deliver half of the Best Start babies and over a quarter of the babies in the county.

This briefly demonstrates to you the geographic spread those hospitals. And then this give you a visual on that as well.

The Board has discussed the family strengthening investments seven times over the calendar year in Board and P and P meetings. In January, the Board discussed both the long-term fiscal picture for the organization as well as the current scope and trajectory of the family strengthening initiative. In February, the Board discussed its overall sustainability approach and specific sustainability strategies of this investment. And throughout May and August, the Board discussed both the
programmatic implementation research and evaluation and -- as well as policy and advocacy.

So today's discussion will build on these discussions to assist the Board and staff in assessing staff's recommendations and next steps.

So given what you've heard about our implementation status, sustainability strategies, and evaluation approach, we'd like to move forward with discussing the result of approving staff's recommendation. And it's important to note that target penetration refers to the percentage of births served by participating hospitals. The total to be served represents the number of families expected to be served at an estimated take-up rate of 80 percent followed by the cost associated with this take-up rate. And all numbers are based on 2010 data.

The following considerations are areas that are impacted by the number of participating hospitals. The first, the financial impact of the recommendation. It's important to note that the costs indicated are total costs to implement the strategy on an annual basis and does not reflect future investments via potential funders. So we're looking at a three- to five-year trajectory to understand via our research work and our policy and advocacy work what the potential -- our potential ability
is to bring in other resources.

Second, the recommendation's impact on equity, which is defined as similar penetration rates across the Best Start communities; third, a sufficient sample size, and that's generally as well as the ability to study important subpopulations; and the fourth is the challenges of the recommendation to identifying non-First 5 LA funds to support home visitation which it becomes more enhanced as additional hospitals are included.

These costs are total costs to provide the services as previously noted. By 2020, we will have made early progress down this what we refer to as a glide path and would not be bearing the full cost as seen here -- there.

By adding these four hospitals, equity in both West Athens, which goes from 26 percent penetration to 41, and Panorama City, which goes from 24 to 65 improve, leaving no communities below 30 percent and only two below 40, Metro and East LA. Particularly the inclusion of Santa Nella and Valley Presbyterian Hospitals improved these penetration rates.

MS. BELSHE: Barb, you want to advance this? There you go.

MS. DUBRANSKY: Sorry about that. And then evaluation. Finally, including all four hospitals
improves the commission's ability to do strong
subpopulation analysis with its evaluation studies. This
will allow the commission the data necessary to
demonstrate impact of the population on specific groups of
interest, including teens, Medi-Cal recipients, and the
Asian/Pacific Islander population.

Finally, implementing the Welcome Baby program in
a Kaiser hospital has implications for policy and advocacy
agenda, which targets private and public health insurers.
Having Welcome Baby implemented at Kaiser Baldwin, First 5
LA has an opportunity to demonstrate its benefits in a
hospital that is part of a large, integrated system of
care.

So here we're going to look at how equity begins
to shift as we add the additional hospitals. This map
compares penetration in four quartiles. As you can see in
Antelope Valley and Long Beach, we have what I call the
feast end of a feast-and-famine situation. It would take
significant hospital participation and resources to get
many other communities up to this level of penetration.
It has to do with there being fewer hospitals delivering
the majority of births in those communities.

So our more manageable objective is to see that
the other communities follow as closely together within
the middle two quartiles, the yellow and the green, in
order to insure that we're serving families in diverse communities and enhancing our ability to learn.

Here again, we see the geographic spread of the hospitals. That purple crosses indicate the four hospitals who responded to the LOI in May. In the north, you see Valley Presbyterian Hospital serving primarily Panorama City and Northeast San Fernando Valley Best Start communities. In the south, we see Santa Nella Hospital serving West Athens, and Torrance Memorial serving Wilmington. And, finally, to the east, you see Kaiser Baldwin Park serving Best Start El Monte.

The result of adding these hospitals is seeing more communities come closer together in their penetration rates moving into the yellow and green quartiles.

Staff also recommends that MLK Community Hospital be added to the list of approved strategic partnerships. The labor and delivery unit is expected to be relatively small and will likely represent a shift in market share from nearby hospitals. Therefore, the cost of including MLK Community should be minimal. In fact, the three hospitals delivering the most babies surrounding MLK are either currently participating; that's California and St. Francis, or have responded to the Welcome Baby LOI; that's Santa Nella.

All right. Staff will undertake the following
next steps upon approval of the recommendation. First, to complete the contract negotiations with the four hospitals included, convene one or more meetings between hospital and commission leadership beginning in the fall to begin to build a shared understanding of how and when hospitals will begin to assess their willingness and ability to invest their resources in the Welcome Baby program, continue to include the Welcome Baby pilot in annual budgets beyond fiscal year 13/14, add MLK Jr. Community Hospital to the approved strategic partnership list, and finally, suspend the list. And the evaluation results we referred to that we will be looking to inform re-engaging that list in three to five years can be found in your memo, pages 6 and 7. And the policy and advocacy activities that will be occurring can be found on pages 8 and 9.

With that, that concludes my truncated presentation.

MS. BELSHE: And who is this adorable child?

MS. DUBRANSKY: That is my first.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: That is your first?

MS. DUBRANSKY: Just when he learned to sit up.

He's now nine. Again, I always assume I should use target population pictures.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: Now he's standing
All right. Questions or comments? The motion is before us. It's been amended in the following way: That is, First 5 LA should report back in November of this year with a plan to expand this program to interested hospitals serving at-risk pregnant women. That would come as an amendment from the Chair. It seems to me that there's value in this work. And to the extent that there is, I would hope that we'll be ready for new takers. And how that would be formulated, I'm going to leave to the staff's imagination. The expansion I believe will be a good thing and we ought to be on the ready.

Any other question or comments on this matter?

Commissioner Au, you're breaking your record again today, and we take note of it. There are nine persons who wish to be heard by way of public comment.

COMMISSIONER AU: Well, I'm trying to make up for missing the meeting in June.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: We're going to make sure the meeting is on the date that you are available.

All right. Go ahead, Commissioner Au.

COMMISSIONER AU: I thank you very much. I think the presentation was really clear and I appreciate that very much, Barbara, as usual, and as well as Armando.

I also appreciate the fiscal clarity here in your
-- your documentation as well. And I just want to be
clear and pay -- and draw the rest of the commissioners to
pay attention that, based on your third recommendation
that we continue to fund Welcome Baby beyond the fiscal
year 13-14, and the -- and with the current recommendation
to increase the number of hospitals, including MLK, that
the projection is that, by year 2015-16, if our revenue
projection is correct, our commitment to these hospitals
are going to take up more than 50 percent of our revenue.
And -- and then even more so, beyond the 15-16 up to the
year 19-20. And I guess -- this is a really critical
issue because we have many programs and projects that are
-- are very compelling. I mean, just today we spent $10
million for -- to provide housing assistance to homeless
children and families.

My -- my guess is that -- that's one time
funding. There's no mechanism for us to retrieve any
additional dollars that it goes out the door and it has to
be replenished if we want to maintain it. Similarly,
we're challenged with other programs and projects that's
going to be sunsetting unless we are able to generate the
dollars to maintain and sustain them.

So I guess the big question I have is impact,
right? If projecting down the road that this particular
commitment is going to take up more than 50 percent of our
projected revenues, would that still allow us to continue
the core of Best Start in terms of the focus on building
strong families in the communities outside of the hospital
setting and -- and -- and the partnership with families to
address not only family issues but also neighborhood
issues and community issues?

So I -- I'm -- you know, I need to have that
understanding because we're reaching a juncture where we
no longer have the luxury of just saying, this is a good
cause, we need to fund it; this is another compelling
cause, we need to fund it. At some point in time, our
money is going to essentially be fully committed.

MS. BELSHE: You're absolutely right and it's a
great opportunity for Barbara to clarify the funding
structure because you're absolutely right. But the intent
of these numbers is not to assert or commit this or
organization to full funding of this initiative over the
long term, but rather, as we clarified in the memo, to
help it get up and running with a significant investment
but with the expectation that, after year three, that
financial cost sharing is going to change overtime and
formed by our work with hospitals as well as throughout
policy and advocacy, but Barb.

MS. DUBRANSKY: Right. And there are various
mechanisms, mechanisms that we can use at that time.
Essentially, the data, the various studies that were received and will allow us to be more precise about how we target our policy and advocacy targets. And so where we're able to say, here's how this program benefits your system so that they can do an effective cost benefit analysis using the data that we provide. So that's one aspect of it.

Also, as Kim mentioned, this is what we call a cost to the county. By "county," I don't mean the county system, the departments; just the County of Los Angeles, this is the cost to the County to serve these families and to achieve outcomes that are core to our strategic plan. as we know, the -- particularly Welcome Baby plays a significant role in making sure that families that most need intensive home visitation receive it. And by doing that, we're able to have a much stronger opportunity to achieve the long-term outcomes of our strategic plans.

So there's a cost benefit dollar. So, obviously, there are other entities that share with us those same interests in terms of outcomes and can become potential funders.

The other aspect of it is, there has been analysis done about where our various current initiatives will either end or continue. And so in those analyses, the ongoing work of the capacity building side of Best Start, this being the home visitation, family
strengthening side, is included in that analysis.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.

Commissioner Fielding.

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I really appreciate that very good, well-truncated report. I think that the kind of results we're seeing are very positive and totally consistent with what we're trying to do in Best Start. And this is the start of Best Start. And we're focused on a lot of those tiny communities. So it seems to me this is -- if we focus on prevention, if we focus on getting it to the earliest point, we have to worry about the process before and soon after birth. And so it seems to me this is totally consistent with our broad strategic plan.

I'm not unmindful of the financial issues, however. And it seems to me that trying to develop ways to share costs over time could be very important. I would think that over time this becomes very important for hospitals, so important that they don't want to be without it, and they're afraid that it might affect marketing, relationship, reputation, and other issues. And I think that that -- that's what needs to be developed over the next few years.

In addition, from public policy standpoint, with this very high-need community, this is the right approach. We may want to -- we don't want to probably tailor it,
more home visiting for the highest risk, but this is the right approach. So I move approval of this.

COMMISSIONER RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. There are persons who wish to be heard. We're going to announce them.

Commissioners, may I indicate that there are several items remaining. Item 13, we're going to continue in consultation with the executive director. The reason being that some of us do need to be present for that presentation. It's an important one. We're going to calendar it for the top of the agenda so that we have a full presence and participation given the significant amount of work that has been done related to L-3 learning. That will afford us an opportunity to accommodate the schedules of the remaining commissioners as we're threatening the loss of the forum. At this point in time, the vice chair will take the balance of the meeting forward.

Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Thank you. So we have a challenge, limited time and lots of people who want to speak. Any there any other commissioners who have any comments before we hear from the public?

COMMISSIONER FIELDING: I just want to find out if there's a second to my motion.
COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: So the motion has been put. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER FIGUEROA-VILLA: Second.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Second. I'm going to read the motion because I'm not sure that everyone knows exactly what we're describing here. Authorize staff to contact with four hospitals which responded to letter of intent in May 2013. Authorize the pilot California House approved, list of hospitals continual implementation beyond its initial grant currently scheduled to end June 30, 2014. Add Martin Luther King Hospital to the approved list of hospitals eligible for strategic partnership to implement Welcome baby. Append a second Welcome Baby letter of intent solicitation until further information is secured related implementation of the currently-contracted hospitals. Progress and execution of First 5 LA's policy and advocacy agenda and development of alternative funding sources.

There was an amendment added to that. First 5 LA staff should report back in November 2013 board meeting with a plan to expand this program to interested hospitals serving at-risk pregnant women.

Yes.

MS. DUBRANSKY: Okay. That -- I would ask for a clarification as to what exactly that means.
MS. BELSHE: I've spoken with the Chair and the intent is for us to come back with a bit more detail in terms of what we recommend that the Board look at to inform consideration about expanding beyond the 14.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Actually that should 15.

MS. BELSHE: Beyond the 15, correct. So it's like what -- a bit more detail about what are some of the considerations, factors, timeline. So that's what's intended by the Chair's motion as I understand it, and it's being affirmed by his deputy.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Any other comments? I'll make one and start calling up some people. If you could all be as brief as you can be because we do really want to get to some other items. Kanetha Gains, Ray Torres -- No. Ray Jones, Brianna Isaacs, Veronica Aguas, Jim Tehan, Aleta Bernall, Kathy Shriner, and Terra Hillard.

My only comment relates to when we do budget estimates, Barbara, that -- Barbara, when we do budget estimates that say we're looking at 80 percent uptake rate and that's how we project it, I think we need to conceptualize this slightly differently. And that is to say, we'd love to get to a goal of 80 percent, but we may make a policy that says we go to 40 percent until other people's money is available or and some other method. And that could really still allow us expand to 15 or even more
if we chose to, but not financially burden us with an obligation of funding up to 80 percent. So I think we need to look at those different models and be able to talk about that. That might help us to understand other people's money, other people's support, and not require us to commit to 42 million or whatever the number was. not for today, but --

MS. DUBRANSKY: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Okay. So I guess Kanetha is first. And mindful two minutes and less would be much appreciated. Thank you.

MS. GAINS: I'll keep it brief. Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Kanetha Gains, and I am here to represent Santa Nella Hospital Medical Center. We are one of the hospitals wanting to participate in the Welcome Baby program. I am the NICU manager, and I am responsible for managing a high-acute nine-bed NICU and working with our labor/delivery, postpartum and nursery to increase our breast feeding rates.

It is important for us to be a resource center for the community and to promote, support, and educate this population that we serve. For 2012, we did an average of 1100 births, predominately Latino and African-American moms, typically low to very low income, and recipients of MediCal. About ten percent of our moms
did not have prenatal care and about five percent of our moms tested positive for drugs. Sixteen percent of all births have to -- were NICU admits. Additional, only 7.7 percent of our births last year left the hospital exclusively breast feeding, well below the county average of exclusive breast feeding.

If anyone needs help and additional resources, it's our population. The Welcome Baby program would be a great asset to our hospital given the resources for moms prenatally and resources for moms post-discharge, which is extremely beneficial for the population that we serve.

We have fostered a great community relationship with Great Beginning For Black Babies, an organization that is well established and well versed in supporting pregnant and parenting women and well -- that will help with the implementation of the program.

We also are a recipient of the First 5 LA Baby Friendly USA grant. And in an effort to help us obtain Baby Friendly status. Baby Friendly, in concert with the Welcome Baby program will be a great resource for the community that we serve.

Thank you for your consideration.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Thank you very much.

MS. BERNALL: Hello. My name is Aleta Bernall.

I am a community affairs representative for Santa Nella.
Thank you. I am -- I was born in an era back in the time when there were five hospitals serving residents in spa 6 and 8. There is currently just one, which is Santa Nella Hospital. Over past 15 years, I have worked for a variety of health care providers seeking to make connections to the Latino and African communities. I worked at Santa Nella when Tenant Health System owned it, Santa Nella Freeman Regional Medical Center, and under Prime Health Care. To date, Prime Health Care is the only owner that has put millions of dollars back into the hospital. We're currently using private dollars to retrofit to meet seismic codes and we just this week announced that we are turning our private rooms into labor and delivery suites scheduled for 2014.

The community -- the hospital is reconnecting and has connected with local resources such as Great Beginnings for Black Babies, and we're also creating public/private collaboratives with FQHCs in our community. So we're here for the long term and we appreciate any and all consideration. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Thank you very much.

Next.

MS. ISAACS: Hello. I'm Brianna Isaacs. I'll keep it really simple. I just wanted to say thank you as a patient of Santa Nella Hospital. I'll be giving birth
there soon. And I'm a client of Great Beginnings for Black Babies. I really want to say thank you. It means a lot. It really does. The help is appreciated.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Do you have pictures of the baby.

MS. ISAACS: Not yet.

MS. HILLARD: Good afternoon. My name is Terra Hillard. I'm the program manager for the Black Youth and Health program at Great Beginnings for Black Babies. I had this great speech, but since we have been approved, Santa Nella Hospital, I just want to say thank you very much. Santa Nella Hospital is greatly needed in the community that we serve. Brianna is just one of many clients that will need the services of Welcome Baby at Santa Nella Hospital. And commissioner left, but that story that he spoke about on the front page of LA Times on Monday happened to be my sister who is a client of Great Beginning for Black Babies who gave birth to a one pound, 15 ounce baby boy and he's doing quite well. And so I'm excited to see what will happen with Santa Nella and Welcome Baby and I look forward to working with you. Thank you.

MR. TEHAN: Good afternoon. I'm Jim Tehan, director of community partnerships for Providence Little Company of Mary. I'm here in support of the staff
recommendation that would include Torrance Memorial Medical Center. This proposal before you presents a unique opportunity for our two medical centers, our San Pedro Medical Center, which is current Welcome Baby grantee, and Torrance Memorial to work together to impact the health and strengthen families in Wilmington. Thank you.


MS. JONES: I'll try to be as brief. Good afternoon, Ms. Belshe, commissioners. I am Ray Jones. I'm executive direct of Great Beginnings for Black Babies, which was founded in 1990 to combat infant mortality in the African-American community. For more than 20 years home visitation has been at the core of our case management services. Through black infant health alone, we serve over 500 sometimes destitute, a lot of times homeless pregnant and parenting women. We are very encouraged today by the relationship that we've built with Santa Nella -- the new Santa Nella over the last year, and we're very encouraged today by your support. Thank you so much.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Thank you. Next.

MS. SHRINER: My name is Kathy Shriner. I'm a member of the guidance body of Best Start Panorama City
and neighbors. And I want to really thank staff for making the recommendation to fund Valley Presbyterian Hospital, which provides 41 percent of the births in our Best Start community. Without that hospital with the current hospitals, we only will serve 24 percent of the births, but with this recommendation, it will be 65 percent of the births. So I urge you to support the recommendation. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: I think that's all. There were two people from the public that must have left and/or didn't want to speak. That's fine.

Any other comments from commissioners?

We have a motion on the floor. Do we still have a quorum?

So is there any further discussion of that motion? Anyone want to hear it again? I read it before. Okay. Hearing -- any objections? No objections. So ordered unanimously. Thank you.

Next item we have I believe --

MS. BELSHE: Mr. Acting Chair, what I'd like to suggest is -- I know the hour is late, but the final item, I would ask the commission's indulgence to spend at least ten more minutes with about five minutes for a presentation by Mabel on the early childhood education landscape project. This will come back to the Board as an
action item in October. And there are resources associated with this body of work. I've really been pleased by the work to date by our staff and in partnership with the Advancement Project. And I know John Kim, one of the co-directors of Advancement Project, is here today as well. But I think this is an important kind of level setting to inform action that will come to you next month. And I know Mabel has had a run-through with P and P where she was very incisive, very quick on point, and I know she can -- I assured her she'd have more time today, but I'm sorry.

MS. MABEL: It's okay.


MS. MABEL: Good afternoon, commissioners. As you will recall, on July 11, 2013, the commission directed staff to develop an environmental scan of the early learning -- of the early care and education landscape in Los Angeles county. The purpose of the landscape is to provide the commission with a comprehensive picture of the ECE-related issues and activities and to inform First 5 LA's consideration of its role in contribution to increasing kindergarten readiness. And, lastly, to really guide future decision making regarding First 5 LA strategies, investments, and partnerships related to ECE
services, workforce, and quality improvement.

The landscape will focus on the current capacity and gaps in relation to services, workforce, and quality improvement and their implications for kindergarten readiness while keeping in mind the whole continuum of out-of-home early learning services including licensed and licensed-exempt care. It will look at the service types, service levels, populations served, funding and resources available.

There are three overarching question that's will guide the work. Number one is, what is the landscape for ECE in LA county, which includes look at impeding and significant federal changes that are looming which could have an impact on the ECE landscape in Los Angeles county. Number two is, what has been past roles, strategies, and their impact around ECE for First 5 LA, other county commissions, and other ECE funders. And, lastly, what are the potential future roles and strategies for First 5 LA and others.

So before you are some of the activities we will undertake to answer the three questions. Please note that these are still being negotiated and therefore in draft form. There are many activities listed on this slide, so in the interest of time, I will focus on a few. In order to answer question one, we will convene an advisory or
stakeholder group to talk about the project orientation, research questions and designs, and to share the initials findings. This advisory group will be convened throughout the project to gain valuable insight about all three questions. The contractor will also assess the needs identified through this landscape and develop recommendations for further cost and research analysis. The contractor will submit a report for each of the findings as they become available. The first one will be due by March 2014.

To answer the second question, the contractor will identify current and past roles, including investments by First 5 LA, other county commissions, and other ECE funders or leaders.

MS. BELSHE: Move the slide.

MS. MUNOZ: Thank you. Then they will identify where possible the impact of past roles or -- the impact of past roles, strategies, or investments. This is to be completed by April 2014.

And to answer the third question of defining possible future roles for First 5 LA and others, the contractor will develop criteria, considerations, and questions for each possible role, conduct specific research on the ECE capacity and needs within the Best Start communities. And, lastly, we will brief the
commissioners at the program and planning committee meetings and the commission meetings at key stages of the project.

So where are we today? We've identified the advancement project, which is a nonprofit organization that provides research and technical support to community planning and advocacy efforts as the contractor to conduct this work based on their unique qualifications. They have the professional expertise. They have the existing relationships with local and state government agencies, foundations, nonprofits, and state and local officials. They have an extensive data use agreements with partners that will enable them to access and analyze data quickly. They have the technology platform, which we all know is healthycity.org, which has an interactive module to help audiences understand findings. And they've done previous work with us in the Save My Seat LA project, which covered extensive research around ECE services and gaps. This will give the project a beneficial head start.

And also because they are a current -- because they are a current contractor, we will have a timely project launch as we will use an existing contract to initiate the work then, given their unique qualifications, we will secure an AB 109 exemption for the rest of the project.
With that said, we're presenting this item for further discussion today. In October, we will submit a budget resolution and include it in the consent calendar. We're expecting for the majority of the work to be completed between October and next May, early June.

So before we open it up for questions and comments, I would like to make a note that we presented this work plan at program and planning committee meeting, and commissioners suggested that, in addition to the work before you, that we consider looking at successful and evidence-based strategies that are being implemented in places other than Los Angeles county relative to the three segments of ECE scan in order to provide us with a benchmark. They also suggested commissioning university faculty to publish white papers to add knowledge to the field. So staff will work with the advancement project and the stakeholder group to assess where there may be gaps in the ECE landscape plan that could be addressed by this additional work.

So now I'll be happy to ask questions.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Well done. In time.

MS. BELSHE: One point I'd like to emphasize, if I may, commissioners, is, number one, thank you, Mabel, for another whirlwind and concise overview of this important project. I think this is a really exciting and
important body of work that we, in partnership with the advancement project with Board support, will be undertaking. I think it will be enormously useful to us as a commission really better understanding the full landscape of early childhood education issues. This is something that Duane, as chair of the program planning committee, has really spearheaded. And I think the point I really want to emphasize is, yes, it will be helpful to us in terms of really thinking through our role and our contribution as it relates to supporting quality ECE and kindergarten readiness, but if we do this right, which is our commitment, it will also be of value to others. So it's not just a conversation, well, what's First 5 LA going to do. It's a broader conversation consistent with the shared responsibility we all have to support quality early education opportunities for all children in LA county.

So I want to underscore, it's not all about us as much as it may always feel like it's all about us, but it's also to help inform what potential roles and strategies others can plan in terms of advancing quality preschool, quality early learning experiences.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Just a word of caution, the augmentation to the advancement project included, I think, everything except for the add-on that Neal and Jonathan
had suggested during P and P last month. And so if that is under consideration, there may need to be additional resources. And I'm not sure, Mabel, if that was taken into consideration because I think the original amount considered the answer -- the answer to the three questions, and the add-on pieces were -- were the academic interconnect and the benchmarking that Jonathan and Neal had suggested during P and P. So there may have to be more consideration given to the amount of the augmentation.

MS. BELSHE: We'll take a look at that and come back with a suggested approach. One of the comments I think I made at the P and P meeting and I know staff have had some discussions with our advancement project colleagues is wanting to include the voice and input of the stakeholder group that's going to be really playing a very important role in this project to help inform where are there some research gaps, what are some of the existing research resources. So we might -- we might come back with an approach that sets aside a little bit of resources to undertake some additional work that's identified. But thank you for that invitation.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: It wasn't an invitation. I just wanted to make sure --

MS. BELSHE: I'm taking it as an invitation.
COMMISSIONER DENNIS: No, it wasn't an invitation. It was a consideration.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Nancy.

COMMISSIONER AU: Just as an additional consideration in terms of looking at early childhood education, there is a very conservative group or group thinking that feel that children can also be made ready for kindergarten even within the context of their own homes rather than in a child care setting, whether it's licensed, unlicensed, or in center based. So is there going to be some consideration to take a look at it, even if it is -- if you want to look at it as a research design, you know, a treated group or untreated group. But is there going to be some consideration there as well?

MS. MUNOZ: I'm sorry. Can you -- for which group?

COMMISSIONER AU: For children that may not necessarily have access to child care in a formalized setting, whether it's center based, home based, or unlicensed. Do you see where I'm going? There are children that are still being kept at home and their first encounter with any structured educational experience is in the -- oftentimes in kindergarten.

MS. BELSHE: So, Nancy, is your question, will the landscape include the full continuum?
COMMISSIONER AU: Exactly, yes.

MS. BELSHE: The answer is yes.

COMMISSIONER AU: Because I think that would help in terms of being able to compare and contrast results as well.

MS. BELSHE: Yeah, it's not specifically focused on resource gaps needs in the context of center-based care. It's looking at the full continuum of early learning.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Duane has a clarification.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: Because what you're describing is called parenting. I mean, it's -- and I don't think this analysis will take into consideration parenting. What we are looking at is an early childhood landscaping because what you just described was just parenting. That's what unlicensed childcare is. 7 is not that's included in.

MS. BELSHE: Family friends and neighbors and formal support.

COMMISSIONER DENNIS: But that's included in the landscape.

MS. BELSHE: It is, and that's the clarification that I think she's seeking.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Yes, that will be included.
Any other questions or comments?

This is great. My comment has to do with, whenever I write a report, I want to know who the audience is. And Kim opened up the door to the audience being broader than just First 5 LA define. And I'd like to see if at the beginning we could define who the audience is beyond ourselves. And you may find that you do different kinds of reporting analysis and other things if the audience is the media, if the audience is universities that train teachers, if the audience are child care providers themselves. So the more that we define who the audience is and most importantly who it's not in some ways, I think it guides the kind of information that we're doing. I don't know what the answer should be, but I think that the group that you pulled together should help us to do that.

Other comments, questions?

So this is not an action item. You'll come back in October with a budgetary requirement for the advancement project. Thank you very much. Good work.

It's seven of 5:00. Do we have other things -- I know there are other things on agenda. Are there other things, madam executive director, that we want to --

MS. BELSHE: In the spirit of pace and calibration, I would like to invite you to review the
final agenda item, which is the zero to five workforce development project, which is a very exciting project that builds upon some really nation-leading work that this organization has funded over the course of the past couple of years. This will be brought to the Board as an action item. I guess I'm testing if the Board has like three more minutes in it or --

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: We have six minutes.

MS. BELSHE: You have six minutes.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: But LAUP sustainability plan --

MS. BELSHE: No, that is tabled along with L3.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: So you've got five and a half minutes now.

MS. BELSHE: Okay. So Lee Werbel demonstrating the nimbleness and alacrity of the First 5 LA staff.

MS. WERBEL: Six minutes.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Five --

MS. BELSHE: No. Actually, you're going to do it in just a -- less than that.

MS. WERBEL: Yes, I am. Good afternoon, commissioners. This short and fast presentation -- can you hear me? Is the mike in the right place -- will provide a brief outline.

There's more -- as Kim mentioned, there's more
detailed program information in the memo which is number action -- agenda item number 14, page 713.

MS. BELSHE: Don't say that.

MS. WERBEL: Okay. Sorry. And there's a deeper discussion of the alignment to the new framework in the -- it's attachment C, page 246. And there are two P-3 program deliverables in your handouts.

So first 5 LA's cross-sector workforce development support began in 2017 when the commission approved a five-year, $2.8 million contract with 0-3 to implement the P-3 workforce development project with the work completed this past June. In 2010, the commission approved $3 million for workforce development as a part of the current strategic plans countywide approach to improve the knowledge and skills of the countywide P-5 workforce, to strengthen families, and support children's healthy development.

The P-3 workforce development project aimed to accomplish the list of objectives with -- across five workforce sectors: Early care and education, early intervention, mental health, physical health, and social services child welfare. Implemented through the establishment of three work groups listed on the slide, the P-3 project was important and significant for First 5 LA. We provided leadership on a national basis through
the implementation of this project.

Convening more than 60 Los Angeles county experts and stakeholders from the prenatal and early childhood field, 0-3 accomplished the project's objectives including creating and field testing what we have since learned to be the nation first P-3 cross-sector core competencies for professionals working in the five sectors.

The workforce development strategy in the current strategic plan seeks to build on the information and resources developed to date through many of First 5 LA's workforce development investments, including the P-3 workforce development project and align them with the strategic plans, goals, and outcomes.

With the P-5 project projecting expanding to include four to five-year olds, First 5 LA will be bringing the core competencies and support to a broader population. With the primary strategies as listed on the slide, the intent of the project is to enhance the knowledge and practice of the P-5 workforce to better support their work with children and families by refining, integrating, and embedding the developed core competencies and accompanying curriculum within and across sectors within the Los Angeles County Health and Human Service delivery system, and community-based organizations.

This project also presents a good example of
First 5 LA -- of a First 5 LA countywide strategy and strong potential for alignment with the new Building Stronger Families framework. As noted on the slide, the P-5 project aligns strongly four of the six core results. Zero to three's cross-sector core competencies focus specifically on the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that make any provider efficient and effective in working with young children and their families.

The P-3 project integrated the protective factors into the development of the core competencies and into the training guides. It is the intent to continue to leverage this approach into the P-5 project to give providers the know-how and ability to build protective factors with families.

The 14 Best Start communities will serve as initial sights for the testing, training, and embedding of the P-5 core competencies with the long-term vision and goal to embed and institutionalize across Los Angeles County. Best Start communities can serve as prototypes given their 16 structure and leadership within the communities with a goal of incremental goal -- growth countywide and service foundational building blocks that will pave the way for countywide embedding of training, practice, and policy. The multiple and diverse sectors represented within the communities also help build
champions for the training work that can greatly benefit the countywide work.

As the P-5 project begins, the alignment between the project and the Building Stronger Families framework and core results can be further emphasized by the activities on this slide. And we're moving on.

In light of the accomplishments experienced through the partnership with 0-3 in implementing the P-3 project, staff will seek approval for 0-3 to implement the P-5 project through 2018 in an amount not to exceed $2.6 million. We believe 0-3 to be the most appropriate entity to implement the P-5 workforce development project. Zero to 3 has worked with First 5 LA for the past five years in developing all related materials for and implementing the P-3 project. Zero to 3 created and field tested, as I mentioned, what we have learned to be the nation's first P-3 cross-sector core competencies for professionals working in five different sectors. Zero to 3 developed and field tested approaches for competency-based training and sustainability and developed detailed recommendations for community-based service agencies, providers, public and private funders, and various county systems that serve the P-3 population.

These recommendations will be informed -- will be used to inform the next steps for the P-5 project.
So supporting, strengthening the workforce provides for an inherent and genuine possibility for sustainability. By approving the $2.6 million over the next five years, First 5 LA will invest in a cross-sector workforce development project that supports a critical population of providers working with and on behalf of parents, infants, toddlers, and their families.

So for our next steps, staff will complete contract negotiates with 0-3 for year one and return to the October meeting to present this memo as an action item for commissioners' consideration of staff's recommendation to implement the P-5 workforce development project effective October 1st and approval year-one contract.

And with that, I'm happy to answer any questions.

MS. BELSHE: Which adorable child is this?
COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: Any comments or questions anyone has?

MS. WERBEL: That was pretty fast.
COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: That was very good.
MS. WERBEL: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: So we'll get this on the October agenda with much more detail, if need be, in terms of what the budget is the first year.
Comments or questions? Any from the public comments? I don't think we have anymore.
COMMISSIONER AU: And this is the best way to end.

COMMISSIONER KAUFMAN: That's kind of how I feel. Motion to adjourn accepted and we adjourn. Thank you very much.

(The meeting was adjourned at 4:59 p.m.)