AGENDA

COMMISSION MEETING
Thursday, November 10, 2011
1:30 pm – 4:30 pm

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

Nancy Au
Jane Boeckmann
Neal Kaufman, M.D., M.P.H.
Alma D. Martinez
Marvin J. Southard, D.S.W.
Evangelina R. Stockwell, Ed.D.
Antronette K. Yancey, M.D., M.P.H.
Ex Officio Members
Duane Dennis
Deanne Tilton
Harriette F. Williams, Ed.D.

Item 1 Call to Order / Roll Call
ACTION

CONSENT CALENDAR: (Items 2-4)

Item 2 Approval of Commission Meeting Minutes
ACTION
  Thursday, October 11, 2011
  Michael D. Antonovich

Item 3 Approval of Monthly Financials
ACTION
  September, 2011
  Tracey Hause

Item 4 Approval of New Contracts and Proposed Amendments
ACTION
  for Existing Contracts and Grant Agreements in Support of
  Initiatives Approved as Part of the FY 2011-12 Programmatic
  Budget for the Period of November 1, 2011 to January 12, 2012
  And Authorize Staff to Complete Final Contract Execution
  Upon Approval from the Board
  Yolanda Bosch
  Antonio Gallardo

COMMISSION: (Items 5 – 19)

Item 5 Presentation to the Commission Chair
INFO
  Jane Boeckmann

Item 6 Announcements by the Commission Chair
INFO
  Michael D. Antonovich

Item 7 Chief Executive Officer’s Report
INFO
  Evelyn V. Martinez

Item 8 Motion to Continue Discussion and Action
ACTION
  on Allocations of Remaining Commission Funds
  Within Each of the Five Approved Funding Strategies
  Michael Antonovich

Item 9 Approval of the Healthy Kids Per Member Per
ACTION
  Month (PMPM) Rate Increase from $72 to $117
  Effective October 1, 2011
  Yolanda Bosch
Item 10 Approval to Use $35,000 from the $990,000 Budgeted in the Program Development Department Budget in the FY 2011-12 Programmatic Budget for Universal Assessment Approved by the Commission on September 8, 2011 in Order to Extend the Contract with HealthReach to Continue Assessment of MAA and TCM Leveraging Opportunities for First 5 LA Universal Newborn Assessments and Best Start Approved Home Visitation Models
  • Teresa Nuno

Item 11 Approval to Extend the Los Angeles County WIC/Dental Visit Collaborative Project for Six Months in the Amount Not-to-Exceed $300,000
  • Teresa Nuno

Item 12 Approval of Recommendation from the Program & Planning Committee:

1) Funding in the amount of $660,000 for an Additional Six Months Commencing January 1, 2012 and Ending June 30, 2012 for the United Way of Greater Los Angeles to Support The Children's Council Work of the Neighborhood Action Councils (NACs) Countywide and Particularly in the Best Start Communities, and Assist First 5 LA's Best Start Communities Staff Increase and Expand Parent Participation in the Best Start Communities' Planning Process; and
2) If This Recommendation is Approved, Authorize First 5 LA staff to Finalize Execution of the Contract Renewal with the United Way of Greater Los Angeles as Fiscal Agent for The Children's Council (Approval for this Amendment can be Found in Item 4)
  • Elizabeth Iida

Item 13 Approval of the GASB 54 Policy Modifications per the Recommendation of the Ad Hoc Executive Committee
  • Tracey Hause

Item 14 Approval of the Revised Records Retention Policy
  • Yolanda Bosch

Item 15 Receive and File Progress Update and Timeline for Implementation of the Public Education Campaign for the Los Angeles County Infant Safe Surrender Program
  • Francisco Oaxaca

Item 16 Receive and File Progress Update From the Kindergarten Readiness Ad Hoc Committee
  • Elizabeth Iida

Item 17 Receive and File Progress Update on the Oral Health & Nutrition Expansion and Enhancement (OHN) Project
  • Teresa Nuno

Item 18 Public Comment

Item 19 Adjourn to a Closed Session of the Board of Commissioners for a Public Employee Performance Evaluation
  • Government Code Section 54957
  • Title: Chief Executive Officer
Item 1

Call to Order / Roll Call
Item 2

Approval of Commission Meeting Minutes

October 11, 2011
FIRST 5 LA
SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES
Commission Meeting
October 13, 2011

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Commissioners:
Michael Antonovich [Chair]
Nancy Au
Jane Boeckmann
Jonathan Fielding [Vice Chair]
Neal Kaufman
Alma Martinez
Marvin (Marv) Southard
Evangelina (Angie) Stockwell
Antronette Yancey

Ex-Officio Commissioners:
Duane Dennis
Deanne Tilton
Harriette Williams

STAFF PRESENT:
Yolanda Bosch, Chief Administrative Officer
Antonio Gallardo, Chief Program Officer
Tracey Hause, Director of Finance
Armando Jimenez, Director of Research & Evaluation
Elizabeth Iida, Director of Program Development
Maria Romero, Executive Assistant

LEGAL COUNSEL:
Craig Steele, Attorney-at-Law

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL:
1. As Mayor Antonovich was going to be arriving late to the meeting, Vice Chair Fielding called the meeting to order at 1:44 pm. Quorum was present.

COMMISSION: (Items 2 – 15)

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

2. Approval of Commission Meeting Minutes – Thursday September 8, 2011

Commissioner Au commented that there were some nuances with the way in which comments stated by her were captured in the minutes. Commissioner Au mentioned that she would be writing a clarification and emailing it to have it incorporated in the minutes. She just wanted to be clear that there would be no misunderstanding regarding her comments.

CEO Martinez asked if the nuances needed to be brought back to the Commission for approval.
Vice Chair Fielding responded that if the nuances did not significantly change the minutes, then he saw no need for the Commission to have to approve the minutes again.

Commissioner Au stated that her comments were in the context of the budget requirements in terms of the structure of the budget as it was being constructed by the department. For her, there was a contradiction in terms of the community investment operations. The Commission really needed to take a better look in terms of how the Commission goes about constructing that particular area or that particular department's budget. From an administrative perspective, when staff is being directed to construct a budget, a general requirement needs to come about how this will be done.

Commissioner Au felt that because of the unique nature of the community investment area, she had concerns that particular requirement was going to restrict this area from actually doing the work. Toward the end of that conversation, the Commission did refer this issue to the Executive Committee, who was looking at the whole budgeting process. This was conversation that she recalled.

Vice Chair Fielding stated that if there was any disagreement after Commissioner Au submitted her change, then that particular issue could be brought back to the Commission for further discussion at the next meeting.

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

5. Chief Executive Officer's Report

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

- **Panel Discussion on Health Care Reform & Childhood Obesity**: On September 30, First 5 LA's Policy Department held a successful panel discussion on health care reform and childhood obesity which drew a crowd of close to 80 people and featured a number of expert speakers. Two Assemblymembers joined the discussion as panelists—Felipe Fuentes of Pacoima, Chair of the Appropriations Committee, and Roger Hernández of Baldwin Park, Assistant Majority Whip. Both spoke about their bills, which aimed to improve children's health.

- **Legislative Update**: Governor Brown signed a number of bills last week that First 5 LA has been tracking, including three of the four bills that had been discussed by the legislators on our panel. One of the bills described at the event and supported by our advocacy efforts was AB 185 by Assemblyman Roger Hernández. This new law accelerates one of the provisions of the Affordable Care Act requiring that insurance companies provide maternity coverage on individual plans. Insurance companies can no longer deny women maternity care coverage, which will mean healthier birth outcomes for women who lack employer based insurance plans.

- **Sweetened Beverages Policy Brief**: The new policy brief on sugar sweetened beverages was released at the panel discussion. The report is the product of a collaboration with the California Center for Public Health Advocacy. It illustrates the dramatic increase in children's consumption of sugary beverages over the decades and how this directly impacts childhood obesity.
• **State Budget**: With regard to the state budget, the news continues to be somber. Everyone is patiently waiting to see what is going to happen with AB 99. The judge is set to make a decision by the end of November.

Commissioner Stockwell referenced the update on Best Start Communities that was reported in the CEO Report. She requested that percentages be provided for parent and community agency participation for each of the meetings held in the Best Start Communities. Her wish is that there be more parent participation at the community meetings than agencies.

CEO Martinez commented that she would ensure that the reporting be consistent. She also reported that she had just completed a series of meetings with the Best Start Communities staff. They are all making a very concerted effort to make sure that a majority of the people at the meetings are parents. Staff is very excited because they have been doing training with parents to make them feel welcome and assuring them and empowering them that they have an equal voice at the table. From experience, once parents are more confident, they become the strongest advocates in the groups regardless of how long a CBO has been in a community or regardless of how long they have been providing a particular service. The goal of Best Start Communities is to empower parents and the staff is doing a wonderful job in making sure that the parents' voice is heard in these communities.

Commissioner Stockwell asked if these meetings were working sessions for parents, not just big functions. CEO Martinez responded that the meetings were working sessions. These working sessions provide an opportunity for staff to meet almost one-on-one with parents. CEO Martinez said that these meetings were trying to explain to the parents exactly what is the intent of Best Start Communities, how parents can play a role in it, and why it is important for parents to be there. These meetings are about staff having an opportunity to meet with parents and for parents also to get to know each other.

Commissioner Au commended the Best Start Communities staff for continuing the work after a significant restructuring. She also commended the leadership for continuing the work and avoiding delays in the process and implementation.

Commissioner Kaufman suggested presenting the information on the community meetings using a table format for easier reading.

Commissioner Tilton asked for a summary sheet to be provided on the outcomes of the bills that First 5 LA is tracking. (NOTE: Commissioner Tilton was provided with this information following the meeting.)

3. Approval of Monthly Financials – August, 2011

   **M/S** (Nancy Au / Angie Stockwell)
   **APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED**

9. Approval of the FY 2011-12 Maximum Administrative Cost Percentage of 2.9%

Vice Chair Fielding commented that a policy decision was made by the Commission at the June meeting which placed a five percent cap on administrative funding. This does not
mean that overall spending is capped at five percent for the First 5 LA staff because they are two components: (1) the programmatic component where there are direct expenditures related to approved programs, and (2) the core administrative component which is financial, human resources, research & evaluation, and general administrative support.

Without the policy taken together, the sum of the fixed staffing expenditures for the three categories (programs, research & evaluation, administrative support) is about $15 million or approximately eight percent of the projected $177 million programmatic budget the Commission approved. If not everything is spent that has been projected, this would be unusual if done, then the fixed administrative staffing costs would exceed eight percent of the direct costs in relation to a drop in programmatic expenditures. For example, in the 2010-2011 annual report which will be considered under Item 7 on page 63, line 52, Commissioners will note that the administrative expenditures as a percentage of the total programmatic expenditures of that fiscal year was 11 percent, which is quite substantial.

Vice Chair Fielding further commented that these figures need to be kept in mind. He also added that projected revenue is estimated between $90 and $95 million in the future. If the same level of administrative core support is maintained, the Commission would be over the five percent, taking away the programmatic piece because the projected revenue is roughly half of this year's approved budget. Over time, attention will need to be given to making sure that the Commission remains within the five percent cap and that it is consistent in the categories that are placed within this five percent as opposed to those categories that are placed in the programmatic side of the budget.

Commissioner Dennis asked if there was an administrative threshold that was decided by the Commission. He said that he did not understand the basis of the conversation.

Vice Chair Fielding stated that the Commission has adopted a five percent cap for core administrative expenses. What was problematic was the differentiation between central expenditures from those that were specifically related to a program. For example, the Best Start Communities staff should not be considered a core administrative expense. This should really be under the Best Start Communities budget. Commissioners are only trying to make this clear. But, also in thinking ahead, a maximum administrative cost percentage of 2.9 is below five percent. However, in looking at what is projected to be spent this year, the administrative costs would exceed five percent.

Director Hause commented that the recommended maximum administrative cost percentage of 2.9 is based on budgeted numbers for operations and programmatic costs for FY 2011-12. The maximum administrative cost percentage was a policy that adopted by the Commission in June 2006 and does lay out how the calculation of this percentage is to be done. The administrative cost percentage being recommended was calculated per the adopted policy. Historically, the Commission has adopted the administrative cost percentage during the June Commission meeting when the operations budget is adopted. However, this year, with not adopting a programmatic budget until September, the calculation was not possible until now. As a result, the approval of the maximum cost percentage is now being presented with the details of the calculation included in the staff report. The Ad Hoc Executive Committee has reviewed the calculation and recommends approval to the full Board of Commissioners.
Commissioner Au asked if this administrative cost percentage was a reflection of this year's budget. Vice Chair Fielding said that was correct.

**M/S (Nancy Au / Marv Southard)**
**APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED**


Vice Chair Fielding stated this comprehensive financial report is an annual report and requires Commission approval prior to the filing the annual report with the State of California and First 5 California. A comparative review of First 5 LA's annual reports since 2004 reveal that the findings in the report were significantly impacted by the Government Accounting Standards Board Statement 54 Policy, which the Commission adopted in June to come into conformance with general accepted accounting standards and principles.

Vice Chair Fielding called the Commissioners' attention to the independent auditor's recommendation on page 123 of the packet. Vice Chair Fielding stated that after the staff presentation, he was to direct the Ad Hoc Executive Committee to report back during the November Commission meeting on developing policies and procedures to operationalize those recommended procedures on page 123.

Director Hause reported that staff was seeking approval of the final draft of the comprehensive annual financial report including the auditors' opinion for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011. She introduced Roger Alfaro, Partner with Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Company LLP, who would be providing a brief update on the documents provided to the Commissioners. Director Hause also reported that the Ad Hoc Executive Committee reviewed the report and recommended approval.

Mr. Alfaro reported that there were four deliverables, in draft, that were intended to be issued upon the Commission's approval.

- **SAS 114 Letter** – This correspondence outlines the Auditor's Responsibility under U.S. Generally Accepted Auditing Standards and OMB Circular A-133. Significant audit findings, if any are discussed in this letter. The Commission did not have any significant findings for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010.

- **Comprehensive Annual Financial Report** – Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co., LLP, Certified Public Accountants, have issued an unqualified ("clean") opinion on First 5 LA's financial statements for the year ended June 30, 2011.

- **Management Letter** – During the course of an audit, certain matters involving internal control and other operational matters are observed by the independent auditors and recommendations are made in the Management Letter. Staff has reviewed all recommendations and will follow-up during the next fiscal year and addresses the issues as indicated in the responses.

- **Single Audit Report** – A single audit is required for all entities who receive more than $500,000 in funding for Federal programs. The Commission receives Federal funding
for Medi-Cal Administrative Activities. The Auditors' Reports on Internal Control and Compliance with Federal requirements are included in the report. The findings, housekeeping in nature, are also included.

Mr. Alfaro commented that the financial statements for the Commission do reflect the new accounting pronouncement, so the fund balance presentation has been changed for the current year presentation. In addition, the financial statements also identify the liability associated with AB 99, which is considered an extraordinary item in the financial statements this year.

The role of the external auditors is to plan and perform the audit; and to obtain reasonable assurance that the financial statements are fairly presented. As part of that process, the external auditors also consider internal controls in order to develop the testing of the year-end financial statement balances. As part of the Commission's financial statement audit, the auditors also perform testing of compliance with the guidelines that are established by the State Controller's Office, applicable to First 5 Commissions. Lastly, the auditors also perform testing as it relates to federal programs under the Single Audit Act.

Regarding the comprehensive financial annual report (CAFR), the external auditors intend on issuing an unqualified opinion indicating that the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An unqualified opinion is also referred to as a clean opinion and is the highest level of assurance that can be provided on the financial statements.

Included within the packet is an internal control report. The internal control report identifies any material weaknesses or significant deficiencies and it will be noted that no material weaknesses were identified during the course of auditors' field work. A management letter has been issued and it provides observations over two areas in the financial statement process that have been communicated to the Commission. On the single audit report and state compliance report, the external auditors have issued an unqualified or clean opinion on the Commission's compliance with State guidelines applicable to First 5 Commissions. The external auditors have also issued an unqualified opinion on the single audit as it relates to the Commission's compliance with federal requirements. The external auditors did note two findings, which are contained within the reports.

Commissioner Au wanted clarification in terms of the recommendations that spoke to the situation that the Commission found itself in when the State was looking at the unspent portion of the Commission's funding. When the Commission would make decisions about initiatives or projects or other program commitments, the Commission would usually allocate a portion of its funds to support that project over a period of time, and it is not just first year, usually extended over the period of the strategic plan, which is up to five years.

Commissioner Au stated that recommendation requested that the Commission have a clearly delineating and formal action to commit resources. She assumed that the Commission's past practice was doing this; but, apparently, this was not the case. Commissioner Au asked what was the difference and what was it that the Commission needed to do differently. Furthermore, Commissioner Au asked that by doing things
differently, were the dollars originally allocated for a project protected so that it would no longer be viewed as so-called unspent, open to fair game, dollars.

Mr. Alfaro responded that for financial statement purposes, the perspective is that there are certain constraints and various clauses of constraints on the resources. The recommendation is identifying that during the course of the audit, the external auditors were testing those balances and looking at the actions that created those constraints. The reason for identifying these recommendations is to clearly delineate for financial statement purposes ensuring the accuracy of that presentation.

Commissioner Au asked how this would look like in terms of the Commission’s decision-making process. She also asked that when this determination was made by the Commission, what should it look like.

Director Hause responded that she would be bringing forth recommendations to the Ad Hoc Executive Committee to include that when allocations are made, there is more specificity in the motions. For example, if an allocation is made, the source of revenue needs to be identified as far as current year revenue, current fund balance, or was the Commission allocating funds for a purpose that was anticipated to be funded by future revenues. This is an important distinction that will be helpful in classifying all actions in accordance with the fund balance. Allocations will be more specific and the documentation of these actions will be done more clearly. From this point on, it is going to be very important to be very clear on all the actions that are taken when it comes to allocating and spending money so that staff can ensure that those actions are classified on a level in the fund balance that truly constrains or commits those funds so that when the State, Governor or whoever looks at the financial statements, they are strongly committed and constrained to the utmost level.

Commissioner Au asked if this meant that, as an example, there was an earlier decision to commit $680 million to universal preschool; but at the time that Sacramento was looking at the Commission’s budget, there seemed to be no consideration in terms of that level of commitment that existed, and at this juncture, the Commission may want to go back and actually put forth clarifying motions so when Sacramento struggles with balancing the budget next year, that the Commission has within its purview the authority to say that those dollars are firmly committed.

Director Hause commented that the concept being discussed by Commissioner Au was the fourth bullet point of the recommendation where a re-affirmation of the committed amounts is done on an annual basis to provide a better year-end audit trail.

Director Hause stated that the Commission needs to reassess how it allocates money. It needs to be clearly documented with motions being extremely clear. An annual re-affirmation would secure this on an annual basis.

Commissioner Au requested of staff to actually do a retrospective of all of the Commission’s previous commitments and to have a staff recommendation that will meet the requirements for a firm commitment. In the future, when motions are presented to allocate funds for projects or initiatives, there should be some kind of guideline for all the motions requesting funding so the Commission is not caught off guard again.
Director Hause commented that Commissioner Au had made excellent points and staff would be coming forward firmly supporting her requests.

MOTION #1:

Vice Chair Fielding made the following motion with regard to the recommendations made in the comprehensive annual financial report.

Direct the Ad Hoc Executive Committee to report back at the November Commission meeting as the first step in the process on the development of policies and procedures to operationalize the recommended procedures on page 123 of the Board packet.

M/S (Jonathan Fielding / Nancy Au)
APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED

MOTION #2:


M/S (Nancy Au / Angie Stockwell)
APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED

7. Approval of the 2010-11 Annual Report to First 5 California (State Commission)

Director Jimenez reported that the process for gathering data begins at the end of summer. He thanked staff and grantees for their hard work.

Director Jimenez reported that the report is a submission of all revenue, expenditure and program data for the Commission. The State Commission has moved toward a web-based reporting process. What is before the Commissioners are examples of two specific forms that are completed in the process: (1) AR-1, which is the financial summary, and (2) AR-3, which is the evaluation summary. Director Jimenez noted that the AR-3 did not represent all of the evaluation activities that First 5 LA conducts during the fiscal year but they are examples that staff are asked to provide. The one limitation of the web-based system is that it restricts the number of characters that can actually be placed in the form. Staff has to be very careful of the amount of narrative that is provided. Staff does not want to slight any program that is not included and also stresses that the AR-3 does not include all the evaluation activities.

Commissioner Stockwell commented the recommendations listed on page 68 relate to all three projects listed and described, not just Family Literacy.

Director Hause commented that First 5 California provides the format in which the financial information is to be reported. This is done to ensure consistent financial reporting across all Counties. The format is very general and might not truly reflect some of the spending categories that First 5 LA adopts per the policy on administrative costs.
Director Jimenez stated that over the course of the fiscal year, First 5 LA has served approximately 114,400 children. In addition, there were approximately 94,200 providers, parents and other family members that were served by the Commission. This is also a reflection of the amazing effort by the partners and grantees that have been connected with the Commission.

Commissioner Kaufman said he was slightly confused. In looking at Item 9, the approval of the administrative budget for next year, it listed operations at $8.1 million and research at $1.6 million. On page 63, it lists administrative expenditures of $14 million and evaluation at $5.2 million. He said he was not sure if the definition of administrative expenditures versus operations was correctly applied.

Director Hause stated that administrative expenditures as captured in this report basically represented all of the Commission's operations. On page 140, the operation budgets for programs, research & evaluation staffing, and administration total approximately $14 million. The evaluation expenditures deal with the consultants and contracts that are in place for evaluation activities which are approximately $5 million.

Commissioner Kaufman then stated that the State Commission uses the $14 million figure in their reporting. Director Hause said that she was not sure how the State specifically does this calculation.

Commissioner Kaufman commented that he thought that in the original proposition language, there was a five percent cap on administrative costs. Director Hause stated that the Commissions follow the financial management guide that was developed in accordance with First 5 California, where administrative costs are clearly broken down as reported on page 140. Director Hause commented that she believes the State does not have a specific threshold; however, this Commission, by policy back in June 2006, adopted a five percent administrative cost rate. What the State looks for is whether a policy has been adopted and if the County Commission is in conformance with the policy. There is no threshold that states that it needs to be five percent.

Legal Counsel Steele commented that there is a requirement that a policy and threshold be in place but Proposition 10 does set the threshold.

Commissioner Kaufman stated that the Commission was not obligated to any particular threshold. Legal Counsel Steele agreed and reiterated that in the mid-2000s, the State Commission came up with a recommended set of guidelines that included a threshold. However, the five percent threshold is a policy of the Commission.

Commissioner Kaufman said that to be clear, that on page 140, the Commission just approved a 2.9 percent for administrative costs but this does not match the numbers submitted to the State Commission.

Vice Chair Fielding referred to page 140 and stated that operations and programs are combined. This has a different definition from the Commission's policy on administrative costs. The information submitted is in the format that the State Commission requires it.

Commissioner Kaufman stated that he just wanted to see if the Commission was within its five percent threshold and what number was being used.
Director Hause commented that the administrative cost percentage was based on the policy adopted by the Commission but it could also be readdressed. Commissioner Kaufman said that he was not suggesting this but wanted to understand the information being presented. He also said that he would take this issue up offline.

Commissioner Kaufman asked why an overall Commission evaluation was not presented to the State Commission. Director Jimenez stated that the Commission can only provide what the State Commission asks for. From the State Commission’s perspective, when overall evaluations were requested, there were so many different types of evaluations that the individual County Commissions would submit that it was very difficult for the State Commission to aggregate them in any meaningful way. This is why the State Commission moved toward a web-based system where they can extract the narrative pieces that they want, the program pieces are all in the same format, and the financial pieces are also in the same format.

Director Jimenez commented that in the future, the Commission will be in a better position to do an overall County-wide evaluation report given the current direction of projects.

Commissioner Kaufman asked if there was a yearly overall evaluation report of projects compared to the goals and objectives even though the science is not all there. Director Jimenez responded that at this time, the Commission does not have such a report.

M/S (Angie Stockwell / Marv Southard)
APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED

4. Announcements by the Commission Chair

None.

6. Motion to Continue Discussion and Action on the Allocations of the Remaining Commission Funds Within Each of the Five Approved Funding Strategies

As there is nothing to report regarding the pending lawsuit, Vice Chair Fielding made a motion to continue this item to the November Commission meeting. If the lawsuit is successful for the County Commissions, then this item will be withdrawn.

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

12. Approval of First 5 LA Commission Activity Break Policy Motion

Commissioner Yancey commented that at last month’s Commission meeting, an opportunity became available to incorporate instant recess or brief bouts of physical activity. This was an intervention initially developed when she worked as the Director of Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion for Los Angeles County. Commissioner Yancey stated that this Commission needed to catch up with the Orange County Health Agency in being able to better integrate and really represent for the grantees and the County, as a whole, the desire, the commitment to childhood obesity prevention and preventing sedentariness and promoting health and well-being. This was not just about
SUMMARY ACTION MINUTES

obesity but overall cognitive improvements. Children actually need physical activity to fully develop bones, brains, muscles and organ systems. As adults, benefits can be gained in cognitive processing, especially executive function. In terms of the entire move, the only major commitment that has been announced is the Partnership for a Healthy American that involves physical activity with a preschool commitment.

The motion before the Commission is the formalizing of what Commissioners informally agreed to at the last meeting in September. Some of the elements for introducing the motion was that there is a major problem in that one in four California children are overweight or obese. This amounts to over 10 percent of the population of zero to five year olds in Los Angeles County. Children are being diagnosed with diseases linked to overweight and obesity that were previously only seen in adults. In most instances, this has not gotten to the zero to five population; but, in serving on the Institute of Medicine Standing Committee on Childhood Obesity Prevention, seven and eight year olds on some of the American Indian Reservations develop diabetes.

Prolonged sitting is found to be associated with poor health. Not only not getting the 30 minutes a day, five or more days a week is a problem but prolonged sitting is also a problem. Commissioner Yancey commented that she was approached by the Superintendent of Public Instruction to co-chair an initiative called Team California for Healthy Kids that will be launched a week from today in Santa Clara County with a launch in Southern California at a later time.

A centerpiece of this campaign will be physical activity and particularly activity breaks just because it is one of the doable things for people in a variety of settings. The Superintendent is encouraging the preschool population to have 10-minute bursts of movement, moderate to vigorous physical activity whenever seat time exceeds 30 minutes.

First 5 LA has from its inception recognized that obesity is a serious public health problem and that individual effort alone is not sufficient. First 5 LA needs to change society, social norms and make prolonged sitting as socially unacceptable as smoking or drinking and driving or riding in cars unrestrained. Obviously, the Commission has had tremendous public health successes in many areas, especially tobacco control. Commissioner Yancey stated that the Commission can have similar successes if the Commission takes the kinds of actions like incorporating activity breaks into the regular function to schools, work places, churches and other religious institutions and certainly civic meetings and other functions.

Commissioner Yancey introduced her motion that the First 5 LA Commission will set an example for other businesses and agencies by implementing the following policies:

1. Establish a 5-10 minute physical activity break in every public Commission meeting;
2. Establish at least one 10-minute physical activity break in meetings lasting more than one hour in length;
3. Encourage other County agencies and other organizations in Los Angeles County to adopt similar activity break integration policies;
4. Encourage First 5 LA grantees to adopt similar activity break integration policies for conferences, meetings, events, functions, and other convenings sponsored by First 5 LA; and
5. Identify opportunities for collaboration with similar initiatives such as the TEAM California for Healthy Kids campaign to promote increased physical activity among
children ages 0-5 and their families.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT:

Vice Chair Fielding proposed the following friendly amendment:

Establish at least one, 5-10 minute physical activity break in meetings lasting more than one hour in length.

The friendly amendment was accepted by Commissioner Yancey.

Commissioner Kaufman commented that he was quite intrigued, actually thought it was silly at first, and then realized that symbolism does matter. Certainly, the extra 10 minutes of walking or movement in the next hour is not going to help the Commission prevent diabetes but Commissioners do know that symbolism matters and being able to show people that the Commission “walks the walk” and “talks the talk” by improving the food and nutrition environment. It really does make a huge difference and there is great evidence that sitting down is not good for blood circulation to the brain.

Commissioner Au said that this motion brings back fond memories of growing up in a Japanese American home. Her parents enrolled her in Japanese language school which she attended after school every day. One of the things that always started the class was to stand up and stretch and do a bit of calisthenics. It is really interesting for her, when she talks about cultural competency and the movement towards all cultures becoming integrated; and taking it a step further, is really also cultures being able to share. What really is quite wonderful and in talking about symbolism, is that this might be a real opportunity for the Commission to take a look at the various cultures that make up Los Angeles County and begin to open up hearts and minds to some of the wonderful practices that are based on wonderful traditions and history that truly grounded the thousands of years of civilizations that many of these cultures come from. Commissioner Au applauded the proposed motion because it brought her back to her childhood and when she had to start her classes with standing up, breathing, stretching and acknowledging the fact that people are more than just their minds. People are also about their bodies.

Commissioner Yancey said that one of the underpinnings of instant recess is the idea that it is built upon cultural assets, namely those in Asia—Japan and China. In Beijing, instant recess has just been reinstated city-wide at a certain time of day. That is exactly what the Commission should do. There are over 35 DVDs and CDs with a variety of music from different cultures.

Vice Chair Fielding commented that Commissioner Yancey is a national leader in this field. She has promoted the idea of instant recess and it is really taking hold in a lot of different places around the country and around the world. Vice Chair Fielding said the Commission was very fortunate to have her here and to push Commissioners to do this but also understanding how to make it work.
Vice Chair Fielding offered the following three comments regarding the motion.

1. Regarding bouts of exercise, the last time he heard bouts, it referenced illness.
2. Anybody who has to deal with the Commission will be very happy to know that these exercises improve cognitive function.
3. This is the first motion that has talked about "motion."

Commissioner Yancey announced that an Instant Recess Toolkit was available free of charge for download. It is targeting workplaces including all schools and preschool programs.

**AMENDED MOTION:**

The First 5 LA Commission will set an example for other businesses and agencies by implementing the following policies:

1. Establish a 5-10 minute physical activity break in every public Commission meeting;
2. Establish at least one, 5-10 minute physical activity break in meetings lasting more than one hour in length.
3. Encourage other County agencies and other organizations in Los Angeles County to adopt similar activity break integration policies;
4. Encourage First 5 LA grantees to adopt similar activity break integration policies for conferences, meetings, events, functions, and other convenings sponsored by First 5 LA; and
5. Identify opportunities for collaboration with similar initiatives such as the TEAM California for Healthy Kids campaign to promote increased physical activity among children ages 0-5 and their families.

M/S (Antronette Yancey / Neal Kaufman)
APPROVED AS AMENDED

(A short 10-minute physical activity break was taken.)

**NOTE:** Mayor Antonovich arrives and assumes leadership of the meeting.

10. Request for Clarification on Action Item 8 of the September 8, 2011 Commission Meeting, “Approval of Motion Extending Timelines for Best Start Communities Ramp Up and Potential Extension of Grantee Funding to Coincide with the Best Start Planning Process”

Mayor Antonovich stated that the motion seeks staff clarification with the recommendation for the Program & Planning Committee to determine whether five specific contracts on the list of 54 contracts with a December 31, 2011 termination dates should also be extended through June 30, 2012 along with the 48 other contracts.

Director Hause commented that funding for these additional contracts was not incorporated into the programmatic budget. As a result if the motion is approved, she will need to bring back at the next meeting with an amendment to the programmatic budget for these five contracts.
Commissioner Yancey thought that these five contracts were part of the 54 contract extensions that the Commission approved. Apparently, there was some uncertainty as to whether these contracts were included with the other contracts. She asked if these five contracts were originally part of the 54 contracts approved for a funding extension.

CPO Gallardo responded that these five contracts were included in the list of 54 contracts; however, no formal motion was made at the time when the Commission agreed to extend the grantees through June 2012 and there was no clarification on these five contracts. What staff is seeking is clarification at the Program & Planning Committee.

CEO Martinez commented that there is a distinction between grantees and contractors. Contractors are hired to do a specific task with a time certain end date. Contractors are normally used by staff as consultants or resources to do tasks that staff does not have the internal resources. This is the distinction between a grant and a contract. This is a very important distinction in this particular case.

Commissioner Stockwell asked staff what was the specific timeline and if the scope of the contract had been completed. CPO Gallardo responded that in the case of the five contracts that are the subject of the clarification motion, all of them, with the exception of one, are scheduled to end on December 31, 2011. All of the contracts are on track and are complying with the requirements of their respective contracts. They are scheduled by project design to end on December 31, 2011. The only contract that by design is scheduled to run through December 31, 2012 is contract 07531 with the Children’s Dental Foundation because the project period was until December 31, 2012.

Commissioner Stockwell again asked if the scope of the contract was completed. She also asked how the other contracts were doing with regard to their scope. CPO Gallardo responded that the contracts are on track and moving along according to schedule and ending on December 31, 2011.

Commissioner Au stated that part of the confusion with last month’s action was that in some ways the motion that was presented really came with almost two different actions—one action was to extend the existing grantees as well as contracts to the end of the fiscal year; and the second piece was the request that the Commission come up with criteria in terms of what projects or grantees were going to be extended beyond the fiscal year because they would still continue to be consistent with Best Start or strategic plans. For clarity sake, she asked if a do-over could be done making it very clear that one action is to extend the contracts as well as the grantees through the end of the fiscal year and the second piece is that the Commission convene an ad hoc committee that is going to look at determining the criteria that would be utilized to determine what contracts and grantees are going to continue beyond June 30, 2012.

Commissioner Kaufman said that although the motion was specific to the various grantees—School Readiness, Family Literacy, Family Friends & Neighbors, Healthy Births—in that they were going to be extended until the end of the fiscal year. On the same list of programs were five additional contractors who were also ending their contracts December 31, 2011 but the language of the entire motion did not mention those five contracts at all. To him, the issue was whether the grantees were going to be extended and if a process was going to be set up through the Program & Planning Committee to look at this. The contractors were never discussed. Commissioner Kaufman recommended that
the Commission not approve the five contracts and continue them to next month when more information can be available.

Commissioner Au commented that at the time the original motion was presented, she did not have the distinction between grantees and contractors. This was not made clear and she did not have that understanding. When she voted in support of the motion, it was assuming that it reflected all of the 54 contracts that were listed on the addendum sheet. When each of projects and contracts are counted, they add up to 54. The motion does state 54 and she assumed it referred to both.

Commissioner Dennis asked what would be the additional allocation needed to cover these contracts through the end of the fiscal year and what would then be the program budget total. Director Hause responded that the allocation was estimated to be $2.5 million for six months bringing the total programmatic budget to $180 million.

Commissioner Dennis commented that the whole of idea of continuation was to transition these programs into the Best Start areas. He asked how do these particular contracts interject with the goals around Best Start. He also asked if there was any connection between these five contracts and what the Commission was doing in the Best Start Communities and also what it was trying to do about the transitioning into the Best Start Communities.

CEO Martinez said that each contract would need to be taken on a case-by-case basis. For example, there would be no reason to extend the contract for Park Water Company because it is a contract for construction related to the fluoridation project. Extending their contract and giving them more money does not make any sense because this contractor already told the Commission what it would cost to do the capital improvement.

Commissioner Dennis stated that CEO Martinez was speaking to his point. He does not know if it is even prudent to look at these five contractors collectively and perhaps there needs to be some kind of consideration individually. Commissioner Dennis said that he did not know if this decision could be made today. He felt this issue should go back either to the Program & Planning Committee or the Ad Hoc Executive Committee.

Commissioner Au stated that the Park Water Company was a pretty clear situation in terms of it being a contract for building capacity to do fluoridation. When talking about the goals of oral health that are embedded in the Best Start work, then it becomes a question mark as to the dental health piece, the children dental piece, and so on. Her assumption was that was why the conversation of what criteria would be utilized would also applied to these contracts and grantees was going to be delegated to the Program & Planning Committee for them to convene an ad hoc committee to make that determination. Commissioner Au said this was her understanding.

Commissioner Dennis said that he agreed with Commissioner Au. He said that he did not think the Commission had the capacity to deal with this motion today knowing that a couple of these contracts have nothing to do with Best Start. He recommended that this issue be tabled until next month.

Commissioner Au commented that the Program & Planning Committee did meet on October 15 and there were two ad hoc committees that had been delegated the task of
making that determination. From her vantage point, the confusion as to whether or not the extension and the work was going to include all 54 that were listed on the addendum sheet. The Commission only made a decision to move the school readiness grantees to the ad hoc committee that was dealing with pre-kindergarten issues. The other ad hoc committee that was convened was to deal with the Healthy Births grantees. At that time, she raised the question about The Children's Council work, which is the relationship based organizing work that they have been actively involved in within the Best Start implementation process. Commissioner Au stated that she had not been clear about dental health and children health. She further stated that she assumed this was the other part of the conversation that was going to be dealt with through the ad hoc committee work.

Commissioner Dennis said that he was in agreement with Commissioner Au. However, he did not think it was a five contract bucket. Furthermore, Commissioner Dennis said that he did not know if the Commission had the analysis to make a determination as to those contractors that should move forward versus those that should not move forward.

Commissioner Au said that the other reality is the Commission is into October and the next time this question comes up will be in November and these five contracts are scheduled to end at the end of December. There is only one Commission meeting after today because the Commission usually does not meet in December. Commissioner Au stressed that she was concerned about the time constrain.

Commissioner Dennis said that he understood the time restrains. Nonetheless, this is coming across as a five contract motion.

Mayor Antonovich clarified that Commissioner Au was asking staff to come back with a recommendation on whether those five contracts should be included for an extension through June 30, 2012. The review would be done through the Program & Planning Committee.

Commissioner Kaufman was in agreement and stated that the discussion could take place in a public meeting followed by a vote of the voting members of the Program & Planning Committee.

Commissioner Kaufman asked if any of the contractors had unspent funding that could be continued to be spent through a no-cost extension.

CAO Bosch said that the contractors, with the exception of the Children's Dental Foundation since it has one more year of funding, are aware that the end date is December 31, 2011. Some of the contractors are already initiating the close-out process.

Commissioner Au proposed the following motion:

Given the time constraints, at least for the four contracts listed, that the Commission continue their contract until the Program & Planning Committee gets to work on the criteria. Contracts 07186, 07441 and 07534 are to be extended to the end of the fiscal year and the Program & Planning Committee will work on the criteria as to whether these contracts will continue beyond the fiscal year.
Commissioner Kaufman said that he was not clear on the motion. He asked Commissioner Au if the intent of her proposed motion was to give these contractors six more months of funding. Commissioner Au responded in the affirmative.

CEO Martinez thought that the intent of the motion was to refer the potential funding extension of these contractors to the Program & Planning Committee.

Commissioner Au said that her motion was for six more months of funding beyond the end of December and then for continuing beyond the fiscal year, while the Program & Planning Committee was able to come up with criteria to determine that.

CEO Martinez said this was really confusing for staff because the question then comes up of how other contractors will be treated.

Mayor Antonovich asked if every contract was going to be continued.

Commissioner Au said that she was trying to be congruent with what she assumed was the spirit of the original motion which was to extend the existing grantees and contractors that were listed on that addendum sheet to go through at least the end of the fiscal year. She turned to Helen Berberian and Mayor Antonovich as the originators of the first motion and asked what was the intention of their motion.

Ms. Berberian responded that Best Start was the intention of the motion. The Best Start planning process was not ready to turn in strategic plans by December. The list of contracts was submitted to the Mayor's Office by First 5 LA staff. The intent was not to break services and when the list was submitted, all were to be addressed uniformly.

Commissioner Au said that she was trying to honor the original motion.

CAO Bosch stated that her understanding was that a request was made of staff to provide a list of all grants and contracts that had an end date of December 31, 2011. The list that was provided was strictly with relationship to Best Start. The list included any grant or contract that was going to end December 31, 2011. The contracts that were listed at the end were contracts that were to end by December 31, 2011. There was no connection necessarily with Best Start. The memo that was produced by staff last month was specific to the grants that were going to end by December 31, 2011. These five contracts could have been taken off the list because they were not relevant to Best Start but they were not and hence the issue being discussed.

Commissioner Au said that what she is hearing from Mayor Antonovich and Helen Berberian was that the intent of the original motion was to really capture all 54 contracts listed on the addendum sheet.

Commissioner Kaufman commented, that in his opinion, the language of the motion described the need for the grantees in School Readiness, Family Literacy, Family Friends & Neighbors and Healthy Births to be extended for six months. He realized that the other contracts were listed but the entire motion was about extending the grantees. It seems to him that each contract needs to be evaluated independently and prefers the motion to say that no later than next month's meeting, a decision will be made to extend the contracts for six months or end the contracts through the Program & Planning Committee with a formal
recommendation to the Board in November. Commissioner Kaufman said he understood why the other contracts were extended but was unsure about extending these five contracts as he was not familiar with them. For example, he is unaware of the work that is being done by The Children's Council.

Commissioner Au said that she was aware of the work that was being done by The Children's Council because she has been getting feedback from the Best Start staff that The Children's Council is actively involved in Best Start. Commissioner Au stressed that she wanted to be congruent with the original intent of the motion.

Commissioner Williams commented that she was concerned about the oral health thrust. This would be her first reason for waking up to deal with this issue. Commissioner Williams asked that in extending the contract, did it mean more money or just more time.

CEO Martinez responded that it was both—money and time.

Commissioner Williams said that if it was a time issue, this did not bother her. However, if this was a money issue, she believed the issue needed to be referred to the Program & Planning Committee to find out about the specifics.

CEO Martinez stated that there was a definite financial impact.

CAO Bosch stated that these contracts were set to end and with an extension, staff would need to figure out something for these contractors to do with the extra money that was not anticipated because the contracts were for a specific period of time with specific scopes of work. If these contracts do not end, then the scopes of work would need to be revised.

Vice Chair Fielding stated that some Commissioners may have some individual knowledge about the contractors like Commissioner Au but felt that not everybody did. He thought it would be helpful to go through the usual process so that all Commissioners have the background and understand the pros and cons of extending them. If this could be done, then a decision can be made at the November meeting. He argued that this issue come back in November with the analysis having gone through the Commission's usual process. Although he was not present at the last Commission meeting, there was a clear rational for extending all of the grantees which was to synchronize them with the Best Start development. The same clarity does not exist with these contracts.

RESTATEMENT OF MOTION:

Commissioner Au restated the motion that she had made earlier in the discussion as follows:

The Commission continue contract 07186, 07441, 07534 to the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 2012. The criteria for continuing those contracts beyond June 30, 2012 be delegated to the Program & Planning Committee based on the Best Start or the new strategic plans.

Commissioner Au said that the spirit of the original motion in September was to ensure that the planning process that the communities were engaged in get the additional six months to submit their plans and the Commission wanted to retain the community capacity.
for them to possibly incorporate into their community plans. The thinking was that if the Commission dismantled this capacity prematurely, then it would cost the Commission more and the communities would have to start from scratch if they wanted to retain those programs and services.

Commissioner Southard reminded Commissioner Au that Vice Chair Fielding had made the friendly amendment of this action taking place after a review by the Program & Planning Committee with any action by the Commission to take place in November.

Commissioner Au said that she was back at the point where she wanted to honor the intent of the original motion presented in September when she assumed the Commission authorized all 54 of contracts.

Commissioner Southard said that there were some errors; one of the 54 contracts being the infrastructure for fluoridation.

Commissioner Au said that staff did not acknowledge this at that time. So the Commission made its decision based on what was presented by staff.

Commissioner Southard said that information included some errors. The additional time would be to sort those were errors from those that are truly consistent with the intention of the previous motion.

Commissioner Au reiterated that she wanted to honor the original motion.

CEO Martinez said that staff also wanted to honor the intent of the original motion. What staff provided to the Board Office was, at their request, a list of all grantees and contractors that were ending at the end of this calendar year, which is the information that was submitted. As Commissioner Kaufman said, the discussion at last month's meeting centered around grantees whose grants were going to end in December and extended them through June 2012 to coincide with the community plans that will be received from the place-based communities. She wanted to make sure that there is no error, per se, but staff submitted what was requested of them. Now, staff is trying to get clarification on what seems to be a logical contract to extend; and, perhaps The Children's Council Foundation is one of those that could possibly be recommended for continued funding. Staff knows that other contractors like the Dental Health Foundation, in spite of all the good work that is being done with WICs, are already closing down. If a decision is going to be made to fund them for another six months, then they will need to ramp back up. She felt that this issue really needed to be referred to the Program & Planning Committee for further discussion and understanding of what each of these contracts represent to see whether, in fact, they merit that extra six months of funding.

CEO Martinez said that she would not be talking about funding beyond six months because they are contracts and the Commission could get itself into legal hot water by extending contracts indefinitely without going through a competitive bid process for the work to be done. CEO Martinez also commented that the Commission needed to be thoughtful about how contracts are extended versus grants.
ROLL CALL VOTE FOR MOTION MADE BY COMMISSIONER AU:

Michael Antonovich  Yes
Nancy Au  Yes
Jane Boeckmann  Yes
Jonathan Fielding  No
Neal Kaufman  No
Alma Martinez  Abstain
Mary Southard  No
Angie Stockwell  No
Antronette Yancey  No

MOTION FAILS
(3-5-1)

Vice Chair Fielding made the following substitute motion:

Direct staff to work with the Program & Planning Committee and come back with specific recommendations on these contracts no later the November Commission meeting for definitive action by the Commission.

M/S (Jonathan Fielding / Neal Kaufman)

WITHOUT ANY OBJECTION, THE MOTION WAS SO ORDERED


Mayor Antonovich reported that back in September, Commissioner Kaufman had a motion directing the return of early learning endowment fund in the amount of $87.2 million to LAUP's current and future operations in accordance with the current contract and modified as follows: setting up LAUP maximum annual payments of $64.75 million to the end of 2016; mandating that LAUP maintain 10,760 preschool spaces; instructing LAUP to create an LAUP sustainability fund derived from operational savings realized over the term of the contract; unrestricted fundraising, revenue generating ventures or earned interest; requiring LAUP by May 2012 to begin reporting to First 5 LA every six months on the development of a sustainability approach for services beyond 2016. Also included in the motion was a directive to extend the time to expand the supervisory demonstration project allocations in the amount of $15 million across all five supervisory demonstration project districts to June 30, 2016. The Commission unanimously adopted the last directive in September and continued the first three directives to the November meeting. Based on the decision to continue those three directives from Commissioner Kaufman's original motion, LAUP Commissioner Liaisons Boeckmann, Martinez and Stockwell met on September 14 and September 26, and following are recommendations from those discussions.

Commissioner Martinez reported that at the September 26 meeting with the Board and staff of LAUP, it was agreed that the aspects of the sustainability plan that was presented to the Commission on May 20, 2011 needed to be revised. It was agreed that the money should move forward in concept and go back to the sustainability plan for revisions. In that sustainability plan, one of the goals and requirements for LAUP was to do some fundraising
targets and milestones. Part of this was to request 10 percent on the part of the providers. This could be anything from fundraising to parent fees, depending on what the structure was for that particular provider. Since then, there is new information that suggests that in these economic times, it is difficult to make that requirement of the providers. As a result, the opinion is now that consideration should be given to using the endowment to help with bridging that gap. As a committee, everyone feels that some time is needed to go back and realign that new $87 million being put forward to LAUP with the existing performance-based contract. The committee wants to make sure that the $87 million that are moving forward have the same regulations and deliverables as the original money that was given to LAUP. The endowment is a loan. She believes it is this Commission's intent to move more towards a grant. Given this, the language of the endowment also needs to be changed. A renegotiation of this new money needs to take place between First 5 LA and LAUP. It is the intent of the committee for services not to be cut and there is some thinking of moving the initiative to 2016. As a result, the sustainability plan needs to be reviewed and adjustments made based on the new information.

Commissioner Stockwell said that in the written report provided to Commissioners, staff listed suggestions and examples of things that need to be reviewed in the contract. As the committee continues to meet with LAUP, every piece of the contract needs to be reviewed carefully and independently so that the spirit of what LAUP was envision to do is maintained. For instance, if the initiative passes, the Commission may want LAUP to reimburse some of the endowment fund.

Commissioner Martinez said that if there was another way of creating another endowment or a reserve for a rainy day that the Commission should try to do this through the return of some dollars when the organization might have other resources.

Commissioner Dennis was one who suggested that if parent fees prohibited young children from getting into LAUP, then the fees should be disregarded. At the same time, fees are common in childcare. He does not want LAUP to believe that parent fees should not be charged but at the same time, LAUP should make sure that parent fees do not prohibit a child from getting into an LAUP space.

Commissioner Dennis also stated that the endowment was contingent on being successful on the lawsuit. If the Commission does not get the $424 million, then it needs to go back to the drawing board.

Commissioner Stockwell stated that in looking at grantees, although there are hard economic times, this is when grantees and foundations should be more aggressively looking for money. As an example, even under bad economic times, the Community Investments Department generated $8 million and will hopefully continue that strong effort. There is no reason why LAUP should not continue to fundraise and take a more progressive stand.

Commissioner Boeckmann reported that the committee agreed that LAUP should do all that they possibly can to help sustain themselves.

Vice Chair Fielding stated that this was a big ask on behalf of LAUP to change this money which was intended as a loan to basically a grant. There is a good partnership that has evolved in terms of developing a performance-based contract, monitoring it and modifying it as necessary. It would be a shame not to continue this and to understand how providing
this money would, in fact, modify the performance criteria. This is something that the Commission should do alone but in close collaboration and negotiation with LAUP. He does not know about fundraising, what is realistic, how much can be paid—but it is something that is worth looking at.

Vice Chair Fielding said that he was concerned long term that if LAUP is not successful in its fundraising efforts whether its through the political process or more traditional ways, this Commission is going to be in a very difficult situation and end up being just the LAUP Commission and not the First 5 LA Commission. This was his concern initially when the Commission decided to give $580 million to LAUP. This is not LAUP's fault. It is the fault of the Commission but it is something of concern.

Vice Chair Fielding said that whatever was done, it has to be contingent on First 5 LA being successful in its lawsuit. If $424 million is to be given to the State, the Commission will need to prioritize everything it has because everything will be on table. He does not think that it would be fair or appropriate to have LAUP exempt from this process because every other aspect of what the Commission does (Best Start, county-wide initiatives) would be called into question.

Commissioner Kaufman said that he was trying to understand the difference between a motion and approval of a contract. Many of the things in the recommendations from the Liaisons have to do with negotiating a contract. It seems to him that the Commission could tie hands by having a very specific motion approved. Conceptually, there are only a few big pieces. One is the Commission agreeing that the money that was going to be loaned and paid back would become a grant. This is a big policy. Assuming that there is a vote for that, and that there is an expectation that LAUP come back and show a sustainability plan, the other things such as the performance incentive plan and targets are things within the new contract. The Commission is safer not putting those things into the motion because maybe it is decided that this does not make the best sense and then have to come back and revise what the Commission had already done.

Commissioner Kaufman said that if the Commission took the motion that he had, hold off on AB 99, see if there is anything that does not make sense, and then go through contract negotiations for final Commission approval.

Vice Chair Fielding asked why there would not be a motion to grant approval in concept and ask staff working with the LAUP Commissioner Liaisons to go back and work with LAUP in a collaborative fashion and return with a very specific proposal, which would be the terms of the contract.

Commissioner Kaufman that there was a natural contract renewal phase that takes place in May or June of each year that includes progress reports. There is a normal performance-based contract review which is going to happen in five or six months. The only reason he thought it made sense to give them the future planning of this being a grant and not a loan is that this way LAUP can do better future planning. This was the key purpose. Given this, a lot things being discussed may stay in the contract and there may be other things to be added. If there is agreement to tell LAUP that this money is going to be there then terms be defined as part of the contract negotiations.
Vice Chair Fielding asked what would be the incentive for LAUP if the Commission simply approved the grant. What would be the incentive for LAUP to come to the table and collaborate and negotiate.

Commissioner Kaufman said that it would be the same incentive that currently exists because the Commission still has control over whether LAUP gets its money and whether the contract obligations are met and accepted by the Commission. The fact that approximately $30-$40 million is added over a couple of years does not change anything.

Vice Chair Fielding asked when would LAUP start using these funds if approval was granted. Commissioner Martinez said LAUP would begin to use the funds in fiscal year 2013-2014.

Commissioner Martinez said that the recommendation is asking for a three month period to go back and negotiate the contract with LAUP. Some of the tenets of the sustainability plan may need to be revisited. This is why there is a need to further discuss the contingencies around the reallocation.

Vice Chair Fielding asked Celia Ayala, LAUP CEO, when the money would be needed for operational purposes. Dr. Ayala responded the way LAUP is currently organized as a network and it continues to serve 10,760 children, LAUP would need to get some of the endowment funding the coming fiscal year. The LAUP providers need to be notified in December or not later than January if change will take place to the way things have been done. In particular, school districts that cannot commit to a 10 percent match, need to let their teachers know by March. The issue for LAUP is that if there is going to be a change on how it was planned to begin reducing children starting July 1, 2012, LAUP would like to know now if the endowment will be available next year.

Dr. Ayala stated that LAUP was going to continue to fundraise. The issue for LAUP to assure a better success rate for its initiative is to be able to go out to the public with something that is working and is whole, not something that is coming apart. LAUP is pursuing 2014 as the year to go forward with an initiative because if LAUP waits until 2016, these dollars will end in 2016. The sooner LAUP moves forward with the initiative, the better.

Dr. Ayala assured the Commission that LAUP was only going to use from the endowment what is needed to maintain 10,760 slots. Whatever is not used stays in the endowment to ensure longer life for more children.

Commissioner Martinez stated that specific fundraising goals for the parents, schools and providers would be written into the contract terms.

Vice Chair Fielding asked Dr. Ayala that if the Commission approves the endowment contingent upon the successful contract negotiations and AB 99 lawsuit, would it be enough time for staff to come back for final approval in January 2012. Dr. Ayala said this would not upset the timeline. The issue is the approval in concept which LAUP will then pursue successful contract negotiations with mutually agreed upon terms.

Dr. Ayala further stated that the urgency was knowing that LAUP could continue with the existing providers serving 10,700 children.
Commissioner Kaufman asked what would happen when a provider went away, how would the 10,760 slots continue to be filled. Dr. Ayala said that LAUP would continue to actively recruit providers.

Commissioner Martinez asked what has been the past operating procedures for LAUP in notifying providers of potential closures. The practice has been for LAUP to come to the Commission in March with a general plan of what would be the level of funding and the strategies. These would be key issues in the performance-based contract including the level of enrollment that was targeted for next fiscal year. LAUP would then return to the Commission in May with a budget and performance matrix.

Commissioner Martinez stated that approving this motion in concept would be much more generous than the Commission has typically been with respect to notifying providers on funding status.

Commissioner Stockwell asked when LAUP has notified school districts of potential cuts. Dr. Ayala responded that LAUP has been very fortunate to date in that it has not had a reduction in terms of school districts. School districts require that any changes in funding be communicated as soon as possible but no later that early January because they have to prepare their Board agendas for the February meeting if there will be reductions in force as it pertains to teachers given that teachers must be notified by March 15. This is the time issue for LAUP. There are 30 school districts that participate in LAUP that cannot come up with the 10 percent match and will not charge parent fees. This may result in losing partnerships and a reduction in LAUP’s network.

RESTATEMENT OF MOTION:

Vice Chair Fielding restated the following motion prior to the vote:

The Commission approves, in concept, the reallocation of the $87.2 million endowment as a grant for LAUP contingent upon successful negotiation of the performance-based contract and contingent upon the Commission’s successful result of the AB 99 lawsuit.

WITH NO OBJECTION, THIS MOTION WAS SO ORDERED

13. INFORMATION: Program & Planning Committee

Commissioner Kaufman reported that at the last Program & Planning Committee meeting, even with the confusion of over what was going to be continued, the idea was that for those grantees, ad hoc committees would be formed. The group present at the meeting—Commissioners, staff and general public—felt that it made more sense to have the existing SRI, Family Literacy and Family Friends & Neighborhoods in the Kindergarten Readiness Ad Hoc Committee rather than in the other committee.

In November, the Kindergarten Ad Hoc Committee will be presenting to the Program & Planning Committee followed by a formal recommendation to the Commission in January 2012.
Commissioner Dennis reminded Commissioner Kaufman that workforce development was also part of the Kindergarten Readiness Ad Hoc Committee.

A small ad hoc committee was formed for Healthy Births. Commissioners Au and Harding are members of this committee. In January, the Healthy Births Ad Hoc Committee will be presenting to the Program & Planning Committee followed by a formal recommendation to the Commission no later than March 2012 to see what happens beyond June 30, 2012 for these grantees.

Commissioner Stockwell expressed her concern over the tight timeline for the Kindergarten Readiness Ad Hoc Committee given its expanded charge. Perhaps the committee may not be ready to bring a recommendation forward to the Commission in January.

Commissioner Kaufman reminded everyone that the next Program & Planning Committee meeting was scheduled for October 27. As of yet, the only agenda item was the review to five contracts discussed earlier for a possible funding extension through June 30, 2012.

As a follow-up to the discussion that took place at the September Program & Planning Committee meeting regarding community investments, Commissioner Stockwell asked for more information on the recommendations made by Commissioner Au.

Commission Au commented that the Community Investment Department did a detailed presentation regarding the work that is being done. It became very clear that there needed to be a separation between the administrative costs of supporting that activity and another budget category that community investments could use as leveraging because opportunities requiring matching dollars cannot be predicted that would, in turn, attract additional dollars to Los Angeles County. Commissioner Au suggested that the Commission think about creating a line item of dollars that would be available to the community investment team to be able to tap into.

Commissioner Stockwell mentioned that she recalled a policy decision made by the Commission as to the approval levels for community investment opportunities. She asked for clarification.

Commissioner Kaufman suggested placing this issue back on the agenda for the Program & Planning Committee. The Program & Planning Committee could possibly come back at the November Commission meeting with a recommendation looking at the amount of money for community investments, looking at procedures, looking at whether there should be a dedicated line item or not.

Commissioner Au said her expectation was that the Ad Hoc Executive Committee was looking at the whole budgeting process and part of that conversation was going to include the community investment piece. Her recommendation was that a line item of dedicated dollars for fund matches be considered.

Commissioner Stockwell concurred with Commissioner Au’s recommendation and asked what was the process for moving that recommendation forward.
14. Public Comment

None.

15. Adjourned to a Closed Session of the Board of Commissioners for a Public Employee Performance Evaluation

The Commission adjourned to a Closed Session at 4:23 pm. Legal Counsel announced that pursuant to Government Code Section 54957, the evaluation of the Chief Executive Officer was to take place in Closed Session.

ADJOURNMENT

The next regularly scheduled Commission meeting will be on:

November 10, 2011 at 1:30 pm
First 5 LA
Multi-Purpose Room
750 N. Alameda Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Meeting minutes were recorded by Maria Romero.
Item 3

Approval of Monthly Financials

September, 2011
Los Angeles County Children and Families First -
Proposition 10 Commission
Statement of Net Assets
September 30, 2011, Unaudited

Assets

Current Assets:
Cash 6,506,839
Cash- Morlin Mgmt Corp 26,950
Investment:
  Operating and Allocated funds 762,552,743
  Operating Fund - SRI 52,226,187
  Cash Advance - LAUP 33,471,416
  Interest Receivable -
  Other Receivables 7,886,819
Total Current Assets 862,670,954

Fixed Assets:
Land 2,039,000
Building & Improvements 12,021,137
Furniture & Fixtures 627,671
Computer, Software & Accessories 1,592,852
Office Equipment 178,361
Accumulated Depreciation (3,344,827)
Total Fixed Assets 13,114,194

Total Assets 875,785,148

Liabilities and Net Assets

Current liabilities:
  Deferred Revenue -
  Other Liabilities - AB 99 424,388,705
  Other Liabilities 8,929,073
Total Current Liabilities 433,327,778

Net Assets:
  Investment in capital assets
  Restricted 429,343,176
Total Net Assets 442,457,370

Total Liabilities and Net Assets 875,785,148

* Operating and Allocated funds - Included within this investment account is approximately
  $5.8 million intended for operating expenses for the next 3 months.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Related Expenses</th>
<th>SEPTEMBER ACTUAL</th>
<th>YEAR TO DATE ACTUAL</th>
<th>ANNUAL BUDGET</th>
<th>YTD VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Wages</td>
<td>695,889</td>
<td>1,824,434</td>
<td>10,248,852</td>
<td>8,424,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>159,795</td>
<td>480,689</td>
<td>2,670,012</td>
<td>2,189,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>855,693</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,305,123</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,918,864</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,613,741</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Operating Expenses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADP Payroll Charges</td>
<td>3,394</td>
<td>4,663</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>13,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers Compensation Insurance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>91,699</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>(31,699)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Insurance</td>
<td>26,039</td>
<td>57,249</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mileage Expense</td>
<td>3,061</td>
<td>5,773</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>31,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephones &amp; Modems</td>
<td>4,921</td>
<td>11,187</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>48,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>4,253</td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>13,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage &amp; Delivery</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>10,650</td>
<td>7,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>6,081</td>
<td>12,494</td>
<td>124,950</td>
<td>112,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions &amp; Publication</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,421</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>7,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay (Equipment Purchases)</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>3,105</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>96,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental</td>
<td>4,274</td>
<td>9,946</td>
<td>59,500</td>
<td>49,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair &amp; Maintenance-Furniture &amp; Fixtures</td>
<td>11,449</td>
<td>21,974</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>173,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair &amp; Maintenance-Equipment</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>34,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents &amp; Lease - Offsite Storage</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>7,607</td>
<td>12,100</td>
<td>4,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Related Costs</td>
<td>9,514</td>
<td>10,572</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>13,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County Overhead</td>
<td>4,121</td>
<td>4,121</td>
<td>130,500</td>
<td>126,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>173,000</td>
<td>172,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities &amp; Other Supplies</td>
<td>2,789</td>
<td>5,605</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>34,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>15,324</td>
<td>28,004</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>131,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Supplies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Phones</td>
<td>2,083</td>
<td>4,753</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>25,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvement Projects</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>48,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware &amp; Software Maintenance</td>
<td>14,279</td>
<td>14,279</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>60,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>111,133</strong></td>
<td><strong>304,292</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,483,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,178,708</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Professional Services              |                   |                     |               |              |
| Audit and Accounting Fees          | 44,960            | 44,960              | 70,000        | 25,040       |
| Legal Fees                         | 20,726            | 20,726              | 75,000        | 54,274       |
| Membership Dues                    | -                 | 45,851              | 50,610        | 4,759        |
| Professional Development           | -                 | 359                 | 52,850        | 52,491       |
| Professional Dues First 5 Association | -               | -                   | 45,000        | 45,000       |
| Staff Recruitment                  | 377               | 8,133               | 15,000        | 6,867        |
| Commission Stipends                | 1,330             | 5,100               | 20,000        | 14,900       |
|                                   | **67,413**        | **125,129**         | **328,460**   | **203,331**  |

| Consultant Services                |                   |                     |               |              |
| Consultant Fees                    | 2,469             | (22,492)            | 420,500       | 442,992      |
| Other Professional Fees            | 3,163             | 13,483              | 67,000        | 53,517       |
|                                   | **5,632**         | **9,009**           | **487,500**   | **496,509**  |

| Travel & Meetings                 |                   |                     |               |              |
| Conferences - Travel & Lodging    | 882               | 5,937               | 39,230        | 33,293       |
| Conference - Registration Fees    | 6,050             | 6,965               | 34,350        | 27,385       |
| Local Meeting Expenses            | 1,274             | 5,959               | 35,700        | 20,741       |
| Lodging                            | -                 | 763                 | 33,800        | 33,037       |
| Per Diem                           | 753               | 1,258               | 21,666        | 19,908       |
|                                   | **8,960**         | **21,382**          | **164,746**   | **143,364**  |

| TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES           | 1,048,830         | 2,746,917           | 15,382,570    | 12,635,653   |

Notes:
The administrative expenses are within the maximum authorized under the Board policy.
(1) A check issued in FY 10/11 was voided and reissued in FY 11/12, resulting in a credit to the Consultant Fees line item.
## Los Angeles County Children and Family First - Proposition 10 Commission (aka) First 5 LA

### GRANTS/CONTRACTS AND OTHER ALLOCATIONS

**September 30, 2011, Unaudited**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRANTS/CONTRACTS</th>
<th>SEPTEMBER ACTUAL</th>
<th>YEAR TO DATE ACTUAL</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE TO DATE ACTUAL</th>
<th>TOTAL ALLOCATION</th>
<th>BALANCE REMAINING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple Year Grants/Contracts:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Opportunity Fund</td>
<td>127,576</td>
<td>129,871</td>
<td>7,290,483</td>
<td>13,200,000</td>
<td>5,909,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE Workforce Development:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Family, Friends and Neighbors</td>
<td>10,765</td>
<td>24,328</td>
<td>4,634,093</td>
<td>5,583,722</td>
<td>949,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Workforce Development</td>
<td>34,498</td>
<td>34,498</td>
<td>5,346,108</td>
<td>7,547,039</td>
<td>2,200,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Literacy Expansion Grants</td>
<td>55,615</td>
<td>55,615</td>
<td>20,538,025</td>
<td>23,488,341</td>
<td>2,950,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership for Families</td>
<td>722,524</td>
<td>722,524</td>
<td>52,247,100</td>
<td>72,938,279</td>
<td>21,091,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Readiness</td>
<td>222,020</td>
<td>222,020</td>
<td>222,063,848</td>
<td>236,516,569</td>
<td>8,452,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contracts:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1-1 Line</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,763,993</td>
<td>9,800,000</td>
<td>36,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1-1 Line (Marketing)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,102,817</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>97,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altman Consulting</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>117,110</td>
<td>149,159</td>
<td>32,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Council - Strategic Partnership II</td>
<td>79,660</td>
<td>79,660</td>
<td>3,489,851</td>
<td>4,250,000</td>
<td>760,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Kids</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>99,904,825</td>
<td>100,000,000</td>
<td>95,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Best Babies Network (Healthy Births)</td>
<td>101,468</td>
<td>92,993</td>
<td>28,946,439</td>
<td>33,759,627</td>
<td>4,813,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Petite Academy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49,803</td>
<td>49,803</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>316,306,094</td>
<td>580,000,000</td>
<td>263,693,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAA - LA County Charges</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>361,644</td>
<td>361,644</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAA - Participation Payment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,359,241</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power of Preschool (PoP)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,757,850</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Education *</td>
<td>20,376</td>
<td>43,286</td>
<td>8,746,236</td>
<td>10,258,768</td>
<td>1,512,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Allocations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Start LA</td>
<td>408,994</td>
<td>410,664</td>
<td>16,225,502</td>
<td>55,000,000</td>
<td>38,774,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Sponsorship</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cutting Approaches</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,233,315</td>
<td>3,317,160</td>
<td>83,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRMIB</td>
<td>230,248</td>
<td>230,248</td>
<td>2,676,616</td>
<td>2,676,617</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Health Community Development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,222,583</td>
<td>8,100,000</td>
<td>6,877,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Health/Nutrition Expansion</td>
<td>66,475</td>
<td>66,475</td>
<td>3,026,345</td>
<td>21,900,000</td>
<td>18,873,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Evaluation</td>
<td>437,050</td>
<td>458,355</td>
<td>14,164,388</td>
<td>35,000,000</td>
<td>20,835,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Evaluation (Early Learning)</td>
<td>18,916</td>
<td>18,916</td>
<td>12,262,499</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td>7,737,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARRA Funds TA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,676</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>199,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance Institute (Strategic Plan) *</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>404,051</td>
<td>450,058</td>
<td>46,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Planning Activities (Strategic Plan) *</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>458,666</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>41,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Infant Health</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,250,362</td>
<td>5,809,930</td>
<td>3,559,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARRA Matching Grants</td>
<td>90,694</td>
<td>90,694</td>
<td>1,751,755</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>2,248,245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Grants and Other Allocations**

| | 2,626,880 | 2,680,148 | 850,752,777 | 1,251,106,706 | 412,470,820 |

**Grand Total**

| | 2,626,880 | 2,680,148 | 850,752,777 | 1,251,106,706 | 412,470,820 |

**Notes:**

(1) The allocation was increased by $500,000 in September 2011 as the Board approved an increase to the approved allocation as part of the FY 11/12 Programmatic Budget.

(2) The allocation was increased by $100,000 in September 2011 to reflect the $1 million allocation for High School Recruitment approved as part of the FY 11/12 Programmatic Budget ($900,000 was added to the allocation per the April 2011 monthly financial statements).

(3) The allocation was increased by $405,000 in September 2011 as the Board approved an increase to the approved allocation as part of the FY 11/12 Programmatic Budget.

(4) The allocation was increased by $15,225,000 in September 2011 as the Board approved an item to add funds to the approved allocation (extending grants to June 2013) at the September 8, 2011 Commission meeting.

(5) As of September 2011, SRI expenditures for FY 11/12 are reflected on the FY 2009-15 Strategic Plan Implementation Allocations statement, as these expenditures relate specifically to the $11,889,110 SRI Extension allocation approved as part of the FY 11/12 Programmatic Budget on September 8, 2011. Expenditures shown here are for FY 10/11 activities only.

(6) Expenditures for FY 11/12 were reclassified to the "Information Resource and Referral" line item on the FY 2009-15 Strategic Plan Implementation Allocations statement as they represent expenses for the Information Resource and Referral Countywide strategy from the FY 2009-15 Strategic Plan.

(7) Expenditures for FY 11/12 were reclassified to the "Health Access" line item on the FY 2009-15 Strategic Plan Implementation Allocations statement as they represent expenses for the Health Access Countywide strategy from the FY 2009-15 Strategic Plan.

(8) The allocation was increased by $2,215,000 in September 2011 as the Board approved an increase to the approved allocation as part of the FY 11/12 Programmatic Budget.

(9) The Cumulative-to-Date amount has been updated to account for an overstatement reflected in the August 2011 monthly financial statements, which included Cumulative-to-Date amounts for "Research and Evaluation (Early Learning)" as part of this line item, as well as adjusting it separately below.

(10) No allocations are included for the Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (MAA) Participation Payment and Power of Preschool (PoP) as those represent pass-through contracts.

(11) The allocation was increased by $230,269 in September 2011 as the Board approved an item to add funds to the approved allocations at the September 8, 2011 Commission meeting.

(12) The Cumulative-to-Date amount has been updated to account for an overstatement reflected in the August 2011 monthly financial statements. The presented amount reflects only the expenditures against the $355 million allocation, which was approved as part of the FY 2004-09 Strategic Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY / INITIATIVE (FY 2009-15 STRATEGIC PLAN)</th>
<th>SEPTEMBER ACTUAL</th>
<th>YEAR TO DATE ACTUAL</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE TO DATE ACTUAL</th>
<th>TOTAL ALLOCATION</th>
<th>BALANCE REMAINING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>895,000</td>
<td>895,000 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Mobilization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,940</td>
<td>13,510</td>
<td>13,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,510,000</td>
<td>2,494,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,550,000</td>
<td>1,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-5 Core Competencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>590,000</td>
<td>590,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>480,000</td>
<td>480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Systems Integration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,090,000</td>
<td>3,061,208 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Access</td>
<td>146,267</td>
<td>449,747</td>
<td>449,747</td>
<td>9,000,000</td>
<td>8,556,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Resource and Referral</td>
<td>159,878</td>
<td>159,878</td>
<td>159,878</td>
<td>1,010,000</td>
<td>800,122 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>4,276</td>
<td>6,860</td>
<td>6,860</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(6,860) (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Augmentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consulting Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47,534</td>
<td>47,534 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East LA College Child Care Providers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,007,992</td>
<td>1,007,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tee Parks and Trails</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Safe Sleeping</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting Risk and Perinatal Service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Partnership with Funders</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE Workforce Consortium</td>
<td>7,355</td>
<td>7,355</td>
<td>7,355</td>
<td>37,079,667</td>
<td>37,072,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Support Groups for Parents</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,000,000</td>
<td>13,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Food Access Initiative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,500,000</td>
<td>7,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing Childhood Obesity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41,197,400</td>
<td>41,197,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Child Interaction Therapy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Family Housing/Family Literacy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,100,000</td>
<td>13,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Step Ahead</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,000,000</td>
<td>30,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Assessment of Newborns</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54,100,000</td>
<td>54,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring Perinatal Health Coverage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,800,000</td>
<td>2,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>895,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal-Exam</td>
<td>251,180</td>
<td>251,180</td>
<td>251,180</td>
<td>2,900,000</td>
<td>2,648,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Surrender</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place-Based Investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Development Process</td>
<td>199,637</td>
<td>291,939</td>
<td>291,939</td>
<td>4,340,000</td>
<td>4,048,061 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Capacity Building</td>
<td>298,964</td>
<td>298,964</td>
<td>298,964</td>
<td>9,680,000</td>
<td>9,381,036 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Strengthening</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,815,000</td>
<td>2,815,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Systems Integration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>32,794</td>
<td>96,862</td>
<td>96,862</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(96,862) (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3,680,000</td>
<td>3,679,893 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal-Works J Funding</td>
<td>(961,479)</td>
<td>369,270</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>14,630,630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUP Workforce Initiative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,999,886</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>12,000,114 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRI - Extension</td>
<td>55,613</td>
<td>55,613</td>
<td>55,613</td>
<td>11,889,110</td>
<td>11,883,497 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,161,948</strong></td>
<td><strong>659,686</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,877,844</strong></td>
<td><strong>326,924,125</strong></td>
<td><strong>311,865,255</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,161,948</strong></td>
<td><strong>659,686</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,877,844</strong></td>
<td><strong>326,924,125</strong></td>
<td><strong>321,865,255</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(1) Line item is based on a zero-based budget and is for a single year only (thus, Cumulative-to-Date amounts will equal the fiscal Year-to-Date amounts). The allocation amounts reflect the FY 11/12 Programmatic Budget amount approved on September 8, 2011.
(2) FY 11/12 expenditures for Place-Based Investments - Data Systems Integration were reclassified to the Countywide Investments line item as there is no Place-Based Data Systems Integration Programmatic Budget for FY 11/12.
(3) Expenditures for FY 11/12 were reclassified from the "Healthy Kids" line item on the Grants/Contracts and Other Allocations statement as they represent expenses for the Healthy Access Countywide strategy from the FY 2009-15 Strategic Plan. Expenditures for FY 11/12 were reclassified from the "211 Line" and "211 Line - Marketing" line items on the Grants/Contracts and Other Allocations statement as they represent expenses for the Information Resource and Referral Countywide strategy from the FY 2009-15 Strategic Plan.
(4) These expenditures represent transition activities on contracts that began in FY 10/11 and are currently coming to an end. Because of the delay in approving a FY 11/12 Programmatic Budget, the Board took action on July 14, 2011 giving staff authority to continue spending against FY 10/11 allocations for existing contracts until the FY 11/12 Programmatic Budget was approved on September 8, 2011.
(5) The allocation was increased by $300,000 in September 2011 as the Board approved an item to add funds to the approved allocation at the September 8, 2011 Commission meeting.
(6) At the September 8, 2011 Commission meeting the Board approved a motion integrating 2 previously approved allocations ("Improve the Nutrition and Physical Activity Environment in Child Care Settings" for $5,197,400 and "Improve Nutrition and Reduce the Obesity Epidemic in Children Ages 0-5" for $35 million) into a single "Reducing Childhood Obesity" project. As such, the allocations for these two projects have been combined under a single line item.
(7) The Year-to-Date amount has been updated to account for an underestimation reflected in the August 2011 monthly financial statements.
(8) The allocation and related expenditures for the LAUP Workforce Initiative were updated and included with the "Workforce Development" line item ($3 million original allocation with $2,999,886 spent) to accurately reflect the $12 million allocation increase approved by the Board at the March 10, 2011 Commission meeting (previously reflected as a wholly separate $15 million allocation).
(9) As of September 2011, SRI expenditures for FY 11/12 are reflected on the FY 2009-15 Strategic Plan Implementation Allocations statement, as these expenditures relate specifically to the $11,885,110 SRI Extension allocation approved as part of the FY 11/12 Programmatic Budget on September 8, 2011. The allocation was increased by $2,538,032 as a result of the approval of the FY 11/12 Programmatic Budget. SRI expenditures related to FY 10/11 activities are reflected on the Grants/Contracts and Other Allocations statement.
(10) The Administration allocation was approved on September 8, 2011 as part of the FY 11/12 Programmatic Budget and represents consulting services needed to support staff in designing and developing various Countywide Investment programs.
Item 4

Approval of New Contracts for Execution and Existing Contracts for Amendment for the Period of November 1, 2011 to January 12, 2011

October 11, 2011
SUBJECT:
New Contracts for Execution and Existing Contracts and Grant Agreements for Amendment for the period of November 1, 2011 to January 12, 2011.

RECOMMENDATION:
Approval of new contracts and proposed amendments for existing contracts and grant agreements in support of initiatives approved as part of the FY 2011-12 Programmatic Budget for the period of November 1, 2011 to January 12, 2012 and authorize staff to complete final contract execution upon approval from the Board.

BACKGROUND:
On September 8, 2011 the Board of Commissioners approved First 5 LA's programmatic budget for $177,774.110. The programmatic budget included investments in five areas: Countywide Investments, Place-Based Investments, Prior Strategic Plan Investments, Research and Evaluation, and Administration. Included with the programmatic budget, and for each of these investment areas, the Commission received staff reports that captured planned financial activities for programs and initiatives for FY 2011-12.

In a letter dated October 20, 2011, Supervisor Michael Antonovich directed staff to "include a consent item for approval on the monthly Board of Commissioners agenda listing all grantee and contractor agreements and amounts to be approved, whether Board of Commissioner approval is required or not, so that information about all agreements is disclosed and any agreement can be further scrutinized at Board meetings if so requested by any member of the Board of Commissioners. Bidding process dates and other milestones should also be reported."

DISCUSSION:
Attached to this memo, staff is providing department information on upcoming contract agreements associated with the FY 2011-12 programmatic budget. Information is included for both new agreements, as well as for amendments to existing contract and grant agreements. Additionally, at the request of the Ad Hoc Executive Committee at its meeting on November 3, 2011, Scopes of Work and Budgets for the agreements we are seeking approval for will be available for review on the First 5 LA website.

For each contract agreement we have included the name of the contractor a brief description of the work to be performed, the type of request (whether it is a new contract or an amendment), as well as the type of procurement leading to the agreement (RFP, RFQ, AB109 Exception or Strategic Partnership), length of the entire project, total dollar award, total contract amount for FY 11-12, and the estimated start and end dates.

For Office Use

Board Action Taken:

Approved: √ Yes √ No √ Further Discussion

Referred to Committee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contract Details</th>
<th>TOTAL AWARD</th>
<th>AMOUNT (In)</th>
<th>CONTRACT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2011</td>
<td>1/18/2011</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$950</td>
<td>Project 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/30/2012</td>
<td>11/15/2011</td>
<td>$4,400</td>
<td>$950</td>
<td>Project 456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/2012</td>
<td>2/18/2013</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$950</td>
<td>Project 789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- These contracts are subject to approval by the CEO.
- Payment terms: 50% upon contract approval, 50% upon delivery.
- Contract renewal terms: automatically renewed upon successful completion of the current contract phase.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/20/03</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Preparing for the upcoming fiscal year's planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/21/01</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Preparing for the upcoming fiscal year's planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/10/01</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Preparing for the upcoming fiscal year's planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/21/01</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Preparing for the upcoming fiscal year's planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/03</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Preparing for the upcoming fiscal year's planning process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Agreements**

**Investment Area:** Contingency Investments - Strategic Plan Strategies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Contract Details</th>
<th>Contract Information</th>
<th>New Agreements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/8/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/30/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/30/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/31/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contract Information**

- Project Title: [Redacted]
- Program Manager: [Redacted]
- Contact Person: [Redacted]
- Contract Start Date: [Redacted]
- Contract End Date: [Redacted]
- Contract Duration: [Redacted]
- Contract Value: [Redacted]
- Contract Type: [Redacted]
- Contract Status: [Redacted]
- Contract Terms: [Redacted]
- Contract Conditions: [Redacted]
- Contract Renewal: [Redacted]
- Contract Amendment: [Redacted]

**New Agreements**

- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
- [Redacted]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>5 Months</th>
<th>10 Months</th>
<th>15 Months</th>
<th>2 Years</th>
<th>3 Years</th>
<th>4 Years</th>
<th>5 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/01/2012</td>
<td>New Agreements</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Information**

- **PROJECT NUMBER**: 12345
- **PROGRAM**: Strategic Plan

**CONTRACT DETAILS**

- **CONTRACT AMOUNT**: $1.5 million
- **TERM**: 2 years
- **PREVIEW DATE**: 12/31/2021

**DEPARTMENT**: Client Services

**NEW AGREEMENTS**: To support the development of the new agreement.

The project will focus on enhancing client services, improving operational efficiency, and expanding services to meet the needs of the community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Details</th>
<th>Project/Initiative</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Start Date</td>
<td>Program Approval Date</td>
<td>Original Contract Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated End Date</td>
<td>Project Length</td>
<td>Award Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Method</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Contract Length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Information</td>
<td>Award Amount</td>
<td>(FM) Total Length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Organization</td>
<td>Award Location</td>
<td>Project Start Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project End Date</td>
<td>Project Completion Date</td>
<td>Project Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project End Date</td>
<td>Project Completion Date</td>
<td>Project Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project End Date</td>
<td>Project Completion Date</td>
<td>Project Completion Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Agreements
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Estimated Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated End Date</th>
<th>Total Award</th>
<th>Total Length</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Approval Date</th>
<th>Original Contract Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69012</td>
<td>1/1/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 350,000</td>
<td>10 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121012</td>
<td>1/1/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 750,000</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program:** Social Services for Family 
**Department:** New Agreements

**Investment Area:** Prior Budgetary Plan Investments

**Notes:**
- The estimated project timeline is subject to change.
- Final budget is $350,000.
- This is the first year of a three year project.
- The purpose of the project is...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Information</th>
<th>Contract Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated START DATE</strong></td>
<td><strong>2012</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total AMOUNT</strong></td>
<td><strong>$300,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project AMOUNT</strong></td>
<td><strong>$297,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total LENGTH in MONTHS</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project LENGTH</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract Duration</strong></td>
<td><strong>09/11/2011 - 06/11/2013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approval DATE</strong></td>
<td><strong>09/11/2012</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program / Initiative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Investment Area Based Investments - Strategic Plan Strategies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>Criminal Justice</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amendments:

- [Insert Amendment Details]
- [Insert Amendment Details]
- [Insert Amendment Details]
- [Insert Amendment Details]
- [Insert Amendment Details]
- [Insert Amendment Details]
- [Insert Amendment Details]
- [Insert Amendment Details]

Support Contract Details:

- [Support Contract Details]
- [Support Contract Details]
- [Support Contract Details]
- [Support Contract Details]
- [Support Contract Details]
- [Support Contract Details]
- [Support Contract Details]
- [Support Contract Details]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Estimated Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated End Date</th>
<th>Contract Length</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Original Contract Amount</th>
<th>Awarded Amount</th>
<th>Contract Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/2012</td>
<td>$7,700.00</td>
<td>$7,700.00</td>
<td>03/2012</td>
<td>07/2012</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/2012</td>
<td>$12,200.00</td>
<td>$11,121.15</td>
<td>09/2012</td>
<td>07/2013</td>
<td>5 Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/2013</td>
<td>$26,200.00</td>
<td>$23,000.00</td>
<td>04/2013</td>
<td>07/2013</td>
<td>No Contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/2014</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>06/2014</td>
<td>07/2014</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/2015</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>08/2015</td>
<td>07/2016</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/2016</td>
<td>$11,200.00</td>
<td>$11,200.00</td>
<td>02/2016</td>
<td>07/2016</td>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/2017</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>03/2017</td>
<td>07/2017</td>
<td>9 Months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/2018</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>03/2018</td>
<td>07/2018</td>
<td>12 Months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Investment Area:** Project Based Investments - Strategic Plan Strategies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1501</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>01/01/2022</td>
<td>12/31/2022</td>
<td>Project A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>01/01/2023</td>
<td>06/30/2023</td>
<td>Project B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
- Project A is a large-scale construction project involving the expansion of the hospital's emergency room.
- Project B is a renovation project for the library's quiet study area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Details</th>
<th>Contract Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract #</td>
<td>00000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program / Initiative</td>
<td>FINANCIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>DEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>01/01/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>01/01/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Start Date</td>
<td>01/01/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated End Date</td>
<td>01/01/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Length</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Method</td>
<td>RFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Amount</td>
<td>$1,933,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Amount</td>
<td>$1,933,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Amt</td>
<td>$1,933,827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Announcements**

**Contract Information**

- **Program / Initiative**: FINANCIAL
- **Department**: DEC
- **Start Date**: 01/01/2012
- **End Date**: 01/01/2014
- **Estimated Start Date**: 01/01/2013
- **Estimated End Date**: 01/01/2015
- **Project Method**: RFP
- **Original Amount**: $1,933,827
- **Contract Amount**: $1,933,827
- **Contract Amt**: $1,933,827

**Notes**: Please refer to the attached documents for detailed contract information and requirements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Details</th>
<th>Contract Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/2012</td>
<td>1/1/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/2012</td>
<td>1/1/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/2012</td>
<td>1/1/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/2012</td>
<td>1/1/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/2012</td>
<td>1/1/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/2012</td>
<td>1/1/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/2012</td>
<td>1/1/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/2012</td>
<td>1/1/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/2012</td>
<td>1/1/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Details</td>
<td>( \text{Program / Initiative} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 6/20/2021 )</td>
<td>$2,237.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 6/20/2021 )</td>
<td>$226,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 6/20/2021 )</td>
<td>$226,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 6/20/2021 )</td>
<td>$226,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 6/20/2021 )</td>
<td>$226,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 6/20/2021 )</td>
<td>$226,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 6/20/2021 )</td>
<td>$226,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 6/20/2021 )</td>
<td>$226,732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** AMOUNT and TOTAL AMOUNT are in dollars.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Details</th>
<th>Contract Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INITIATIVE</strong></td>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT/PROJECT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>END DATE</strong></td>
<td><strong>START DATE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT LENGTH</strong></td>
<td><strong>PROJECT AMOUNT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AMPM»»</strong></td>
<td><strong>AMOUNT ESTIMATED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOTE</strong></td>
<td><strong>NOTE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FTE</strong></td>
<td><strong>FTE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AMOUNT</strong></td>
<td><strong>AMOUNT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT</strong></td>
<td><strong>PROJECT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROCUREMENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>PROCUREMENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOARD</strong></td>
<td><strong>BOARD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPROVAL DATE</strong></td>
<td><strong>APPROVAL DATE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORIGINAL DATE</strong></td>
<td><strong>ORIGINAL DATE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTACT INFORMATION</strong></td>
<td><strong>CONTACT INFORMATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AMENDMENTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>AMENDMENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INVESTMENT AREA: Prior Strategic Plan Investments**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Details</th>
<th>Program Initiation</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Program / Initiative</th>
<th>Contract Information</th>
<th>Project Procurement Board Approval Date</th>
<th>Project Length (Yrs)</th>
<th>Total Award</th>
<th>FY 11-12 Amount</th>
<th>Estimated Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/30/2012</td>
<td>1/1/2012</td>
<td>$92,100</td>
<td>$1,195,673</td>
<td>7/10/2001</td>
<td>1/16/03</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>RFP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/30/2012</td>
<td>1/1/2012</td>
<td>$161,660</td>
<td>$1,174,560</td>
<td>7/20/2000</td>
<td>1/16/03</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>RFP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/30/2012</td>
<td>1/1/2012</td>
<td>$1,793,10</td>
<td>$1,974,572</td>
<td>7/20/2000</td>
<td>1/16/03</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>RFP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Investment Area:** Prior Strategic Plan Investments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Details</th>
<th>Program / Initiative</th>
<th>Investment Area</th>
<th>Program Strategic Plan Investments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research and Evaluation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Award</td>
<td>Length (Yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mapping Projects**

Healthy City: This project seeks to enhance data and information collection and analysis focused on health behaviors and outcomes. The scope includes data collection, analysis, and dissemination.

**Original Contract**

**Contract Information**

**Research and Evaluation Department**
Item 5

Presentation
to the Commission Chair
Item 6

Announcements by
the Commission Chair
Item 7

Chief Executive Officer’s Report
I. RACE TO THE TOP - EARLY LEARNING CHALLENGE GRANT

On October 19, 2011 Governor Brown applied for the Race to the Top—Early Learning Challenge funds. California could be awarded up to $100 million to support improvements in quality of early care and education (ECE) programs for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers. The funds are intended as a one-time investment that will have sustainable impact on ECE quality by investing in capacity building, quality rating systems, workforce development, and by leveraging existing efforts to close the school readiness gap.

First 5 LA has been working on supporting this opportunity throughout multiple phases of the process. The Policy Department staff advocated for inclusion of the Early Learning Challenge Grants within the federal Race to the Top investment, and then advocated at the state level for California to apply.

In early October, First 5 LA and other Proposition 10 County agencies were contacted to support the California Department of Education in their application for the funds. Staff submitted information on the Commission’s investment in ECE direct service programs as well as a letter of support and letter of intent. Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP) coordinated with staff to submit supporting documents as well as a separate letters of support and intent. The funds are intended to build upon local investments and the application required highlighting these investments. First 5 LA and 15 other First 5 County agencies have indicated support and interest in maintaining involvement should funds be awarded. The advocacy and support to the State appear to have made an impression on the Governor. He included the following statement of support in the cover letter for the application:

California is applying for this grant to give federal support to creative early learning approaches that have been undertaken since the passage of Proposition 10 in 1998 and its establishment of First 5 Commissions in all 58 counties. The heart of our plan is local control, where the effort to improve the quality of early learning can be accomplished.

Staff will continue to be engaged with the state as the application review process moves forward. Staff will continue to update the Commission with new information on the Early Learning Challenge Fund.
II. FEDERAL HOME VISITATION AWARD

The California Health & Human Services Agency’s Department of Public Health has awarded Federal Home Visitation dollars in the amount of $1.3 million for FY 2011-2012 and $2.9 million for FY 2012-2013 to Los Angeles County, to be administered by the LA County Department of Public Health. Funds will become available February 2012. The award will expand the LA County Department of Public Health’s Nurse Family Partnership (NFP) program in Service Planning Areas 2, 3 and 7 and Antelope Valley’s Healthy Families America program. In addition, it will support the creation of NFP program administered by Los Angeles Unified School District.

The Los Angeles County Home Visitation Advisory Committee, led by the Department of Public Health’s Maternal, Child and Adolescent Health Division to apply for the funds, was able to request up to three geographic regions for expansion of Nurse Family Partnership (NFP) and Healthy Families American (HFA). In the first year the California Public Health Department selected the NFP and HFA models as the only options it would provide to the counties for expansion and are expected to allow additional program models, including innovations, in future years.

In preparation for LA County to be eligible to utilize Federal Home Visitation dollars for expansion of innovations the county’s application required that potential innovations be noted as promising practices. Included were the Healthy Births Best Babies Collaboratives, the Best Start Welcome Baby Program and Black Infant Health. Further, the following were listed as key indicators that there is significant collaboration and cross-agency coordination occurring in LA County to support timely ramp up.

- The Children’s Council
- The Los Angeles Partnership for Early Childhood Investment
- Healthy Births’ Best Babies Collaboratives
- Partnerships for Families, Family Literacy and School Readiness as collaborators in LA County’s Prevention Initiative Demonstration Project (PIDP)
- First 5 LA’s Place-Based Approach, Best Start

It is expected that this expansion, along with the Mental Health Services Act’s expansion of home visitation programs will impact the Commission’s approach to expanding home visitation programs through Best Start, which will complement these investments and provide the greatest opportunity to match programs with the strengths and needs of each of the Best Start Communities. The RFQ for implementation of Welcome Baby and approved home visitation models is on schedule for January 2012.

III. TOT PARKS AND TRAILS

The Tot Parks and Trails project will provide $10 million in funding over a period of four years to upgrade, develop, or enhance toddler playground facilities as well as upgrade and/or create stroller compliant, developmentally appropriate play spaces for children ages 0 – 5. This project will encourage greater use of parks and provide opportunities for physical activities for young children and their caregivers.

An RFP was released on October 14, 2011 to provide funding to qualified public/private partnerships for tot parks and trails projects. Public/private partnerships are encouraged to
propose a variety of play spaces for young children including indoor, natural, shaded, roof-top play spaces, and splash pads. Up to $2 million will be available in each Los Angeles County Supervisorial District for a total of $10 million to develop, upgrade or enhance existing land in park deficient communities. No funds are to be used to acquire land. Proposals are due no later than 5:00 p.m. on November 30, 2011. An information Session was held on November 1, 2011 at First 5 LA. Recommendations will be presented for approval at the January 12, 2012 Commission meeting and contracts are anticipated to be executed by March 1, 2012.

IV. UPDATED RESEARCH SECTION OF THE FIRST5LA.ORG WEBSITE

The Research and Evaluation webpages on the First5LA.org website have been updated and expanded. The revised pages now provide both brief summaries and detailed descriptions of 27 of the research and evaluation projects managed by the Research and Evaluation department. For a number of those projects, video summaries are also available. The new pages are structured around three main areas of our work: Change in our Best Start Communities; Program Evaluation; and Research Partners. The navigation has been updated so that the pages link to each other, and they link to related complementary content on other sections of the First 5 LA website. This will make it easier for interested stakeholders to learn about the work First 5 LA is doing.

V. BEST START COMMUNITIES

The community meetings continue to attract a consistent, committed base of participants and growing in attendance as new participants become involved. In Attachment A you will see a report on the attendance to community meetings for the first quarter of this fiscal year (July-September).

Participants in community meetings represent a broad spectrum of community residents, parents and stakeholders from community-based organizations, faith-based groups, social service agencies, health professionals, early care and education programs, etc. In Attachment B you will see a breakdown on the diversity of participants in those meetings.

To date, the communities have made decisions and reached agreements on the Community Vision, and the Community Boundaries. Through the end of the year the communities will focus on establishing the governance bodies that will work toward completing the communities' plans by the end of the fiscal year.

Vision Statement: most of the communities have developed vision statements through a consensus process. Communities established workgroups that drafted the vision statements and then brought the drafts back to the larger partnership for refinement and approval.

Boundaries: communities have completed asset mapping exercises facilitated by Harder+Co and are deciding on boundaries. Staff is ensuring that the suggested boundary revisions are in alignment with First 5 LA's community selection process (i.e., number of births, ethnic representation, etc.). Once the communities have final recommendations regarding boundary revisions, staff will bring those recommendations back to the Commission for approval.

Partnership Development: communities are working to formalize their community partnerships which will include determination of membership, leadership structure and decision making process. In order to assist with this, communities are participating in trainings to assist with leadership development, introduce them to various decision making processes, etc.
First Step Grants (January to March for application and selection process; April to June for implementation): after the Community partnerships are formalized, communities will be eligible or ready to work on their first funding projects as part of the community capacity building efforts.

Community Plans: Communities will submit their plans for Commission approval in June 2012.

VI. POLICY ADVOCACY FUND

The policy department is in the midst of processing the applications for the Policy Advocacy Fund (PAF). The purpose of the fund is to support organizations who are working to further the goals of the First 5 LA Policy Agenda. The RFP was released on August 26, 2011 and received strong interest from a diverse range of organizations. The Policy Department held a webinar to inform potential advocates of the parameters around the fund; over 76 individuals participated. The fund application window closed on October 7. A total of 35 applications were received, ranging from universities, community based advocacy and service organizations, city entities, statewide children’s advocacy organizations, business groups and collaborations of various players. At this time, the external reviews have been completed and the department is moving forward with narrowing the field for site visits. The department currently estimates that it will be able to contract with 10-13 grantees, given the amount of dollars in the 2012-13 budget ($550,000) and as some applicants requested less than the full available amount. We expect to finalize the grantee list in December and complete contracts for Board approval in January.

VII. ASSEMBLYMEMBER HOLLY MITCHELL SPEAKS AT FIRST 5 ASSOCIATION MEETING

Assemblymember Holly Mitchell (D-Los Angeles), Chair of the Budget Subcommittee on Health and Human Services, addressed First 5 Commission Executive Directors at the October 20 Association meeting in Burbank. As the former Executive Director of Crystal Stairs and a one-time grantee of First 5 LA, the Assemblymember told the group that she understands the mission of First 5 and values the Commissions’ work.

Assemblywoman Mitchell noted that as much as legislators articulate support for children and their needs, they actually author relatively few bills that relate to children. Of the 466 bills signed by Governor Brown in September, only 24 pertained to children.

As chair of the Assembly’s Budget Subcommittee on Health and Human Services, Mitchell also noted that she is tasked with protecting “core” services, which means identifying dollars to fill gaps to prevent cuts to health and human services programs. While she expressed gratitude for the work that the Prop 10 Commissions do, Mitchell justifies seeking Commission funds to avoid the elimination of state-wide programs like, for example, Denti-Cal for children.

Assemblywoman Mitchell thanked the First 5 Commissions for stepping up to support the Stage 3 Child Care System when the prior Governor eliminated it. She expressed regret that the Legislature could not arrive at a budget compromise that avoided devastating cuts and pending “trigger cuts.” The Assemblywoman suggested that the trigger cuts, which would target programs like child care and education, are not inevitable and may yet be avoided if revenue picks up or if the Legislature reconvenes to work out a deal that stops the worst of the cuts.
Following the Assemblywoman's presentation, the Executive Directors (EDs) spoke of convening regionally to consider ways to meet emerging needs of the state's children while honoring County Commissions' unique strategic plans. The EDs will consider recommendations at the next state-wide meeting in January 2012.

VIII. API COMMUNITY HEARING ON PLACE-BASED FUNDING APPROACH

First 5 LA was invited by members of the API community to participate in a hearing on place-based funding on October 21. Convened by Assemblyman Mike Eng (D. Monterey Park) and co-hosted by The California Asian & Pacific Islander Legislative Caucus, the Commission on Asian & Pacific Islander American Affairs, and the Asian & Pacific Islanders California Action Network (APIsCAN), the event provided a number of API service providers with the opportunity to provide testimony on the challenges they encounter as more funders shift to a place-based funding approach. First 5 LA—represented by Commissioner Nancy Au and Armando Jimenez, Director of Research and Evaluation—and other public funding agencies were also provided with an opportunity to address the community's concerns.

One of the primary concerns expressed by a number of community organizations was that by shifting to a place-based funding approach, public funders — including the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, Los Angeles City's Family Source Centers, the federal government's Promise Neighborhoods Program, and First 5 LA — fail to take into account Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and other Pacific Islanders with high needs who do not reside in the targeted areas. Other issues raised include the impact place-based funding would have on service agencies outside targeted communities, and the lack of linguistic and cultural competency that would arise if the agencies who were the designated gatekeepers of the community were not included in the process.

First 5 LA's response highlighted the efforts staff and contractors have made to involve API organizations during the roll-out of Best Start and data showing that place-based efforts will serve several thousand more API children and families than were served under past First 5 LA initiatives. Over 25 organizations have been active in at least two of the Best Start communities with relatively large API populations—Long Beach and El Monte-South El Monte. Outreach material is consistently translated into Chinese, Vietnamese, Cambodian, and Tagalog and interpretation services are available during meetings. First 5 LA also testified that county-wide funding has remained solid, and in fact, is expanding, giving all communities an equal opportunity to compete for grants.

The hearing organizers will submit a summary document with recommendations to the API Legislative Caucus and the Commission on API/A Affairs.

IX. MEETINGS WITH ELECTED OFFICIALS

Government Affairs staff attended a number of events this past month organized by elected officials, including a hearing on the state of children's programs in California, convened by Assemblywoman Holly Mitchell (D-Los Angeles); a roundtable discussion with Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa to discuss a discount prescription drug card; and an L.A. Chamber event on jobs with Lieutenant Gavin Newsom, Speaker John Pérez, Senate President Pro Tem Darrell Steinberg, and others.
X. LEGISLATIVE HIGHLIGHTS

Governor Jerry Brown signed a number of First 5 LA supported bills into law. The list below includes two sections: bills signed by the Governor and those that First 5 LA supported that did not advance.

BILLS SIGNED INTO LAW

- **AB 6: CalWORKs and CalFresh Program - Fuentes (D)**
  Repeals the provisions requiring fingerprinting in order to receive CalWORKs and CalFresh benefits and the quarterly reporting requirements for the CalWORKs program. Replaces it with a semiannual reporting period. Requires the development of a utility assistance initiative through the federal Low Income Heating and Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP). Linked to First 5 LA policy goals of increasing access to healthy food options and physical activity. **POSITION:** Support, with proposed amendments offered by Los Angeles County that will maintain fingerprinting requirements for general assistance only. **STATUS:** Signed and chaptered.

- **AB 152: Food Banks: Grants: Contributions: Income Tax Credits - Fuentes (D)**
  Requires the State Department of Social Services to establish and administer the State Emergency Food Assistance Program (SEFAP), to provide emergency food and funding for the provision of emergency food to food banks. Creates the SEFAP Account and would, upon appropriation by the Legislature, allocate the moneys in the account to SEFAP and require that those moneys be used for the purchase, storage, and transportation of food grown or produced in California, as prescribed, and for the department's administrative costs. Bill also allows a tax credit for donations of fresh fruits and vegetables to food banks. Linked to First 5 LA's policy goal of increasing access to healthy food options and physical activity. **POSITION:** Support. **STATUS:** Signed and chaptered.

- **AB 210: Maternity Services – Hernandez R (D)**
  Requires every group health insurance policy to provide coverage for maternity services for all insured persons covered under the policy. Contains provisions similar to AB 185. Linked to First 5 LA's policy goal of promoting comprehensive, affordable health insurance for all. **POSITION:** Support. **STATUS:** Signed and chaptered.

- **AB 581: Public Health: Food Access - Perez J (D)**
  Creates the California Healthy Food Financing Initiative Fund for the purpose of expanding access to healthy foods in underserved communities and to leverage other funding. Linked to First 5 LA's policy goal of increasing access to healthy food options and physical activity. **POSITION:** Support. **STATUS:** Signed and chaptered.

- **AB 1088: State Agencies: Collection of Demographic Data - Eng (D)**
  Requires certain state agencies to disaggregate data collection categories and tabulations for other major Asian groups and Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander groups, and make the collected data available to the public. Linked to First 5 LA's policy goal of supporting integration and sharing of data. **POSITION:** Support. **STATUS:** Signed and chaptered.

- **AB 1296: Health Care Eligibility, Enrollment, and Retention Act – Bonilla (D)**
  Requires the California Health and Human Services Agency to establish a standardized single application form and related renewal procedures for Medi-Cal, the Healthy Families Program, the Exchange, and county programs. Linked to First 5 LA's policy goal of
promoting comprehensive, affordable health insurance for all as well as supporting integration and sharing of data. POSITION: Support. STATUS: Signed and chaptered.

- **AB 1319: Product Safety: Bisphenol A - Butler (D)**
  Prohibits the manufacture, sale, or distribution in commerce of any bottle or cup that contains bisphenol A (BPA), at a detectable level above 0.1 parts per billion (ppb), if the bottle or cup is designed or intended to be filled with any liquid, food, or beverage intended primarily for consumption by children 3 years of age or younger. Requires manufacturers to use the least toxic alternative when replacing BPA in containers in accordance with this bill. Linked to First 5 LA policy goal of increasing access to healthy food options. POSITION: Support. STATUS: Signed and chaptered.

- **ACR 62: Read Across California Month - Brownley (D)**
  Proclaims the month of March of every year as Read Across California Month and requests that various stakeholders work together to raise awareness of the importance of reading to young children and the importance of independent reading among our pupils and citizens of California. POSITION: Support. STATUS: Chaptered into law.

- **SB 222: Maternity Services – Evans (D)**
  Requires every individual health insurance policy to provide coverage for maternity services for all insured individuals covered under the policy. Contains provisions similar to SB 155. Linked to First 5 LA's policy goal of promoting comprehensive, affordable health insurance for all. POSITION: Support. STATUS: Signed and chaptered.

- **SB 502: Hospital Infant Feeding Protection Act - Pavley (D)**
  Requires hospitals with perinatal units to have an infant-feeding policy based on Baby Friendly USA or on the Department of Public Health’s Model Policies and to clearly post that policy. Requires that these policies be routinely communicated to all perinatal unit staff and that the infant-feeding policy apply to all infants in a perinatal unit. Linked to First 5 LA's policy goal of increasing supports for breastfeeding. POSITION: Support. STATUS: Signed and chaptered.

**OTHER BILLS SUPPORTED BY FIRST 5 LA**

- **AB 171 Autism Spectrum Disorder - Beall (D)**
  Requires health care service plan contracts and health insurance policies to provide coverage for the screening, diagnosis, and treatment of autism spectrum disorders. Linked to First 5 LA's policy goal of promoting comprehensive, affordable health insurance for all. STATUS: Appropriations Committee hearing postponed 05/27/11. Now a two-year bill.

- **AB 185 Maternity Services - Hernandez R (D)**
  Requires new forms of health insurance policies to provide coverage for maternity services. Defines maternity services as prenatal care; labor, delivery and postpartum care; inpatient hospital care; neonatal care and complications arising out of pregnancy. Linked to First 5 LA’s policy goal of promoting comprehensive, affordable health insurance for all. STATUS: Appropriations Committee hearing postponed 05/27/11. NOTE: Another bill, AB 210 (Hernandez R.), was amended to incorporate AB 185’s language. The bill was signed by the Governor.
• AB 234 Healthy Food Options - Wieckowski (D)
  Declares the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation to ensure that all Californians
  have access to fresh produce and healthy food options. Linked to First 5 LA's policy goal of
  increasing access to healthy food options. STATUS: Not assigned to committees. Now a two-
  year bill.

• AB 419 Community Care Facilities - Mitchell (D)
  Requires that Community Care Licensing visit all licensed facilities, including child care
  centers, annually with the exception of licensed family child care facilities which must
  receive visits biannually; requires the use of a key indicator protocol specific to each facility
  type. Provides for a modest increase in licensing fees. Increases the availability of technical
  assistance to community care facilities. Linked to First 5 LA's policy goal of expanding
  access to, and improving quality of, early care and education programs. STATUS: Held in
  Assembly Appropriations on 06/27/11.

• AB 540 Medi-Cal: Alcohol and Drug Screening - Beall (D)
  Establishes a Medi-Cal Alcohol and Drug Screening Program to provide reimbursement to
  localities for alcohol and drug screening and brief intervention services to Medi-Cal
  beneficiaries who are pregnant women or women of childbearing age. Requires localities to
  pay for the non-federal share of the expenditures. Linked to First 5 LA's policy goal of
  promoting reductions in drug, alcohol, and tobacco use by parents/caregivers. STATUS: Held
  under submission in Senate Appropriations as of 08/25/11.

• AB 660 Children's Health - Hall (D)
  Declares the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation that addresses chronic health
  issues facing children. STATUS: Not assigned to committees. Now a two-year bill.

• AB 669 Sweetened Beverage Tax: Children's Health - Monning (D)
  Institutes a tax of $0.01 per fluid ounce on bottled sweetened beverages and sweetened
  beverages distributed in California. Requires these funds to be deposited in a Children's
  Health Promotion Fund which would be used for childhood obesity prevention programs.
  Linked to First 5 LA's policy goal of increasing access to healthy food options and physical
  activity. STATUS: Referred to Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee suspense file on
  04/25/11.

• AB 823 Children's Cabinet of California - Dickinson (D)
  Establishes a Children's Cabinet of California to promote and implement information
  sharing, collaboration, increased efficiency, and improved service delivery among and within
  the state's child-serving agencies, departments, and organizations. Linked to First 5 LA's
  policy goal of supporting integration and sharing of data. STATUS: Held under submission
  in Senate Appropriations on 08/25/11.

• AB 1072 Community Development: Promise Neighborhoods Initiative - Fuentes (D)
  Requires the Office of Economic Development to establish 40 “Promise Neighborhoods”
  throughout the state to maximize efforts within a community to improve the health, safety,
  education and economic development in these neighborhoods for children from cradle to
  grave. Would require the office to use existing state resources and federal funds, and
  authorizes the office to accept fiscal support from other sources for these purposes. Not
  linked to one specific First 5 LA policy goal but mirrors First 5 LA's place-based approach to
  developing local communities. STATUS: Held under submission in Senate Appropriations
  as of 08/25/11.
• AB 1100 Retail Food Facilities: Toys and Incentives - Hernandez R (D)
  Declares the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation to improve the health of children in California by setting healthier standards for children's meals that are accompanied by toys and other incentive items. Linked to First 5 LA's policy goal of increasing access to healthy food options and physical activity. STATUS: Now a two-year bill.

• AB 1147 Dependent Children: Status Reports - Yamada (D)
  Requires, if the dependent child in foster care is also a parent, the report made by the child's social worker to the court specifically set forth the age and developmentally appropriate services that were provided to the minor parent to allow him or her to provide a permanent and safe home for the child. Linked to First 5 LA's policy goal of promoting family strengthening principles and prevention practices in the child welfare system. STATUS: Vetoed by governor on 10/02/11.

• SB 147 Furniture: Flammability Standards - Leno (D)
  Modifies state requirements to include alternative flammability standards for residential upholstered furniture that can be met without the use of toxic brominated and chlorinated fire retardants, which are known to cause cancer and reduce fertility, and have been found in the bloodstreams of Californians, including children and pregnant and nursing moms. Linked to First 5 LA's priority outcome of readiness for kindergarten. STATUS: Failed passage in committee on 05/02/11.

• SB 155 Maternity Services - Evans (D)
  Requires new forms for health insurance policies, submitted to the Insurance Department after a specified date, to provide coverage for maternity services. Requires health insurers to submit revised policy forms that provide coverage for maternity services, and requires insurers to include that coverage in the corresponding policies that are issued, amended, or renewed following the approval of the revised forms. Linked to First 5 LA's policy goal of promoting comprehensive, affordable health insurance for all. POSITION: Support. STATUS: Senate Health hearing postponed by committee on 03/25/11. NOTE: Another bill, SB 222 (Evans), was amended to incorporate SB 155's language. The bill was signed by the Governor.

• SB 166 Autism Spectrum Disorders - Steinberg (D)
  Requires health care service plans licensed by the Department of Managed Health Care (DMHC) and health insurers licensed by the Department of Insurance (DOI) to provide coverage for behavioral intervention therapy for autism. Linked to First 5 LA's policy goal of promoting comprehensive, affordable health insurance for all. STATUS: Held in Senate Health Committee 04/27/11. NOTE: SB 846 (Steinberg and Evans) was amended to incorporate provisions similar to SB 166; that bill was signed by the Governor.

• SB 472 Early Intervention Services: Assessments - Correa (D)
  Amends the California Early Intervention Services Act to require the development of either an integrated assessment instrument or a process to consolidate assessments to be used to coordinate multiple agency assessments, and to report to the Legislature. Linked to two First 5 LA policy goals: supporting early identification and intervention and supporting the integration and sharing of data. STATUS: Held in Senate Appropriations and under submission as of 05/26/11.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Meetings</th>
<th>Number of</th>
<th>Avg. Mgd.</th>
<th>Est. Total</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Central Long Beach</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Compton, East Compton</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. East Los Angeles</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lancaster</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Metro LA</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pacoima</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Palmdale</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Panorama City</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. South LA / Broadway-Manchester</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. South El Monte / El Monte</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. South LA / West Athens</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Southeast LA</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Watts, Willowbrook</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BEST START COMMUNITY MEETINGS: July - September 2011**
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ATTACHMENT B
Item 8

Motion to
Continue Discussion and Action on
Allocations of Remaining Commission
Funds Within Each of the Five
Approved Funding Strategies
Item 9

Approval of Healthy Kids Per Member Per Month (PMPM) Rate Increase from $72 to $117 Effective October 1, 2011
FIRST 5 LA

SUBJECT:
Healthy Kids per member per month (PMPM) rate increase from $72 to $117.

RECOMMENDATION:
Approve the Healthy Kids per member per month (PMPM) rate increase from $72 to $117 effective October 1, 2011.

BACKGROUND:
Healthy Kids is designed to expand eligibility for existing health insurance programs by covering all children ages 0-5 living at or below 300% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL). The vision for Healthy Kids is: 1) to achieve health insurance coverage for all children ages 0-5 living at or below 300% FPL; 2) to optimize children’s health and development by increasing access to coordinated and quality health care; and 3) to support the health care safety net by increasing the pool of insured children.

In 2003, First 5 LA established a strategic partnership with L.A. Care Health Plan to administer the Healthy Kids insurance product. First 5 LA funding covers the cost of insuring children ages 0-5, while funding from the Children’s Health Initiative of Greater Los Angeles (CHI) Coalition, convened by LA Care, covers children ages 6-18.

First 5 LA supports Healthy Kids by paying LA Care for the cost of the medical care (a per member per month, PMPM, fee) and by offering premium assistance to cover the cost of the monthly premium for families that demonstrate hardship and inability to pay.

DISCUSSION:
The "Per Member Per Month" (PMPM) rate reflects the cost of providing medical care to each member per month. This rate is determined by forecasting the total monthly cost of providing care to each member based on the prior year’s cost experience for professional, facility, and administrative services, plus an inflation and trend factor, when appropriate.

The medical cost of care has increased steadily in the last three years, with a sharp increase in the last 12 months. The increase is primarily due to rising facility (hospital) costs. Several catastrophic cases each year have adversely impacted overall program costs. Additionally, due to the continuous declining enrollment, the Healthy Kids 0-5 program has experienced a gradual increase in administrative expenses per member because the cost of administering the program is spread over a smaller population.

In May, the Board of Commissioners approved $4 million for Healthy Kids 0-5 premiums and $5 million for outreach/enrollment/retention and utilization which supports the Healthy Kids program as well as Medi-Cal, Healthy Families and other programs including Kaiser and Access to Infants and Mothers (AIM). LA Care has analyzed past and projected enrollment patterns and cost trends and believes that the $4 million allocated for the Healthy Kids premiums is sufficient for the medical cost of the current population. The $4 million allows for unexpected growth and/or catastrophic events and will accommodate the premium increase and allow for new enrollment. LA Care does not anticipate needing additional funding beyond this amount. LA Care has requested the new rate take effect on October 1, 2011.
Item 10

Approval to
Use $35,000 from the $990,000 Budgeted in the Program Development Department Budget in the FY 2011-12 Programmatic Budget for Universal Assessment Approved by the Commission on September 8, 2011 in Order to Extend the Contract with HealthReach to Continue Assessment of MAA and TCM Leveraging Opportunities for First 5 LA Universal Newborn Assessments and Best Start Approved Home Visitation Models
FIRST 5 LA

SUBJECT:
Leveraging Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (MAA) and Targeted Case Management (TCM) funds to potentially support and sustain First 5 LA Universal Assessment, Welcome Baby and Best Start Approved Home Visitation models.

RECOMMENDATION:
Approval to use $35,000 from the $990,000 budgeted in the Program Development Department budget in the FY 2011-12 Programmatic Budget for Universal Assessment approved by the Commission on September 8, 2011 in order to extend the contract with HealthReach to continue assessment of MAA and TCM leveraging opportunities for First 5 LA Universal Newborn Assessments and Best Start Approved Home Visitation Models.

BACKGROUND:
The Community Investments Department, in coordination with the Program Development Department and Finance Department, has identified potential leveraging opportunities to implement and sustain countywide universal screening of families with newborns, as well as Welcome Baby and intensive home visitation programs in the Best Start Communities by accessing MAA and TCM funds. Further, staff has completed initial efforts to assess the potential magnitude of this opportunity.

_Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (MAA)_
The MAA program is locally initiated, State Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) administered, and funded through the federal Medicaid program. The State contracts with counties to administer MAA programs locally. MAA involves assisting clients to understand the need for, to seek, apply, access and retain health services funded by Medi-Cal.

The claiming methodology revolves around cost reimbursement for staff and associated expenses, and is based on staff time surveys or worker logs conducted throughout the year. Time survey results are factored by actual costs each quarter to arrive at claim amounts. Documentation required for the MAA program includes time surveys or worker logs, agency time cards, agency job descriptions and fiscal information used in the MAA invoice.

First 5 LA has extensive experience drawing down MAA funds for First 5 LA’s School Readiness Initiative (SRI), Family Literacy, Partnership for Families (PFF), Community-Developed Initiatives and 211 LA County grantees, and holds a current contract with the Los Angeles County Chief Executive Officer (CEO), the LCA (Local Governmental Agency) for Los Angeles County, to access MAA funds. Since 2008, First 5 LA has leveraged $2,311,308 in MAA funds.

_Targeted Case Management (TCM)_
TCM is an optional Medicaid service in which the federal government shares in the cost of program services and is administered by the State DHCS through the County. TCM reimburses a portion of public agency expenditures made by government agencies, or through their subcontractors, which are directed towards the provision of TCM services.

TCM assists Medi-Cal enrollees to gain access to needed medical, social, educational, and other services. Reimbursement is made based on a payment mechanism involving documented face-to-face encounters with clients wherein certain TCM program service components are provided. TCM service components are categorized as follows: 1) Documented Assessment; 2) Development of a Written, Comprehensive, Individualized Service Plan; 3) Linkage and Consultation; 4) Assistance with Accessing the Services; 5) Crisis Assistance Planning; and 6) Periodic Review.
In order to participate in MAA or TCM, the federal Medicaid program requires that funds used to pay for reimbursable activities come from a non-federal public source. These public expenditures must be “certified” and also must be used specifically to perform MAA or TCM activities. Local First 5 Commission expenditures through staff or community-based contractors that pay for documentable MAA or TCM activities are allowable for use for claiming purposes.

DISCUSSION:
Per the recommendation of the MAA/TCM Coordinator in the Service Integration Branch (SIB) of the County CEO, First 5 LA convened Maternal Child Health Access (MCHA) staff for training in order to complete a one week “mock” time study and cost survey of the Welcome Baby program for both MAA and TCM for the purpose of determining the cost benefit to participating in either program.

The two-day training was held in September 2011 and facilitated by HealthReach, the contracted consultant for First 5 LA’s MAA program. HealthReach assisted MCHA staff in the completion of MAA and TCM time studies and cost surveys and performed an analysis of the data.

HealthReach considered several scenarios—in which some Welcome Baby staff participates in MAA and others participate in TCM—to maximize revenue projections for participation in either or both programs. Costs for participation in MAA and TCM were also considered in order to estimate net revenues for a start-up year (year one) and a typical year (year two+). Two scenarios in which Welcome Baby can draw down the maximum amount of revenue are presented below.

**Scenario #1- MAA Only – 1 Welcome Baby Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Program Start-Up (Year 1)</th>
<th>Typical Year (Year 2+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 11-12 Welcome Baby Program Budget</td>
<td>All (25) Welcome Baby staff participate in MAA</td>
<td>All (25) Welcome Baby staff participate in MAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected MAA Revenue</td>
<td>$109,505</td>
<td>$109,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated MAA Costs</td>
<td>$19,927</td>
<td>$18,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net MAA Revenue</td>
<td>$89,578</td>
<td>$90,730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Net MAA Revenue represents 4% of total program budget.*

**Scenario #2- MAA and TCM – 1 Welcome Baby Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Program Start-Up (Year 1)</th>
<th>Typical Year (Year 2+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 11-12 Welcome Baby Program Budget</td>
<td>(16) Case Managers, Project Director participate in TCM; remaining (9) staff participate in MAA</td>
<td>(16) Case Managers, Project Director participate in TCM; remaining (9) staff participate in MAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected MAA/TCM Revenue</td>
<td>$112,189</td>
<td>$112,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated MAA/TCM Costs</td>
<td>$94,329</td>
<td>$89,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net MAA/TCM Revenue</td>
<td>$17,860</td>
<td>$22,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Net MAA/TCM Revenue represents 1% of total program budget.*
Scenario #1 - MAA Only – Rollout to 23 Welcome Baby Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1: 1 Hospital</th>
<th>Year 2: 8 Hospitals</th>
<th>Year 3: 15 Hospitals</th>
<th>Year 4: 23 Hospitals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Start-Up</td>
<td>$2,130,811</td>
<td>$12,630,811</td>
<td>$23,130,811</td>
<td>$35,130,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Start-Up (1) Year 2+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Welcome Baby Program Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected MAA Revenue</td>
<td>$109,505</td>
<td>$634,505</td>
<td>$1,159,505</td>
<td>$1,759,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated MAA Costs</td>
<td>$19,927</td>
<td>$116,775</td>
<td>$207,775</td>
<td>$312,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net MAA Revenue</td>
<td>$89,578</td>
<td>$517,730</td>
<td>$951,730</td>
<td>$1,446,730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net MAA Revenue represents 4% of total program budget.

As summarized above, the initial analysis of projected revenue and estimated costs for Welcome Baby staff participation in MAA and TCM indicates the Welcome Baby program may have the greatest net return by participation in MAA only. Further considerations for Welcome Baby staff participation in MAA and TCM programs are outlined below.

Considerations

Scenario #1: MAA Only

- Higher net revenue for participation by Welcome Baby staff.
- First 5 LA is currently contracting with the LGA to draw down MAA funds for 22 SRI grantees, six PFF grantees, and two Healthy Births grantees. The addition of MCHA administered Welcome Baby program would not require a new contract or amendment with the LGA.
- First 5 LA has the current administrative expertise and capacity to integrate additional MAA subcontracts with minimal incremental costs.
- All staff is participating in a single Medicaid program - MAA.
- First 5 LA assumes moderate audit risk in the MAA program as compared to participation in TCM, as less documentation of reimbursable activities is required to submit claims. (Timesheets, general ledgers and grantee invoices are reviewed prior to submitting MAA invoices. In addition, First 5 LA holds 5% of MAA reimbursements in reserves, pending audit findings.)
- MCHA, California Hospital Medical Center (CHMC) staff - the fiscal agent for MCHA - and First 5 LA will incur increased costs for administrative functions, training and technical expertise from consultants, and the purchase of licenses for online time survey program.
- MCHA and CHMC staff will experience an increase in administrative work load in order to complete, review and submit time surveys/worker logs and to prepare MAA invoices for submission to First 5 LA, particularly in year 1.
- Once MCHA staff is proficient (year two+) in MAA reimbursable activity codes and documentation procedures, staff will need approximately 15-minutes per week to enter data using an on-line time survey program.

Scenario #2: MAA and TCM

- Lower net revenue for participation by Welcome Baby staff.
- First 5 LA will need to negotiate a contract with the LGA in order to access TCM funds. Annual TCM contract negotiations begin in January for a July 1 start date.
- First 5 LA will incur costs to increase staff’s administrative expertise and capacity to establish and manage TCM documentation.
- First 5 LA, MCHA and CHMC will require extensive training and technical assistance to create systems to identify, document and submit claims for TCM billable activities.
- Staff will be participating in two Medicaid programs - MAA and TCM - with different requirements and reporting mechanisms.
- Each case manager that performs TCM must register as a Medi-Cal Provider and maintain an up-to-date status.
• First 5 LA assumes audit risk, as extensive documentation of reimbursable activities in the form of time surveys/worker logs, case records and service plans are required for compliance.

• MCHA, CHMC and First 5 LA will incur increased costs for administrative functions; training and technical expertise from consultants, LGA and DHCS; and the purchase of licenses for online time survey program and case management tracking system.

• MCHA and CHMC staff will experience an increase in administrative work load in order to complete, review and submit time surveys/worker logs, case records and service plans and to prepare MAA and TCM invoices for submission to First 5 LA.

• While TCM has the potential to draw down more funds than participation in MAA only, TCM is highly administrative and may be cost prohibitive unless the home visitation program activities are closely aligned with billable TCM services and the case management services are implemented on a large scale.

Pending approval by the Commission, First 5 LA will contract with HealthReach to estimate MAA revenues for universal newborn assessment activities. As the universal assessment is currently in development, a review of billable MAA activities will allow staff to design program protocols which maximize First 5 LA’s potential to draw down MAA funds. Additionally, First 5 LA and HealthReach plan to examine individual activities within each of the approved Best Start Home Visitation Program Models to identify MAA and TCM billable activities.

FISCAL IMPACT:
In January 2011, the Commission approved an allocation of $54,100,000 for Universal Assessment of Newborns. In September 2011 $990,000 was approved as part of the FY 2011-12 Programmatic Budget. It is recommended the resources for this contract come from this adopted FY 2011-12 Programmatic Budget line item.
Item 11

Approval of to Extend the Los Angeles County WIC/Dental Visit Collaborative Project for Six Months in the Amount Not-to-Exceed $300,000
SUBJECT:
Program & Planning Committee's Recommendation to Extend the Dental Health Foundation/Kaiser Permanente Oral Health Partnership

RECOMMENDATION:
Approval to extend the Los Angeles County WIC/Dental Visit Collaborative Project for six months in the amount not-to-exceed $300,000.

Approval of the $300,000 allocation to the Dental Health Foundation/Kaiser Permanente Oral Health Partnership will require a budget amendment of the FY 2011-12 Programmatic Budget.

BACKGROUND:
The Oral Health and Nutrition Expansion and Enhancement Project was approved by the Commission in October 2006, with an allocation of $10 million for the purpose of promoting good oral health and nutrition for young children and their families in L.A. County. In June 2010 and then again in March 2011, the Commission re-directed an additional $6.9 million and $5 million respectively from the Oral Health and Community Development (OHCD) to the OHN Project. As part of this initiative, First 5 LA has funded 12 projects that have expanded or will expand services and education to approximately 111,500 children ages 0-5 and/or education to their parents, as well as oral health training for service providers, across L.A. County.

One project that was funded through this allocation is the Los Angeles County WIC/Dental Visit Collaborative, which is managed by the Dental Health Foundation (DHF). Through this project, DHF expanded the work of its most promising strategy: providing dental visits at WIC centers. This strategy is intended to increase the number of at-risk infants and toddlers (0-5) who receive preventive dental services, access early dental care and have a relationship with an identified dental provider by developing and implementing systems that will enable a “well baby dental visit” at the WIC site on regularly scheduled days, as well as mechanisms for referrals for more serious restorative/therapeutic needs. The strategy is also intended to educate parents and caregivers of these children on appropriate oral health care. First 5 LA entered into a strategic partnership with DHF in July 2009 to leverage a grant DHF received from Kaiser Permanente Community Benefits. Two contracts were ultimately created to complete the work associated with this project. Contract 07534 directly contracts with 7 Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHC's) to provide direct oral health services to children, and addresses the various policy components of the project. Contract 07441 builds partnerships with 9 WIC agencies and addresses the data collection and evaluation components. Attachment A includes a table highlighting the clinics and WIC centers participating in this project.

To date, the number of children ages 0-5 receiving preventive and/or therapeutic oral health services, and those being referred to a dental home, and the number of parents educated through this project is approximately 26,500.

Another key goal in this project is to work with the California Primary Care Association (CPCA), to assist those FQHCs who do not currently have WIC centers under their scope of work to have the ability to bill encounter rates for services provided at the WIC center. The CPCA has been working with the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) and the
California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS), on policy which would expand FQHCs ability to provide services outside their “four walls,” such as those provided at WIC centers. A key objective of the DHF project is to obtain agreement from DHCS to allow clinics to bill encounter rates for allowable dental services provided at the WIC site. CPCA has also developed a "WIC Project Resource Guide for FQHC’s," which provides guidance on federal Scope of Project changes necessary to ensure WIC sites and services are reimbursable.

This policy issue is one of the key issues in the long-term sustainability of the project. Throughout this project, CPCA has been in communication with both CMS on the federal level and DHCS on the State level, to obtain an agreement on this issue. Presently, they are still awaiting a response, but have reported that to date, project participants have been billing and securing reimbursement without any issues arising.

**DISCUSSION:**
In September 2011, the Commission considered a motion to “Extend Timelines for Best Start Communities Ramp Up and Potential Extension of Grantee Funding to Coincide with the Best Start Planning Process,” as was established in the prior transition plan.

In the motion, Commission directed staff to "extend the strategic plan submission deadline for the 14 Best Start Communities from December 2011 to June 2012; and to develop:

1) Standard review criteria, including but not limited to available evaluation/ outcomes/ fiscal data for each of the 54 contracts with December 31, 2011 termination dates, taking into consideration the Ad-Hoc Program and Planning Committee's work already underway involving the Partnerships for Families and School Readiness Initiative programs; and,

2) Recommendations, for the Commission’s consideration during the October 13, 2011 Commission meeting, for either termination or extension of each of the 54 contracts on the attached list, citing the specific standard review criteria that formed the basis for each recommendation. If extension is recommended, at what funding level and for what duration, based upon information readily available from the pertinent Best Start Planning process and/or the projected launch of the pertinent Countywide Augmentation proposal(s)."

In reviewing the audio discussion of this agenda item, the subject motion was not formally approved by the Board of Commissioners. Following is staffs' understanding of the discussion that took place:

a. The Program and Planning Committee was charged with assessing the 54 contracts included in the motion. This Committee would provide a preliminary report to the Commission at the November meeting, and provide a final recommendation to the Commission at the February 2012 meeting.

b. The grantees' contracts would be extended until June 2012.

The original motion included a list of 54 existing contracts ending on December 31st, 2011. Out of these 54 contracts 48 of them are with grantees from initiatives that were included in the Transition Plan approved as part of the 2009-2015 Strategic Plan. These initiatives are Family Literacy, Healthy Births, and Partnerships for Families, Family Friends & Neighbors, and School Readiness.
Additionally, the motion included five contracts not included in the Transition Plan as follows:

- Contract 07186 - The Children Council Foundation, Inc.
- Contract 07360 - Park Water Company
- Contract 07441 - The Dental Health Foundation
- Contract 07530 - Children’s Dental Foundation
- Contract 07534 - The Dental Health Foundation

During the October 13, 2011 Commission meeting, the contracts not included in the Transition Plan, were discussed as part of a follow-up motion to clarify the earlier motion made by Mayor Antonovich in September 2011. This included the two contracts with DHF. It was decided that any further discussion as to whether these contracts should be extend would take place in the next meeting of the Program Planning Committee. The Program Planning Committee then met on October 27, 2011. Prior to this meeting, the five contracts listed above were clarified to include the following for purposes of discussion:

- Contract 07186 - The Children Council Foundation, Inc.
- Contract 07441 - The Dental Health Foundation
- Contract 07534 - The Dental Health Foundation

It was determined that Park Water Company’s contract could be extended without additional funding. In the case of Children’s Dental Foundation, this contract was removed from the list because the actual end date of the contract is December 31, 2012, not December 31, 2011 and therefore not applicable to the discussion.

During the October 27, 2011 Program Planning Committee meeting, staff presented background information on the two DHF contracts including scope of project, location of sites and number of children and parents participating in the program, as noted above. Staff also shared that the project has met its objectives and remained in compliance during the course of its scope of work. Staff also shared information about the pending OHN RFPs, which will continue to expand oral health services countywide through various mechanisms, including investing in technology and improving the dental safety net by providing services in non-traditional settings and mechanisms.

No consensus was reached by Commissioners at the Program & Planning Committee meeting. Some Commissioners expressed concerns that allowing this contract to end as planned would leave a gap in services and dismantle the infrastructure that has been created through this program while new programs under the OHN RFPs ramp up. There were also statements by other Commissioners that this contract should end as planned. Staff was asked to return to the Board in November with some information regarding the implications for extending this contract for two months to transition to new OHN contractors, for an additional six months through June 30, 2012, or to let the contracts end. Staff was asked to have Craig Steele discuss the legal implications of extending a contract if there are no legal grounds to do so. Below are some points to consider that were discussed by Commissioners and staff:

- If DHF does not have funding for these services from another source, then it is possible that services provided by these clinics and WIC centers in these specific geographic areas will end;
- Some oral health-related provisions in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act are anticipated for 2014, but the legislation itself faces a number of barriers to passage at both the State and federal levels. Therefore, a gap in access to oral health services
will remain in the interim period until 2014, and possibly afterwards given the complexities of health care reform;

- There is new First 5 LA oral health funding in the form of three RFP's released this summer. Those applications are still under review, and therefore it is unclear which strategy for serving children will be funded (e.g. mobile vans, tele health, school based health centers, etc.), nor does staff know the service-providing entities that will be funded. Therefore it is too soon to say that the existing DHF project model will be implemented and/or that DHF could play a role as an entity to facilitate a newly funded strategy;

- The Dental Health Foundation is a model that, though previously implemented in other counties in California, is a pilot project in LA County. Therefore the project was designed as a demonstration, and through its implementation, has identified multiple and persistent systemic gaps which exist in the delivery of oral health services for children;

- A key sustainability strategy of this project was to secure policy change to encourage the incorporation/ adoption of this strategy into a system of care, specifically to secure reimbursement for services provided at the WIC agency. This change would enable clinics to continue providing these services beyond the contract period. As mentioned above, DHF is still awaiting an agreement from DHCS and it is unclear, however, whether this will occur during the current contract period;

- It is important to consider the fiscal impact of the project in continuing the project – specifically whether to continue the project in its totality or only to continue the direct service aspects of the project (see Fiscal Impact section, below);

- In terms of the DHF project alignment with Best Start LA, staff provided a map overlaying the geographic locations where the DHF project is providing dental services (7 community clinics and 9 WIC agencies) with the Best Start LA communities. Of the agencies involved in the project, one clinic and one WIC agency (Elsmore Pediatric and Family Medical Center and PHFE Washington WIC) are operating in and involved in the Best Start planning process;

- Currently, in addition to the two DHF contracts under review, First 5 LA is supporting 7 other oral health contracts, with varying end dates. All of these efforts, while designed with sustainability and leveraging components, will continue to experience some gaps in services once they end, due to larger systemic issues.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

If the Commission were to continue the current scope of work with the Dental Health Foundation through June 30, 2012 an allocation in the amount of $300,000 would be necessary. If another option is selected as outlined above, the amount required would be determined based upon a more limited scope of work for specific time period to be negotiated. This allocation will result in a constraint of existing resources; therefore, will become part of the Committed Fund Balance at June 30, 2012, and will also require an amendment to the FY 2011-12 Programmatic Budget.
Item 12

Approval of
Recommendation from the Program & Planning Committee:

1) Funding in the Amount of $660,000 for an Additional Six Months Commencing January 1, 2012 and Ending June 30, 2012 for the United Way of Greater Los Angeles to Support The Children’s Council Continue the Work of the Neighborhood Action Councils (NACs) Countywide and Particularly in the Best Start Communities, and Assist First 5 LA’s Best Start Communities Staff Increase and Expand Parent Participation in the Best Start Communities’ Planning Process; and,

2) First 5 LA staff to Negotiate and Execute a Contract Renewal with the United Way of Greater Los Angeles as fiscal agent for The Children’s Council
SUBJECT:
Program & Planning Committee’s Recommendation to Extend the United Way of Greater Los Angeles Contract as Fiscal Agent for The Children’s Council

RECOMMENDATIONS:
Approval of Recommendation from the Program & Planning Committee:

1) Funding in the amount of $660,000 for an additional six months commencing January 1, 2012 and ending June 30, 2012 for the United Way of Greater Los Angeles to support The Children’s Council work of the Neighborhood Action Councils (NACs) countywide and particularly in the Best Start Communities, and assist First 5 LA’s Best Start Communities staff increase and expand parent participation in the Best Start Communities’ planning process; and

2) If this recommendation is approved, authorize First 5 LA staff to finalize execution of the contract renewal with the United Way of Greater Los Angeles as fiscal agent for The Children’s Council. (Approval for this amendment can be found Item 4.)

Approval of the $660,000 allocation to the United Way of Greater Los Angeles will come from available existing resources and as such, will become a part of the Committed Fund Balance. Approval of this allocation will also require amending the FY 2011-12 Programmatic Budget.

BACKGROUND:
Since 2002, First 5 LA has had ongoing contractual relationships with The Children’s Council (formerly known as the Children’s Planning Council) in the form of strategic partnerships to achieve various objectives related to developing services for very young children ages 0-5 years old and their parents, and supportive community networks. The most recent of these strategic partnerships began in July 2007 after the Commission approved $4,250,000 over a period of four years to develop The Children’s Council Service Planning Area (SPA) infrastructure and further expand community organizing and engagement efforts countywide through the councils.

Since July 2007, however, The Children’s Council has undergone various changes. In late 2009, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors phased out funding for The Children’s Council. First 5 LA then provided a 5-month contract extension (February 1, 2010 to June 30, 2010) to The Children’s Council for First 5 LA staff to: 1) reassess the contractual relationship with The Children’s Council and their abilities to continue the work of the NACs as well as their capacity to maintain as an independent nonprofit organization, and 2) evaluate the NACs, which are based on the Asset Building Community Development Model of John McKnight, for their level of developmental progress and capacity to create child, family, and community level changes.

The evaluation completed in June 2010 by Dr. Todd Franke with the UCLA Center for Healthier Children, Families, and Communities demonstrated that implementation of the NAC encouraged relationship building within communities from improvements in protective factors known to reduce child abuse and neglect and social isolation within parents. These protective factors, which build on the work being undertaken by the Center for the Study of Social Policy in Washington D.C, include increasing social connectedness and knowledge of parenting and child development, and providing parents with more concrete support in times of need. In addition, continuation of the NACs was expected to benefit the planning process for First 5 LA’s targeted Best Start Communities.
At the end of the 5-month contract, First 5 LA program staff recommended to continue funding the activities of the NACs based on The Children's Council's successful progress in achieving their deliverables, and their likely benefit to the Best Start Communities' planning process. Subsequently, a contract for $880,000, beginning July 1, 2010 and ending December 31, 2011 was executed with The Children's Council Foundation, Inc. The 18-month period, rather than the typical 12-month renewal period was provided to support the NACs through the end of the Best Start Communities planning process. Funding totaling $880,000 for the 18-month period was part of the July 2007 $4,250,000 approved allocation for The Children's Council.

The Scope of Work for the 18-month contract contained three objectives. Specifically, The Children's Council was expected to:

1. Establish a regional network of neighborhood groups with a particular focus on First 5 LA's Best Start Communities. This network will demonstrate evidence of resident-owned civic engagement within the adopted Community-level Change Model. This model seeks, in the long term, to build a movement of evolving partnerships that will affect policies and change practices of institutions and organizations that contribute to the outcome of The Children's Council and the goals of First 5 LA; and
2. Employ a utilization focused evaluation strategy to inform practice and improve outcomes.

Further, The Children's Council Foundation, Inc., a separate body serving as The Children Council's fiscal agent, was expected to:


On December 15, 2010, First 5 LA program staff met with The Children's Council Foundation Board to discuss the outstanding deliverables related to the third objective above and the overall status of the Foundation's organizational capacity building efforts. The Children's Council's board President and other board members stated that they could not complete the fundraising goals in the scope of work and that The Children's Council Foundation would not be able to continue. Board members expressed a desire for the work to continue and stated that The Children's Council anchor agencies in each of the SPAs have the capacity to do so if The Children's Council received ongoing financial support from First 5 LA.

Pursuant to the December 15, 2010 meeting, First 5 LA program staff sought alternatives to The Children's Council Foundation, Inc. for fiscal sponsorship of the project. After assessing various alternatives, First 5 LA program staff secured the United Way of Greater Los Angeles to be the fiscal sponsor for The Children's Council. The First 5 LA-United Way of Greater Los contract is for the period beginning May 1, 2011 and ending December 31, 2011.

Throughout all of the stages and changes described above, the NACs have consistently met or exceeded their programmatic deliverables for First 5 LA (objectives 1 and 2 above). As of October 21, 2011, 25 new NACs have been created in the Best Start Communities and the NACs met, exceeded, or are on target for 19 of their 20 programmatic deliverables for First 5 LA.

**DISCUSSION:**
In September 2011, the Board of Commissioners considered a motion introduced by Mayor Antonovich to “Extend Timelines for Best Start Communities Ramp Up and Potential Extension of Grantee Funding to Coincide with the Best Start Planning Process.” This motion directed staff to “extend the strategic plan submission deadline for the 14 Best Start Communities from December 31, 2011 to June 30, 2012, and develop:
1) Standard review criteria, including but not limited to available evaluation/outcomes/fiscal data for each of the 54 contracts with December 31, 2011 termination dates, taking into consideration the Program and Planning Committee’s work already underway for the Partnerships for Families and School Readiness Initiatives; and

2) Recommendations, for the Commission’s consideration during the October 13, 2011 Commission meeting, for either termination or extension of each of the 54 contracts on the attached list, citing the specific standard review criteria that formed the basis for each recommendation. If extension is recommended, at what funding level and for what duration, based upon information readily available from the pertinent Best Start Planning process and/or the projected launch of the pertinent Countywide Augmentation proposal(s).”

The motion included a list of 54 existing contracts ending on December 31, 2011. Out of these 54 contracts, 48 of them were grantees from initiatives that were included in the Transition Plan approved as part of the 2009-2015 Strategic Plan (Family Literacy, Healthy Births, Partnerships for Families, Family, Friends and Neighbors, and School Readiness) while five were contracts not included in the Transition Plan:

- Contract 07186 · The Children Council Foundation, Inc.
- Contract 07360 · Park Water Company
- Contract 07441 · The Dental Health Foundation
- Contract 07531 · Children’s Dental Foundation
- Contract 07534 · The Dental Health Foundation

A sixth contract, 07509 with the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health for the 2010 Los Angeles Health Survey received approval for additional funding to complete the work under the existing contract at the September 8, 2011 Commission meeting as part of the FY 2011-2012 Programmatic Budget.

This motion was not approved by the Board of Commissioners at the September 8, 2011 Commission meeting. Therefore, the motion was reintroduced at the October 13, 2011 Commission meeting and the five contracts not included in the Transition Plan were also discussed. After some discussion, the Board of Commissioners delegated the development of recommendations to extend/not extend each of the above five contracts to the Program and Planning Committee at the October 27, 2011 scheduled meeting.

The Program and Planning Committee met on October 27, 2011 and Committee members recommended: 1) the Park Water Company’s contract be extended for another six month without additional funding to complete the construction of the last well in Compton and unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County; 2) The Children’s Dental Foundation’s contract not be extended since the contract expiration date is December 31, 2012 instead of December 31, 2011; 3) The Dental Foundation contracts (07441) and (07534) not be extended (please see separate memo regarding the Dental Foundation contracts); and 4) the United Way of Greater Los Angeles1 contract for The Children’s Council be extended for six months (commencing January 1, 2012 through June 30, 2012) to coincide with the updated Best Start Partnership Development phase timeline in the amount not to exceed $660,000. The provision of the contract extension also includes the NACOs’ work in increasing and expanding parent participation in Best Start Communities’ planning efforts.

If approved, Commission staff will negotiate and execute a six-month no-cost extension with the Park Water Company and a six-month contract extension with the United Way of Greater Los

---

1 The Children’s Council Foundation, Inc. has been replaced by the United Way of Greater Los Angeles (Contract 07863) as the fiscal sponsor for The Children’s Council.
Angeles to continue funding The Children's Council's work of the NACs that includes their assistance in increasing and expanding parent participation in Best Start Communities' planning efforts for the period from January 1, 2012 to June 30, 2012 in an amount not to exceed $660,000.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**
Of the original $4,250,000 allocation to The Children's Council authorized in July 2007, only an estimated $39,810 remains. Further, the $660,000 proposed for this contract extension was not included in the FY 2011-12 Programmatic Budget. As a result, it is recommended the Commission allocate $660,000 from existing resources, which will become a part of the Committed Fund Balance at June 30, 2012, and amend the Programmatic Budget accordingly.

---

**For Office Use**

Board Action Taken:

Approved: □ Yes □ No □ Further Discussion

Referred to Committee/Work Group: ___________________________
Item 13

Approval of the GASB 54 Policy Modifications per the Recommendation of the Ad Hoc Executive Committee
SUBJECT:
Ad Hoc Executive Committee Recommendation to Approve GASB 54 Policy Modifications

RECOMMENDATION:
Approval of the GASB 54 Policy modifications per the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Executive Committee.

BACKGROUND:
During the course of the fiscal year 2010-11 audit, the independent auditors noted that the Commission had adopted GASB Statement No. 54, Fund Balance Reporting and Government Fund Type Definitions. The statement required that fund balance be classified according to its level of constraint: nonspendable, restricted, committed, assigned and unassigned. The auditors noted that the formal actions used by the Commission resulted in committed fund balance classifications based on: 1) formal actions noted in the minutes of the meetings, 2) approval of contracts, and 3) funding allocations based on Commission action. Several of the actions took place in prior years and required management to roll forward balances to June 30, 2011. Certain amounts were reclassified as “assigned” because the documentation supported a lower level of constraint.

The auditors recommended that the Commission strengthen its existing policies and procedures related to fund balance classifications. Such procedures should include consideration of the following:

- Clearly delineating a formal action used to commit resources (i.e. resolution);
- Clearly identifying whether the action results in a constraint of existing resources versus an allocation/appropriation of future revenues;
- Establishing a periodic reporting mechanism for the status of the specific committed and assigned amounts;
- Approving (or reaffirming) the committed amounts on an annual basis before year-end to improve the audit trail of the specified purposes and amounts; and
- Evaluating the amounts that have been committed when the financial position results in deficit unassigned fund balance.

DISCUSSION:
These recommendations were brought forward to the Board of Commissioners at the October 13, 2011 meeting as part of the approval of the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR). The Chair proposed that these recommendations be considered by the Ad Hoc Executive Committee, which would then return to the full Board of Commissioners at the November 10, 2011 meeting with a recommendation for implementation. At the November 3, 2011 Ad Hoc Executive Committee meeting, the Committee considered the following questions and points:
• What type of formal action would be required to restrict funds: 1) a resolution or 2) a motion recorded in the meeting minutes. Either type of formal action should identify where the constraint of resources will be coming from, existing resources or future revenues.

*Ad Hoc Executive Committee Recommendation:* The Committee recommended that a resolution be required to restrict funds.

• What type of formal action would be required to commit funds: 1) a resolution or 2) a motion recorded in the meeting minutes. Either type of formal action should identify where the constraint of resources will be coming from, existing resources or future revenues.

*Ad Hoc Executive Committee Recommendation:* The Committee recommended that a resolution be required to commit funds.

• Whether the Commission should designate a body/committee or an official who can designate fund balance as "assigned" for a specific purpose, as allowed by the adopted policy. If the Commission designates a body/committee or an official to be able to "assign" fund balance for a specific purpose, what type of action or documentation would be required supporting the actions.

*Ad Hoc Executive Committee Recommendation:* The Committee recommended that the Commission not designate a separate body/committee/official that can designate funds as assigned for a specific purpose. The Committee recommended that any assignments be made via a formal motion approved by the Commission.

• Whether the Commission should review the status of specific committed and assigned amounts on a quarterly basis.

*Ad Hoc Executive Committee Recommendation:* The Committee recommended that the Commission not review the status of specific committed and assigned amounts on a quarterly basis.

• Whether there should be a reaffirmation of the committed amounts before the fiscal year-end to ensure it is the Commissions’ desire to have the fund balance resources reported in the CAFR as committed. The reaffirmation action would be presented as a summary of all actions throughout the fiscal year and would improve the audit trail of the specified purposes and amounts.

*Ad Hoc Executive Committee Recommendation:* The Committee recommended that the Commission undergo an annual reaffirmation process prior to fiscal year-end to review all committed amounts to ensure that it is the Commissions’ desire to have the fund balance resources reported in the CAFR as committed.

• If the unassigned fund balance carries a deficit balance, should the Commission be proactive in eliminating the deficit position. If a deficit fund balance in unassigned remains on-going, the question of the agency’s fiscal responsibility may come into question during the annual independent audit process.

*Ad Hoc Executive Committee Recommendation:* The Committee recommended that the Commission review all levels of fund balance prior to the fiscal year-end as part of the reaffirmation process and determine what action—if any—is needed. The Committee
recommended that the Commission take formal action prior to the fiscal year-end to either modify the existing fund balance levels or to leave them as is.

Revisions to the policy and the existing definitions of the fund balance classifications will need to be completed. Staff will return to the Board of Commissioners at the January 2012 meeting for final adoption of the revised policy.

Attachment: Adopted GASB 54 Policy (Approved by the Commission on June 9, 2011)
FIRST 5 LA
FUND BALANCE POLICY

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this policy is to:

Classify current fund balance categories to be accordance with the new fund balance classifications contained in the reporting requirements of Statement 54 of the Government Accounting Standards Board (GASB) effective June 15, 2010. The guidelines for adoption are consistent with the First 5 Financial Management Guide and establish who has the authority to commit or assign fund balances.

It is recommended First 5 LA establish a policy for its fund balances in accordance with GASB 54. The elements of the policy are created by the Commission for its own purposes and may, therefore, be revised by the Commission as needed in the future.

STATEMENT OF POLICY:
This policy sets forth the following in compliance with GASB 54:

The authorization level for committing or assigning Fund Balance is established by the Board of Commissioners. Formal action of the Commission will be defined as an action taken at a publicly noticed meeting.

The following classifications of Fund Balance are established in conformance with GASB 54.

a. Nonspendable fund balance
b. Restricted fund balance
c. Committed fund balance
d. Assigned fund balance
e. Unassigned fund balance

DEFINITIONS AND REPORTING:
Fund Balance - All financial assets less liabilities normally expected to be liquidated with current financial resources. The following are categories of fund balance:

a. Nonspendable
   Portion of net resources that cannot be spent because they are not in an expendable form (e.g. Prepaid Expense or Fixed Assets).
   Portion of net resources that cannot be spent because they must be maintained intact. (E.g. revolving fund or the principal of an endowment.)

b. Restricted (externally enforceable limitations on use)
   Amounts constrained to specific purposes by their providers (such as creditors, grantors, contributors, or laws and regulations of other governments (e.g. funds advanced by First 5 CA under specific agreements for services such as matching funds for specific initiatives).

   Amounts constrained by limitations imposed by law through constitutional provisions or enabling legislation (e.g. funds legally restricted by County, state, or federal legislature, or a government’s charter or constitution; or amounts collected from non-spendable items such as long term portion of loan outstanding if those amounts are subject to legal constraint).
c. **Committed (self-imposed limitations in place prior to end of the period)**

   Amounts constrained by limitations imposed at the highest level of decision making that require the same formal action at the same level to remove or modify.

   Resources in this category may include:

   1) Resources committed for a specific purpose and/or future initiatives.

   2) Funding that has been designated for legally enforceable contracts but not yet spent (includes multi-year contracts).

   3) Resources that have been committed by a Commission for specific agreements that have not yet been executed.

   4) Resources committed as a local match for State Commission initiatives, programs or projects within the approved long range financial plan, funding recommendations, or the strategic plan.

   5) Minimum fund balance reserves.

---

d. **Assigned (limitation resulting from intended use)**

   Amounts or limitations that are constrained by the Commission's intent to be used for a specific purpose (the purpose of the assignment must be narrower than the fund itself). The commission may also designate a body/committee or an official who can specify such purposes.

   Resources in this category may include:

   1) Appropriation of a portion of existing fund balance sufficient to eliminate a projected deficit in the subsequent year's budget.

   2) Resources assigned to a specific program, project or organization for which the Commission has approved a plan or budget.

   3) Resources approved by the Commission for a long range financial plan (where formal approval is not required to modify the amount).

   **Comparison: Committed vs. Assigned**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Committed</th>
<th>Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A decision to use funds for a specific purpose requires action of governing body</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal action of governing body is necessary to impose, remove or modify this constraint and formal action has taken place before end of reporting period</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
e. **Unassigned (residual net resources)**

   Resources in the fund balance that cannot be reported in any other classification.
Item 14

Approval of
Revised Records Retention Policy
FIRST 5 LA

SUBJECT:
Revision of Records Retention Policy and Staff Report to the Commission Regarding the status of Implementing Phase Two Audit Finding Recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION:
Approval of the revised Records Retention Policy.

BACKGROUND:
In response to the Phase Two audit conducted by Harvey M. Rose Associates, LLC, Mayor Antonovich sent a letter to CEO Evelyn V. Martinez, dated October 20, 2011. The letter directs the CEO to implement, effective immediately, the recommendations listed below and to report back in writing to the Commission on the status of the implementation. Additionally, the letter directed staff to fully comply with the Commission's record retention policy by keeping documents the requisite time required by the policy and that no documents be disposed of or destroyed without the specific written consent of the CEO, legal counsel and the Commission.

DISCUSSION:

Phase Two Finding 4.2:
Direct management to include a consent item for approval on the monthly Board of Commissioners agenda listing all grantee and contractor agreements and amounts to be approved, whether Board of Commissioner approval is required or not, so that information about all agreements is disclosed and any agreement can be further scrutinized at Board meetings if so requested by any member of the Board of Commissioners. Bidding process dates and other milestones should also be reported.

Staff Response:
In response to the above, staff has included all contracts and grant agreements with amounts to be approved, under the consent items for the Commission to review and approve at this meeting. Staff will continue this process for every Commission meeting where there are contracts that need approval. Staff will bring contracts that have already completed the review process and have been fully negotiated. Staff will also bring all amendments for Commission approval.

Phase Two Finding 4.3:
Direct management to prepare a protocol addressing the preparation and maintenance of documentation related to all sole source contracts and grants, regardless of their characterization as AB 109 Exceptions, Strategic Partners, or others, and ensure staff familiarity with and adherence to these policies.

Staff Response:
Staff has prepared and developed protocols which address the preparation of documentation related to all sole source contracts and grants including all Strategic Partner and AB 109 Exceptions. These protocols have been incorporated into a
Procurement Overview Training, which has taken place for First 5 LA staff, to ensure that everyone is familiar with and adheres to these procedures and policies associated with the preparation and documentation of the distribution of public funds (see Exhibit A).

First 5 LA ensures that public funds are adequately spent and services are procured in alignment with the adopted Procurement Policy. Staff is required to follow policies so that there is a fair competitive bidding process for all contractors and grantee agreements. When another procurement method is “deemed appropriate” it requires approval through a formal process as outlined in First 5 LA’s AB 109 policies (see Exhibit A, B, F & G).

**Phase Two Finding 4.4**
Revise current policy so that all solicitation materials, outreach effort documentation, proposals from all bidders, agreements and contracts, and agreement monitoring documentation is kept on file until two years after the termination date of the agreement. This documentation can serve as a valuable management tool for assessing the efficiency of the contracting process and compliance with competitive bidding requirements.

**Staff Response:**
Staff currently complies with the records retention policy as written and adheres to the timelines and procedures specified. In an effort to further enhance transparency, staff revised the policy to increase the retention period to three years from the termination of the initiative or agreement. The policy was also revised to specifically include that all solicitation materials including outreach effort documentation, proposals, agreements and contracts, and related monitoring documentation be kept in addition to the other documents required by law (see Exhibit C).

**Commission Concern:**
First 5 LA staff does comply with the Commissions Record Retention Policy because it does not keep documents for the required two year period and does not comply with the procedures that require the CEO, legal counsel and the Commission to approve any document destruction.

**Staff Response:**
Documents are disposed of only when the Board of Commissioners approves such destruction of the documents. The Contract Compliance Department submits the document destruction list in writing to Legal Counsel. Legal Counsel prepares the Board Memo for approval of the destruction of identified documents, all of which are in alignment with First 5 LA’s Records Retention Policy. Most recently staff sought and obtained approval from the Board of Commissioners to destroy documents on May 17, 2007 and October 14, 2010. Commission approval can be found in the Board Minutes. A copy of the Minutes from the October 14, 2010 meeting is attached for your reference (see Exhibits D&E).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Office Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Action Taken:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Strategic Partnership Review Tool

## Specific Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Resources</th>
<th>Yes (2)</th>
<th>More Info (1)</th>
<th>No (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear articulation of fiscal resources partnership would bring to project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear articulation of how good and services and other fiscal resources will be leveraged</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear match drawn between partnership fiscal resources and fiscal resources necessary to implement project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Fiscal Resources</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear articulation of non-fiscal resources partnership would bring to project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear articulation of how staffing, in kind services and other non-fiscal resources will be leveraged</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear match drawn between partnership non-fiscal resources and fiscal resources necessary to implement project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Response Totals                                                                 | 0       | 0             | 0      |

## Demonstrated Ability and Level of Expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrated ability and Level of Expertise</th>
<th>Yes (2)</th>
<th>More Info (1)</th>
<th>No (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear articulation of how the ability and expertise of the partnership exceeds or matches the abilities and expertise required to implement the project.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear examples of sought after abilities and experience derived from working on projects of comparable size and scope</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear examples of sought after abilities and expertise derived from working on projects with similar objectives or outcomes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear examples of sought after abilities and expertise derived from working with similar populations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear articulation of results and successes from programs the partnership has implemented</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear articulation of how the partnership is uniquely placed in its ability to undertake the proposed partnership (compared to other potential individuals or organizations with similar ability and expertise)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Response Totals                                                                 | 0       | 0             | 0      |

## Cost Effectiveness and Expediuousness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Effectiveness</th>
<th>Yes (2)</th>
<th>More Info (1)</th>
<th>No (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear articulation of how costs will be avoided/minimized in program implementation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear examples of how economies of scale will be introduced</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear examples of how the cost savings will not diminish program’s ability to achieve the intended outcomes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expediuousness</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear articulation of how time will be saved in the planning and implementation of the project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear examples of how time will be saved in the delivery of the program services or strategies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear examples of how outcomes will be achieved more quickly/data generated more quickly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Response Totals                                                                 | 0       | 0             | 0      |

OUTCOME

## Other Issues

**PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS (type an "X" for the appropriate response)**

- Is there a Board Approval for the project? [X]
- Was there a Board Directive for the project? [ ]
- Are there any known or potential conflict of interest? [ ]

IF YES, please explain:
Los Angeles County Children and Families First Proposition 10 Commission

Contract Compliance
Records Retention Policy and Procedures

1 POLICY STATEMENT

The Public Records Policy approved by First 5 LA on January 24, 2002 in accordance with the California Public Records Act governs access to the Commission’s records and provides guidelines for record retention. All public records are to be open for inspection at the Commission office, as required by law, at all times during regular business office hours.

2 PURPOSE

This policy sets forth the guidelines and procedures pertaining to the retention, purging, and destruction of records maintained by the Commission. Additionally, this policy includes records retention schedules and the state and federal codes and statutes pertaining to record retention.

3 POLICY GUIDELINES

The Public Records Act is a California statute that affords the public the right to inspect and be provided a copy of, most of the written information retained by State and local agencies in the course of business. The Public Records Act regulates the public’s access to records and sets out the specific statutory circumstances under which particular records are open to inspection at all times during the office hours of a local agency.

The Public Records Act applies to every conceivable local governmental entity. Under the Public Records Act, a “local agency” includes non-profit organizations, and local agencies which are supported solely by public funds. This includes First 5 LA.

“Public Records” includes any writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public’s business prepared, owned, used, or retained by any State or local agency regardless of physical form or characteristics.
"Public Records" include computer data (email, instant messages, Word files, et.al.), although such data can be provided in a form determined by the agency. It does not include computer software developed by the agency.

Requestor's rights under the Public Records Act are not unlimited. A local agency is not required to create a document or compare a list in response to a request made under the Public Records Act.

Original Commission records shall remain in the custody of the Commission at all times, ensuring their integrity and accessibility. Review of original Commission files/records by a requestor will be supervised by a Commission employee. If necessary, copies of the original records may be provided upon written request. In all instances, an attempt should be made to have the written request provide specific document identification.

General perusal of the files will not be permitted.

All finance-related documents will be retained and maintained by the Finance Department following generally accepted accounting principals and the standards set forth by independent auditors.

All other documents, including agreements and contracts, records for grantees, funded awarded contracts and non-funded grant and contract applicants, solicitation materials, outreach effort documentation, proposals from all bidders, and monitoring documentation shall be retained for a minimum of three (3) years past the date of grant/contract completion.

Applications that are in the review process are not available to the public. Once grant or contract awards have been awarded by the Commission Board, those applications become public information. Exceptions are in accordance with the exemptions identified in the California Public Records Act.

No original Commission document or file, used in a court case, shall be made a part of the court files. If the court requests a document on file, certified copies of the original records shall be submitted. The exception is only to Grand Jury Subpoenas, which shall be referred to the Executive Director, or designee, upon receipt, for review by Commission Legal Counsel.

The released copies of staff reports or other Commission agenda materials is not allowed before the packets have left Commission office for delivery to the Commission members.

Retention, purging, and destruction of records will be done in compliance with the requirements of the Public Records Act and other applicable codes or regulations.
4 APPLICATION

This policy applies to all Commission employees and representatives associated with First 5 LA.

5 RESPONSIBILITIES

The Chief Administrative Officer or designee will monitor the procedures for this policy and coordinate with Directors as required. Each department will have a single point of contact, responsible for records applicable to the specific department. Each Department's point of contact will forward all award documentation and non-funded applications, review tools and declination letters to Contract Compliance. The Contract Compliance Department will enter the information into the official ECM folder.

6 Records subject to and exempt from Disclosure

6.1 Subject to Disclosure

Drafts, personal notes and records are not public records subject to disclosure, as long as those documents are not customarily retained by the public agency in the ordinary course of business. Ask whether a document in draft or note is one which:

1. Is normally kept by the agency in the course of business?
2. Somehow documents or memorializes the day-to-day transactions of the public's business?
3. Is merely a temporary step in the process, not necessary for complete and accurate public information?

Documents that fit within category 3 above are probably not public records.

6.2 Records Not Subject to Disclosure

The following records are not public and public access is not allowed:

1. Preliminary drafts, messages and notes customarily discarded, stenographic notes, tapes used for transcription of a typed document and then discarded or reused, and interagency or intra-agency memorandum which are not retained in ordinary course of business, provided that the public interest in withholding such records clearly outweighs the public interest in disclosures.

NOTE: Care should be taken to keep such notes and working papers separate from files containing records that are considered public and to label personal working files as such.
2. Records pertaining to pending litigation to which the Commission is a party or claims made pursuant to Government Code Section 810 et. Seq., until such litigation or claim has been finally adjudicated or otherwise settled.

3. Personnel, medical, or similar files, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

4. Records of complaints to or investigations conducted by, or records of intelligence information or security procedures of law enforcement.

5. Test questions, scoring keys, and other examination data used to administer examinations for employment.

6. The contents of real estate appraisals, engineering or feasibility estimates and evaluations made for or by the Commission relative to acquisitions of property, or prospective public supply and construction contracts, until such time as all of the property has been acquired or all of the contract agreements obtained.

7. Records, the disclosure of which is exempted or prohibited pursuant to provisions of federal or state law, including, but not limited to provisions of the Evidence Code relating to privilege.

8. Communication from Commission Legal Counsel to Commission Personnel consultants or other parties with whom the Commission has a confidential relationship.

9. Any record that is either exempt from disclosure or not a public record under applicable law.

NOTE: Once an exempt record is released to any of the public, disclosure constitutes a waiver of the exemption.

7 Definition of Retention, Purge, and Destruction

7.1 Records Retention

Each record category (See attachment A) has been evaluated based upon its administrative, operational, fiscal, legal and, historical value to determine appropriate retention period. This evaluation has resulted in the following records retention schedule. For each category the schedule identifies the following:

1. Record Description: identifies the type of record to be retained.
2. Legal Authority: identifies relevant state and federal codes and statues.
3. Retention Period: establishes the period of time which the document must be retained.

The retention period is indicated by alphanumeric codes. The retention codes are used to indicate when the retention period begins and the length of time the record must be maintained. The retention code has two components:

The alpha code represents when the retention period begins:
The numeric code represents the length of time in years that records must be kept after the retention period begins. For example, a retention code of Au+3 means that a record's retention period begins after completion of the audit and must be kept for three (3) years thereafter.

Effective July 1, 2009, the majority of Commission's public records will be maintained on the agencies Electronic Content Management System. All staff will be trained on a regular basis on how to utilize this system. Key staff will be identified to serve as leads for each department to ensure compliance and quality control.

7.2 Records Purge

In the case of grants, care should be exercised to ensure that records are maintained based on the retention period following completion of the Commission's audit.

Staff will be trained annually on what records to keep, what notes and materials may be purged and how to keep working papers separate from files available to the public.

Generally, public access is not allowed to the following identified records and unless public interest requires a document's retention, the document may be purged. Documents include: preliminary drafts, messages and notes customarily discarded, stenographic notes, tapes used for transcription of a typed document, and the discarded or reused, and interagency or intra-agency memoranda which are not retained in the ordinary course of business. Care should be taken to keep such notes and working papers separate from the files containing records that are considered public and to label working files as such.

7.3 Destruction of Records

Prior to destroying any records, a list will be made of all records that are to be destroyed. This list will be presented to Commission legal counsel who will be asked to review and approve the destruction of the records identified. Once the approval of legal counsel has been obtained, a motion will be brought before the Commission requesting their approval of the request to destroy those records. Duplicate records can be destroyed without Commission approval.

The Chief Administrative Officer or designee will coordinate with any department requiring destruction of records to ensure protocol is followed and requisite review and approvals are obtained from Legal Counsel and the Commission.

8 Records Retention Important Points and Future Actions
8.1 Important Points

- All documents are open to inspection as required to be in compliance with state law.
- Focus on Section 6. Same approach to cleaning Outlook folders.
- Do not save drafts. Save only final documents.
- If a document must be kept, use Section 7, with Attachment A "Records Retention Schedule" as a guide to determine retention schedule.
- Destruction of Records must be authorized.

8.2 Future Actions

- Separate notes and working papers from files containing records considered public and label as working files.
- Mark all notes/working papers as drafts/for internal use only.
COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:
Commissioners:
Jonathan Fielding
Neal Kaufman
Alma Martinez
Gloria Molina (Chair)
Marv Southard (Vice Chair)
Evangeline Stockwell
Carolyn Wilder

Ex-Officio Commissioners:
Duane Dennis
Deanne Tilton
Harriette Williams

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:
Commissioners:
Nancy Au
Jane Boeckmann

STAFF PRESENT:
Evelyn V. Martinez, Chief Executive Officer
Carol Baker, Director of Policy
Yolanda Bosch, Chief Administrative Officer
Antonio Gallardo, Chief Program Officer
Tracey Hause, Director of Finance
Armando Jimenez, Director of Research & Evaluation
Teresa Nuno, Director of Community Investments
Maria Romero, Executive Assistant

LEGAL COUNSEL:
Craig Steele, Attorney-at-Law

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL:
1. Chair Molina called the meeting to order at 1:41 pm. Quorum was present.

CONSENT CALENDAR: (Items 2 – 3)
2. Approval of Commission Meeting Minutes – Thursday, September 9, 2010
   M/S (Jonathan Fielding / Marv Southard) APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED
3. Approval of Monthly Financials – August, 2010
   M/S (Jonathan Fielding / Marv Southard) APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED
COMMISSION: (Items 4 – 9)

4. Announcements by the Commission Chair

Commissioners were reminded that due to the observance of Veteran's Day on Thursday, November 11th, the regularly scheduled Commission Meeting will be taking place the following week on Thursday, November 18th.

5. Chief Executive Officer's Report

RECEIVED AND FILED

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

- Chief Program Officer – CEO Martinez introduced Dr. Antonio Gallardo as the new Chief Program Officer. Dr. Gallardo comes to our organization with over 22 years of experience in the private and non-profit sectors with expertise in program development and implementation, research and evaluation, financial management, policy, public affairs and management.

- State Budget – Governor Schwarzenegger has signed the budget. Among the governor’s unilateral cuts this year were several which affect young children, including $256 million from CalWORKs Stage 3 child care for parents going back to work. This reduction will effectively end Stage 3 child care as of November 1st leaving thousands of struggling families without access to child care.

- Coro CrossTalk – First 5 LA will be co-hosting a panel discussion on childhood obesity on November 8, 2010 with the Coro Foundation. Panelists include Councilwoman Jan Perry, Rosa Soto from the California Center for Public Health Advocacy, and Alex Sosa from the WIC Program Breastfeeding Taskforce of Greater Los Angeles. The panel discussion will be moderated by Dr. Michael Goran from the USC Keck School of Medicine.

6. Approval of the 2009-2010 Annual Report to First 5 California (State Commission)

Director Jimenez reported that each year staff prepares two versions of the Annual Report: 1) a report to the State Commission that provides fiscal and programmatic information in response to a Commission-designated template, and 2) a “user-friendly” report that is distributed to all First 5 LA stakeholders and includes the Commission’s annual financial report, as well as significant activities and accomplishments for the year.

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

7. Approval of the Final Draft of the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) for FY 2009-2010

Director Hause reported that Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co., LLP, Certified Public Accountants, have issued an unqualified (“clean”) opinion on First 5 LA’s financial
statements for the year ended June 30, 2010. Commissioners were provided with four documents provided as part of the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report.

- **SAS 114 Letter** – This correspondence outlines the Auditor’s Responsibility under U.S. Generally Accepted Auditing Standards and OMB Circular A-133. Significant audit findings, if any are discussed in this letter. The Commission did not have any significant findings for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010.

- **Comprehensive Annual Financial Report** – Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co., LLP, Certified Public Accountants, have issued an unqualified (“clean”) opinion on First 5 LA’s financial statements for the year ended June 30, 2010. The independent auditor’s report is located at the front of the financial section of this report on Page 1. Further reports on Internal Control and State Compliance begin on Page 34. Management also provides a Letter of Transmittal and an overview and analysis of the basic financial statements in the form of Management’s Discussion and Analysis (MD&A). The MD&A can be found immediately following the independent auditor’s report beginning on Page 3.

- **Management Letter** – During the course of an audit, certain matters involving internal control and other operational matters are observed by the independent auditors and recommendations are made in the Management Letter. These issues are considered housekeeping in nature. Staff has reviewed all recommendations and will follow-up during the next fiscal year and will address the observations as indicated in the responses.

- **Single Audit Report** – A single audit is required for all entities who receive more than $500,000 in funding for Federal programs. The Commission receives Federal funding for Medi-Cal Administrative Activities. The Auditors’ Reports on Internal Control and Compliance with Federal requirements begin on Page 1 of this Report. Findings, again housekeeping in nature, are found on Pages 9-12.

Director Hause also reported financial highlights including a decrease in tobacco tax revenues by $12.4 million or 10.8% primarily due to the decrease in sales of tobacco products, a decrease in the birth rate in Los Angeles County as projected by the State, and increased administrative fees assessed by the State Board of Equalization for the collection of tobacco taxes.

The Commission reported expenditures of approximately $168.2 million in FY 2009-10, a decrease of $3.0 million or 1.8 percent over the prior year. Reduced expenditures were primarily due to reduced grants to Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP) and a slower start up of the Oral Health Community Development initiative than originally anticipated.

The Commission’s financial position remains strong with net assets totaling $872,640,945. This is a decrease of approximately $22.3 million from the previous year, representing a 2.4% decrease. This decrease is primarily due to a decline in tobacco tax revenues and reduced interest earnings.

M/S  (Jonathan Fielding / Neal Kaufman)  APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED
8. Request for Authorization of Destroy Specified Records Pursuant to the Commission’s Records Detention Schedule
Legal Counsel Steele reported that state law requires public agencies to retain all records for a minimum of two years, and then permits the destruction of obsolete records pursuant to a written records retention schedule.

The Commission has previously adopted a records retention schedule in compliance with applicable. There are 54 boxes of records that need to be destroyed. All documents proposed for destruction are outside the applicable retention period and none are documents designated for permanent retention. These documents are no longer needed for current Commission business or for historical records.

M/S (Marv Southard / Angie Stockwell) APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED

9. Resource Mobilization Strategy

A staff presentation was made on the strategies and activities which the Community Investment (CI) Department will employ to ensure that resources are maximized to support the four priority outcomes of the Commission. The staff presentation also provided information on the three main approaches to leveraging resources, internal process and procedures, and the criteria for the prioritizing strategic partnerships and grantmaking activities.

Commissioner Fielding asked about sustainability being part of the criteria. Director Nuno responded that sustainability was an element that is expected to be addressed within the criteria. While it is included in the criteria, this will be more clearly defined.

Commissioner Fielding asked for clarification on the evaluation of leveraging opportunities. Staff clarified that when leveraging opportunities are assessed, especially programmatic opportunities, such opportunities will need to have clear outcomes that can be evaluated and measured.

Furthermore, Commissioner Fielding asked if a threshold amount could be defined for seeking approval of strategic partnership opportunities by the full Commission rather than just delegating this responsibility to the CEO and the Operations Committee. Based on Commissioner Fielding’s inquiry, unanimous consensus was reached on the following baseline thresholds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVERAGING OPPORTUNITY</th>
<th>APPROVAL BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to $500,000</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $500,000 and $1 million</td>
<td>Operations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $1 million</td>
<td>Board of Commissioners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commissioner Fielding asked that staff provide Commissioners with a progress report at the end of a 12-month period on the lessons learned and status of the implementation of the resource mobilization strategy.

Chair Molina reported that at the September Commission Meeting, there was an effort to say that more money needed to be invested in the community for Countywide programming. Based on the discussion that was generated, it was agreed to create a series of motions of what other kinds of issues, policies and programs should be funded by the Commission. Staff had previously presented a series of various items but Commissioners felt strongly about investing additional resources in the community.

Chair Molina commented that all of the staff efforts under the new re-organization have been moving toward the placed-based approach based on the strategic plan previously approved by the Commission. In the proposed motions, there are a lot of issues that require unique or special expertise in order for the proposals to be carried out. Some of the proposals require an RFP process, contracting responsibilities, and the provision of direct services. Decisions need to be made as to how these are going to be carried out keeping in mind these issues. Chair Molina also suggested having a workshop on these proposals to further discuss the proposals and refine the outcomes, the target population, and the impact on the community.

It was the consensus of the Commissioners that each proposal would be presented and requests for clarification, if any, would be made. In agreement with Chair Molina’s suggestion of having a workshop to further discuss the feasibility of these proposals, staff was directed to initiate an RFQ process to identify a consultant pool, with the necessary subject matter expertise, to assess each proposal and determine its feasibility based on the Commission’s priority goal areas. Staff would also be conducting proposal assessments, as appropriate, based on subject matter expertise.

10. Approval of Motion for East Los Angeles College Child Care Providers

Commissioner Martinez commented that East Los Angeles College has a long and successful history in offering a quality academic and workforce program as well as in creating and administering special projects. Family child care providers from all over the County come to the East Los Angeles Community College to take English as Second Language courses and introductory child development courses and are strongly motivated to complete their Commission on Teacher Credentialing Child Development Teacher Permit, Initial child development permit, and/or their Associate Degree in child development. There is an increased (from 35 to almost 200 providers) interest and demand, for prerequisite courses in English, Math, and advanced child development, especially by Spanish and Chinese Speaking providers. This group of students is a special population that needs additional support services, bilingual assistance in meeting and understanding prerequisites, course sequence and graduation requirements, counseling, alternative scheduling of Friday evenings, Saturdays, and Sundays.

The proposal is requesting that an East Los Angeles College Family Child Care and Caregivers Higher Education Academy be funded at a cost of $528,976 per year for a period of two years, to ensure that child care providers are equipped to adequately prepare the children in their care for kindergarten.
Chair Molina commented that this proposal could be further strengthened by making it a pilot program that could be replicated to other community colleges and institutionalized.

Commissioner Kaufman asked if the program had the capacity to generate revenue for tuition. Commissioner Martinez commented that students had to follow the fee schedule at the community college.

Commissioner Williams commented that she would like to possibly see another community college in another part of the geographical area. Commissioner Martinez commented that East Los Angeles College could possibly be a mentor to another community college.

11. Approval of Motion for Tot Parks and Trails

Commissioner Martinez reported the benefits of green space, parks and trails in urban areas are great improving family and children’s physical and psychological health, and making our neighborhoods better places to live. Common places where children meet to play and enjoy time in the outdoors are at a premium in disadvantage areas of the County and existing parks need to be re-imagined to be toddler-friendly, safe, shaded and accessible to strollers and developmentally disabled children; and

Current research has determined that when children and their parents have access to more parks and trails they exercise more, maintain healthier weight, suffer less depression and that the cooling effects from green spaces generates public health benefits by lowering heat-related incidents and reducing emergency room visits for asthma. Findings from the USC Green Visions Plan, Access to Parks and Park Facilities in the Region, August 2008 demonstrate that only 14.6% of the region’s population has pedestrian access to green spaces (where pedestrian access is defined as living ¼ mile—or ¼ mile round trip—to the nearest park), leaving 85.4% of the population without easy access to such resources.

Parks and trails create an opportunity for parents to “get in on the action” by exercising with toddlers or by walking through well-designed stroller trails and paths. The reasons for lack of green spaces is varied; the fact remains that the First 5 LA commission has an opportunity and a responsibility to define create a better future for its children and generations yet to come. Community-based organizations, are stepping forward to fill this critical gap by leveraging resources and working to communicate the benefits provided by parks and green spaces.

The proposal is requesting a one-time allocation of $50 million for a countywide park and trail enhancement campaign from the First 5 LA Commission that will have a lasting impact on the built environment affecting 0 – 5 year olds. Part of the funding would be for land acquisition. Maintenance costs of the parks would be absorbed the local municipalities.

Commissioner Southard commented that the proposal seemed to be more of an intensive place-based approach.
Chair Molina requested further clarification of child safety, how to ensure that parks are utilized by the 0-5 population, and how would these parks be sustained after they are built.

Commissioner Fielding commented that this was a good idea. Tot parks could be created in smaller areas than traditional parks, still keeping with the Commission's priorities.

12. Approval of Motion for Infant Safe Sleeping

Commissioner Tilton reported that the goal of this project would be to significantly reduce the number of preventable infant fatalities resulting from unsafe sleeping. This positive impact would be sustained with community level involvement, institutional support, and infusion into existing prenatal and infant programs.

Research has shown that these tragic deaths could be prevented by the use of safe sleeping practices such as back to sleep, uncluttered sleep surfaces, and room sharing instead of co-sleeping. Information and guidance regarding safe sleeping practices needs to be shared with all infant caregivers including parents, grandparents, babysitters, foster parents, and employees of child care facilities.

A major safe sleeping effort should be undertaken in Los Angeles County to save infant lives by raising communication, guidance and support at the local and countywide level. This effort would begin with 10 small community focus groups on safe sleeping in areas known to have higher rates of unsafe infant sleeping deaths.

The small groups would be followed by an initial community-wide forum to share information from the small focus groups and help create an informed and culturally relevant campaign that can effectively impact infant safe sleeping. The community-wide forum would draw directly from the lessons learned in the focus groups and would incorporate through vignettes, role playing and dialogue, the cultural beliefs and practices as well as real life challenges related to economic struggles, sleep deprivation and lack of social support.

Following the initial community-wide forum in the higher risk area, a county-wide effort including forums in at least 10 communities based on this approach would be launched to provide the foundation for a major campaign to promote awareness and education about safe sleeping. Each level and aspect of this campaign would utilize existing materials, documents, and resources such as SIDS prevention materials, American Academy of Pediatrics research, and other campaigns, expanding the focus to address all aspects of unsafe infant sleeping.

The proposal is requesting an allocation of $800,000 to fund the Infant Safe Sleeping Campaign over the next 2 years.

Commissioner Williams was supportive of the proposal, especially with its focus on child safety.

Commissioner Fielding commented that the impact of cultural traditions should also be taken into consideration as part of the focus groups, and that an education campaign be developed.
Commissioner Wilder proposed an amendment to this proposal requesting an additional allocation of $2 million to fund a crib voucher program and education campaign. The crib voucher program would fund 10,000 vouchers in the amount of $150 each for the purchase of cribs that promote child safety. Additionally, $500,000 would augment the budget proposed in Agenda Item 12, Infant Safe Sleeping, to provide new parents with information on alternatives to co-sleeping and crib safety.

13. Approval of Motion for Connecting Risks and Perinatal Service Systems

Commissioner Tilton reported that perinatal programs may miss issues of violence and perversion. There are also multiple programs serving the same clients. Given this, data connections between these programs can help connect services.

The goal of this project is the creation of a linked multi-agency data system connecting risk programs and perinatal service systems. Prevention and early intervention could occur more often if these separate service systems were connected, and common data links would provide a foundation for such connections.

The proposal is requesting an allocation of $200,000 for data analyst, clerk, consultants, office, and purchase of data and equipment. The end product will be a data system with liaison for future case services. Minimal costs to agencies may be more than matched by more efficient and effective service. Current models include Child Death Review, DCFS / hospital neonatal project, Family and Children's Index, and ICAN Multiagency Data Report.

Chair Molina commented that the proposal lacked a defined pathway. Specifically, she wanted to know the purpose for the collection of data. She felt that more definition was needed to the project.

Commissioner Kaufman that it was important to collect this type of data but felt that more information was needed as to what was going to be done with this data.

14. Approval of Motion for Funders' Partnership

Commissioner Kaufman reported that this motion was aimed at enabling First 5 LA to take advantage of a timely opportunity to support the efforts of public and private funders of early childhood in Los Angeles County to pool their resources in order to support innovative and community-driven organizations that are working to make the systems that serve children and their families more efficient, better coordinated, and higher quality. There are many precedents for multi-sector funders collaboratives and partnerships of this kind in other states and cities. From New York to Texas, and Florida to Washington State, early childhood partnerships have formed to galvanize parents, municipal and state governments, businesses, and institutions to work together to create communities that support and strengthen families with young children. Examples of such partnerships include Thrive By Five (Seattle) and the Early Childhood Funders Collaborative (National). In Los Angeles, First 5 LA has previously participated in funders collaboratives for its Healthy Kids Initiative (Children Health Initiative) funding of conferences, and shared learning activities.
First 5 LA's support of, and participation in, a funders collaborative dedicated to investments for children 0-5, will enable the Commission to coordinate and leverage funding in our Best Start Communities and Countywide in a way that we have not yet been able to achieve. This is especially important as the Commission seeks to work deeply in communities, and to "scale up" investments Countywide. In order to create an environment in which investments can be replicated, we will need funding partners who understand and engage in our work.

In Los Angeles County, there is an urgent need to strengthen the collaboration among funders of early childhood. In addition to the Best Start communities, other large-scale place-based efforts will begin to take shape throughout the County. For instance, two Promise Neighborhood Planning Grants were recently awarded to LA-area collaboratives. These grants are supporting the development of multifaceted programs and services to create a robust "Cradle-to-Career" continuum of support for children and families in underserved and impoverished communities. The planning grants will result in requests for Implementation funding that will need to be matched with commitments from local governments, private philanthropy and businesses. In order to successfully "bring home" long-term allocations of federal resources to LA County, the Promise Neighborhood grantees will need to demonstrate that they can garner local support from aligned funding sources. This will require leadership and coordination of the public and private funders of early childhood, including First 5 LA, to ensure that Los Angeles County is successful in these efforts.

A strong and active funders' collaborative will help the Commission to create this type of broader investment in our target communities and Countywide. As grantees are carefully planning their applications for implementation, the Commission needs to be supporting the efforts of funders partnerships as well to ensure that we do not lose the opportunity to leverage federal investment in our communities. This may include providing resources for leadership, organizing, and convening activities among the public and private funders. It may also include capitalizing a flexible grant fund, in the form of a pooled investment, which encourages others to also invest. This fund can be used, for example, to support Promise Neighborhood applicants who did not receive the federal planning grants, but who nonetheless have innovative and well-positioned collaborations in place as a result of their application process.

The proposal is requesting an allocation of $1.5 million to support development of a new or established prenatal to five public-private funders partnership in Los Angeles County designed to leverage First 5 LA's investments, and to increase the support for innovative family strengthening activities Countywide. Of this allocation, $1.5 million would be used to provide leverage for innovative programs and promising practices arising out of the public-private partnership. First 5 LA funding in this category would be subject to a 1:1 matching requirement. The criteria and process for disbursement of the leveraging fund will be governed by an advisory body to the partnership representing all of its investors who are interested in participating. First 5 LA will be represented on the advisory board by a staff person to be determined. The remaining $500,000 would be used for the management, organizational needs, and governance of the funding initiative.

Chair Molina commented that more clarity was needed as to what would be accomplished with the formation of the partnership.
Commissioner Stockwell was supportive of the proposal, especially since the proposed partnership would potentially lead to leveraging opportunities and facilitate the resource mobilization strategy.

15. Approval of Motion for Data Partnership

Commissioner Kaufman reported that the Commission has invested in improving infrastructure and capacity for data-driven policy, planning and services in LA County and other funders have made similar investments. Data capacity is essential in order to optimally plan for and measure meaningful results in First 5 LA’s four goal areas: 1) Children are born healthy; 2) Children maintain a healthy weight; 3) Children are safe from abuse and neglect; and 4) Children are ready for kindergarten;

There is a need to create a place where tools and information can be exchanged and applied toward accelerating and focusing investments for kids. Data infrastructure would be enhanced through integration among partners who have demonstrated alignment, collaboration, and ability to respond to the information needs of communities and decision-makers. Diffusion of a variety of data is critical in the path toward building broader and deeper awareness and enthusiasm for the potential of such investments, based on evidence (from data and research) and real stories from communities.

The purpose of the Data Partnership would be to establish a collaborative network of people and organizations experienced in addressing gaps related to data, technology and communication on child and family well-being. The Data Partnership would have three functions: (1) formation and convening of Data Response Team, (2) engagement with data consumers, and (3) development of research clearinghouse/portal and new community-based research applications.

The proposal requests an allocation of $5 million in countywide funds over five years to help create a countywide Data Partnership focused on increasing access to timely accurate data and improving outcomes for families with young children.

Commissioner Stockwell recommended that some of the other proposals that complement this proposal be consolidated into a more comprehensive proposal. She suggested that Commissioner Tilton’s proposal on Connecting Risks and Perinatal Service Systems be incorporated.

Director Jimenez commented that the proposed data collection of certain proposal will help the accountability framework of the Commission in determining which investments have resulted in an impact. The data partnership could possibly feed information onto the various dashboards. Staff was directed to coordinate multiple data projects to see how they fit into the accountability framework.

16. Approval of Motion for County-Wide Universal Assessment of Newborns

Commissioner Kaufman reported that a brief assessment provided to each newborn and his or her family would screen for immediate needs, provide information about available programs and services, and allow the opportunity to receive at least one voluntary home visit and ongoing information on child development. Providing a system that could
touch all families countywide presents an opportunity to positively influence the life of each and every child born in Los Angeles County. Offering universal assessment immediately after birth before discharge from the hospital would ensure that almost all families with new babies are reached, and all families would have the opportunity to participate in the supportive services offered.

In Los Angeles County, there is currently no community-wide system in place that universally provides parents with an opportunity to learn about parenting and early childhood development, or obtain assistance on issues such as basic health care, insurance coverage, nutrition, breastfeeding, family violence, maternal depression, improving home safety, etc. This would be a voluntary system where all families are assessed at birth and offered either one home visit or referrals and resources for additional services as needed.

Other counties in California, cities throughout the United States and other countries have already invested in universal assessment programs. These examples demonstrate that this approach is affordable, feasible and positively impacts the health and well-being of children and families.

The initial assessment would occur in the hospital following birth. This assessment would indicate the services and programs that the family may be eligible for, indicate concerns and issues that the family would like assistance with, and provide assistance in enrolling the newborn in health insurance. Following the assessment the family would be offered a tailored menu of services that they are eligible for. The services are all voluntary, but the key to success in these programs is the element of universality. A universal program takes away the stigma that a program only targeted at high risk families would have.

Families with greater need would be offered voluntary home visitation follow-up services. This would consist of one to three visits in the home or to another mutually acceptable location. The home visits would focus on meeting the identified needs of the family and could consist of limited education about child health, development, and safety; newborn care; safe sleeping; linkage to additional community resources; and assistance with breastfeeding, using health insurance benefits, or other critical resources. Implementation of the universal assessment tool would have the added benefit of providing community planners with more accurate and time sensitive information relative to the needs and challenges facing new parents in LA County.

The proposal requests an allocation of $54.1 million for the remaining duration of the current strategic plan to implement a universal assessment of all new parents at the birth of their child to systematically identify families in greatest need of support in LA County.

Chair Molina asked for clarification as to how the program would be implemented? She further asked if staff would be responsible for implementation or if hiring a consultant would be a better approach for program implementation.

Commissioner Wilder proposed an amendment to Commissioner Kaufman proposal by adding a Parent-Child Interaction Training component that is to be offered to new parents assessed as higher risk. Specific groups of new parents of 0-5 year old children would be targeted for services: teen parents; parents with any criminal history;
transitional age youth; first-time kinship caretakers. The training would adopt a “train-the-trainer” model to develop a sustainable intervention. The training should strive to develop real-time skills for handling behavior problems in young children and positive discipline strategies. It would also include a special training component directed to new fathers.

The proposed amendment requested an additional allocation of $20 million.

Commissioner Martinez commented that perhaps a vote should be taken at what proposals should be moved forward for further assessment. Chair Molina reiterated that all proposals were being presented for discussion and that no formal action would be taken until an assessment could be done of each to determine feasibility.

17. Approval of Motions to Augment the Countywide Investment

Commissioners Stockwell and Dennis presented their two-prong proposal focusing on (1) improving the nutrition and physical activity environment in child care settings; and (2) an early care and education workforce consortium.

Regarding the improvement of nutrition and physical activity environment, the proposal requests, building upon the pilot recently done by the Commission and current projects being implemented by LAUP and the Department of Public Health, funding a countywide workforce improvement program that will impact early childhood providers in order to reverse the growing epidemic of early childhood obesity in Los Angeles County be establishing appropriate eating and physical activity patterns among children in care. The program would best be administered by contracting with a single community agency for implementation and including relevant County and community agencies in a public-private partnership to share expertise and build on past experience. Included in this component is the development of a strategic partnership with the Child Care Alliance of Los Angeles to support a data collection plan for countywide advocacy and planning.

The proposed early care and education workforce consortium goals are to increase the quality of early learning programs for young children and their families by supporting the education and preparation of an effective, well-compensated, and diverse early care and education workforce. Furthermore, key stakeholders across LA County would be involved and engaged in providing and improving available training and professional development to a wide spectrum of the early childhood education current workforce and potential workforce.

The proposal requests an allocation of $51,304,547 as an additional augmentation to the Countywide investment.

Commissioner Dennis suggested that the data collection component of the proposal could be integrated with other data collection proposals.

Commissioner Fielding commented that having data on the relationship of children in childcare and family factors and outcomes was important. With respect to the consortium, he commented that it was similar to the proposal submitted by Commissioner Martínez and suggested that both proposals could be consolidated. Commissioner Martínez was agreeable to this suggestion.
Commissioner Kaufman requested that measurable outcomes be included in the proposal—i.e., number of children impacted.

18. Approval of Motion for Improving Access to Substance Abuse Services

Commissioner Southard reported that research indicates that substance abuse increases the risk of child abuse and neglect, and is often associated with increased risk of substance abuse and emotional problems later in life. If the parental issues of the family are not adequately addressed, the family unit may not be able to maintain the level of stability necessary to remain intact and impact the well-being of children and families.

Currently, there are no adequate ways to connect such parents to resources and the existing substance abuse service continuum. Through this project, parents of children, aged 0-5 years old, and identified by DCFS as having a need for substance abuse services will be provided screening, brief intervention (information and education), referral, and substance abuse treatment, as needed. This initiative would be implemented Countywide and meets First 5 LA's overarching object to strengthen families and children via system integration and improved navigation of services.

DPH and DCFS will develop a screening and referral process to quickly identify and offer services to families who have been reported to DCFS, but have no substantiated case for abuse or neglect at the time of investigation. Under the proposed project, DPH will continue to subcontract with the Community Assessment & Service Centers (CASC) and alcohol and other drug (AOD) treatment agencies to enhance service delivery to this population.

According to DCFS data, there were 4,811 cases of suspected child abuse and/or neglect opened during Calendar Year 2009 involving children ages birth to five years. In 2,146 (45 percent) of the 4,811 cases, the child(ren) was never removed but released back to the family. In contrast, in 2,666 (55 percent) of those cases, the child(ren) was removed from the family and detained by DCFS. In another data report DCFS further indicated that there were a total of approximately 21,809 cases opened during Fiscal Year 2009-2010. Of those opened cases, 9,143 (42 percent) cases had one or more parent with substance abuse related issues.

The proposal requests a time-limited $5 million annual investment that would allow DPH and DCFS to design service integration and system navigation strategies to improve access to substance abuse services for parents of children (from birth to age 5).

The proposed investment by the Commission would be time-limited because access to substance abuse services is anticipated to improve as 2010 Federal parity requirements become fully implemented, and with the implementation of Federal health care reform in 2014.

19. Approval of Motion for “One Step Ahead” Initiative

Commissioner Fielding reported that the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC) is a food and nutrition education program for
pregnant, breastfeeding, and postpartum women, infants and children under age five who are low-income (up to 185% of the Federal Poverty Level) and at nutritional risk. WIC provides nutrition education, breastfeeding promotion and support, medical and social service referrals, and supplemental foods tailored to eligible families through funding from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). WIC is a short-term intervention program designed to influence lifetime nutrition and health behaviors in this targeted, high-risk population. Nationwide, approximately 25% of the individuals served are women, 25% are infants and the remaining 50% are children ages one to five. WIC services are available in every state and US territory, and currently WIC services are delivered to over 9 million participants each month.

In Los Angeles County (LAC), WIC currently serves approximately 67% of all infants and about half of all children ages one to five, translating into approximately 600,000 individuals and 400,000 families each month. WIC organizations are devoted to improving nutrition and health among pregnant women and young children. The following seven local agency WIC Programs provide these services in LAC in over 90 sites—nearly every low-income neighborhood—across the County:

The proposal requests the establishment of a five-year project called “One Step Ahead” that would provide important child development, safety supplies and resources to families with new babies in low-income communities receiving WIC services in Los Angeles County. These items could include: children’s and parenting books, developmental toys, vouchers for car seats, child safety locks, and other items that improve childhood development and safety. WIC centers would distribute the vouchers to their clients, and provide education to ensure parents know how best to utilize these items.

The goals of this project are to provide low income families with developmental and safety items that they might have difficulty affording as well as to retain families in WIC beyond the child’s first year of life. The One Step Ahead project is modeled on the First 5 funded, successful WIC literacy program, Little By Little.

Commissioner Martinez asked how other Commission programs could be incorporated into this proposal such as Family Literacy. CEO Martinez suggested that the Ready.Set.Grow! campaign also be considered for potential incorporation into this proposal.

20. Approval of Motion for Mini-Grant Program to Establish Community Peer Support Groups for Parents of Infants and Small Children

Commissioner Fielding commented that the proposal recommends creating a mini-grant program for parents of children 0-5 to establish peer support groups in order to enhance social support for and foster community cohesion among parents. The peer support group model has been widely utilized as a strategy to address issues such as postpartum depression and continuation of breastfeeding. Communities establishing peer support groups with these funds may choose to focus on these and other issues such as parenting skills or healthy eating in the home. Support groups focusing on these issues would most significantly impact the strategic plan priority goals of children being safe from abuse and neglect and children maintaining a healthy weight.
The target for this intervention would be parents of children 0-5 in communities where peer support and a sense of social cohesion and connection to the neighborhood are often weak or lacking. A significant proportion of new mothers relate feeling a lack of social support consistent with a feeling of isolation or lack of connectedness. Social support groups are particularly important for mothers of newborns experiencing feelings of isolation. Common feelings experienced by mothers who have recently delivered include a perception of not being supported, difficulties with family members living far away, cross cultural issues, being cut off or no longer having commonalities with friends, difficulties with spouse and afraid of judgments. Data from the 2005 Los Angeles Mommies and Babies (LAMB) survey show that one in four mothers stated that they did not have someone to listen to their problems; and nearly 30% stated that they did not have someone to help them care for their child if they became sick. There is data to suggest that parents value the identity and connectedness they receive from support groups. WIC found that 26% of participating mothers in their WIC Offers Wellness case management program for low-birth-weight and very-low-birth-weight infants were returning solely to attend their support groups, without receiving food vouchers and other available services. In general, mothers with high perceived level of support are more satisfied with their babies, their maternal roles, and their lives overall.

The proposal requests the establishment a grant fund to award up to 100 individual mini-grants in amounts not to exceed $20,000 per award to establish community peer support groups for parents of children 0-5. The total allocation is $2.2 million made available for the remainder of the five-year strategic plan.

21. **Approval of Motion to Augment Countywide Resource Mobilization Strategic Investment**

Commissioner Stockwell reported that the Commission adopted a strategic plan, out of which an approach was also adopted to include strategies for Countywide and Place Based community investments;

The strengthening of financial and social capital resources together with local First 5 LA community mobilization to build capacity and countywide public education, policy and advocacy is necessary to the successful implementation of placed-based investments.

One of the Commission's role in the new strategic plan is to support leveraging of resources for systems (organizations and networks) to strengthen services and resources available to families and communities to achieve the long term and intermediate goals that have been set.

The Resource Mobilization strategy will facilitate connection and strengthen the Commission's ability to leverage federal, state, county and other private dollars; develop partnerships that will give the Commission a greater reach throughout the county; and broaden the services for families and children 0-5 in Los Angeles County beyond the Commission's investments.

The proposal requests that that the countywide investment of Resource Mobilization budget be augmented by an additional $40,000,000. ($11,000,000. is already allocated for fiscal year 2010-2011; $10,000,000 would be added to years 2-5 for a total of $51,000,000).
It was the consensus of the Commissioners to exclude this proposal from further assessment and consideration. The current allocation of $11 million for Year 1 was deemed to be sufficient for Year 1 of the Resource Mobilization Strategy. If additional resources are needed, staff was instructed to come back to the Commission with a request for additional funding. Staff was also directed to provide a status report on Year 1 activities of the Resource Mobilization Strategy at year-end.

NOTE: The following motions were introduced by Commissioner Wilder at the meeting. All subsequent agenda items were renumbered.

22. Approval of Motion for Ensuring Pregnant Low-Income Women have Uninterrupted Prenatal and Post-Partum Care

Commissioner Wilder reported that recent studies show that African-American infants have disproportionately higher mortality rates than the rest of the population and that eligible Hispanic women enroll in the Medi-Cal program and begin prenatal care late in pregnancy posing risks to both the mother and the newborn.

Simplifying the enrollment procedures into the Medi-Cal program for pregnant women and children is necessary to promote access to timely health services that can save lives and prevent disabilities. Providing prenatal care and health services in the first years of life can prevent more costly long-term chronic illnesses and disabilities.

Savings will result from enrolling more of the currently eligible pregnant women and newborns into health programs as early as possible and to maximize receipt of federal matching funds to support these programs. Health program enrollment for pregnant women should be as simple, convenient, timely, administratively feasible and direct as possible. This includes the key principle of immediate and ongoing coverage for persons who are very likely to be eligible until a final eligibility determination is made by the county or state.

The proposal entails engaging in two separate but related activities, especially if done in coordination with the universal home visitation program: 1) create a Perinatal Hotline; and, 2) engage in policy advocacy to any avoid disruption in medical coverage for pregnant women, especially as health reform changes are implemented.

The Commission would fund a pilot project to both create a hotline for pregnant women countywide and to work with several prenatal care clinics of various types – high volume, group practice, single provider - on the issues for women and their providers surrounding the transformation of the two-step into one-step application for Medi-Cal presumptive, immediate and ongoing coverage. The experiences would be relayed real-time to the various departments that should address any access-related barriers – primarily the State Department of Health Services and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services – and summarized in a report to support necessary policy and e-changes for the enrollment processes to affect health reform in 2014.

The proposals requests an allocation of $500,000 annually for duration of 5 year strategic plan ($2.5 million total). An additional $300,000 budget would be needed for evaluation.
23. Approval of Healthy Food Access Initiative

Commissioner Wilder reported that a third of all U.S. deaths annually can be attributed to either a lack of physical activity or poor eating habits or both. Almost a third of U.S. children and adolescents are overweight or obese with even higher rates in African-American and Latino and lower-income communities.

Overweight children and adolescents have a greater likelihood of becoming overweight and obese adults at risk for heart disease, hypertension, diabetes and other compromising health conditions. Only a quarter of the youth in Los Angeles County consume five or more serving of fruits and vegetables per day, but half consume fast food at least once a week.

Community gardens are an effective community-based strategy for improving health disparities because they offer the joint benefits of physical activity promotion and access to fruits and vegetables. Studies suggest that families are more likely to be physically active if they have neighborhood or nearby public spaces that they consider aesthetically appealing.

Health benefits from participating in community gardens include positive changes in total cholesterol, HDL cholesterol and systolic blood pressure are associated with either walking or gardening. Community gardens have also demonstrated a role in improving access to positive nutrition including findings that suggests that community gardeners have a greater consumption of fresh vegetables compared with non-gardeners as well as lower consumption of sweet foods and drinks; and

The proposal requests an allocation of a $7.5 million over the next five years for a Healthy Food Access Initiative.

COMMISSION: (Item 24)

24. Public Comment

Luz Chacon, Maternal & Child Health Access
Janice French, LA Best Babies Network
Sylvia Drew Ivie, Office of Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
Kathy Malaske-Samu, Office of Child Care, Los Angeles County
Yanci Panameno, NEUHC WIC Program
Caron Post, LA Perinatal Mental Health Taskforce
Caroline Rivas, Advancement Project
Shannan Whaley, PHFC WIC Program
Kimberly Wong, LA County Perinatal Mental Health Taskforce

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:32 pm.

A Closed Session took place prior to the Commission Meeting. There is no reportable action.
The next regularly scheduled Commission meeting will be on:

November 18, 2010 at 1:30 p.m.
Multi-Purpose Room
750 N. Alameda Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Meeting minutes were recorded by Maria Romero.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Chair and Members of the Commission

CC: Evelyn V. Martinez, Chief Executive Officer

FROM: Craig A. Steele

DATE: October 1, 2010

SUBJECT: Request for Authorization to Destroy Specified Records Pursuant to the Commission's Records Retention Schedule

State law requires public agencies to retain all records of the agency for a minimum of two years, and then permits the destruction of obsolete records pursuant to a written records retention schedule. In many cases certain specified records, such as the minutes and agendas of the agency, records relating to real property, and personnel records, must be retained for longer periods, or even permanently. An efficient records retention and destruction system, in compliance with applicable law, is essential to the operation of the organization since records are expensive and cumbersome to maintain when they are past their useful life.

The Commission has previously adopted a records retention schedule in compliance with applicable law. Prior to the destruction of any record, the schedule and State law require the approval of Legal Counsel, the Executive Director and the Commission. Ms. Martinez and I have approved the attached records destruction request from Yolanda Bosch, Esq., Chief Administrative Officer. All documents proposed for destruction are outside the applicable retention period and none are documents designated for permanent retention. Staff therefore requests the Commission's approval to destroy the document files, as listed on Attachment 1, attached hereto, which are no longer needed for current Commission business or for historical records.

Total boxes to be destroyed: 54

If the Commission concurs with this request, the appropriate motion would be to approve the destruction of the 54 boxes of Commission records in compliance with the Commission’s Records Retention Policy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Boxes</th>
<th>Initiatives/Project</th>
<th>Grant/Contract Period</th>
<th>Scheduled Disposal</th>
<th>Requested Board Approval Date</th>
<th>Disposal Date Confirmation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CDI</td>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CDI Small Proposals</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CDI Applications/ Letters of Agreement</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CDI Small</td>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CDI Cycle 4 Small</td>
<td>4-2005-4-2008</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CDI Cycle I</td>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CDI Cycle IV</td>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CDI Large</td>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Family Literacy</td>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Family Literacy Proposals</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Family Literacy Review Tools</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Family Literacy -Phase 2</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Healthy Births</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2006-2006</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CDI Small Cycle 4</td>
<td>2000-2005</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CDI Small Grant Cycle 1, 2, &amp; 3</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CDI Moratorium Cycle 1, 2, &amp; 3</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LABBN Blueprint</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LABBN Blueprint, Appendices A-H</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABBN Blueprint, Appendices I-X</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETA Proposal</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDI Large Cycle I-II Large Declinations</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Institute Cycle 1</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRI Working Budgets &quot;loose papers&quot; (not final budgets)</td>
<td>2003-2005</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Los Angeles County Children and Families First Proposition 10 Commission

All Departments
Policy and Guidelines for
Selecting Strategic Partners

1 POLICY STATEMENT
Provide consistency, transparency and uniformity in the selection of strategic partners.

2 PURPOSE
Provide general guidelines in the selection process of strategic partners based on specific guidelines established by the “Los Angeles County Children and Families First – Proposition 10 Commission (“Commission”) aka First 5 LA.”

3 APPLICATION
This policy applies to all strategic partners being considered and/or applying to provide services to the Commission. A strategic partner is defined as an existing governmental, not-for-profit or for-profit entity which has specific resources needed by the Commission and which has the demonstrated ability or level of expertise to implement specific activities in cooperation with the Commission that are consistent with the Commission’s Strategic Plan in a manner that is more cost effective and expeditious. A strategic partner is selected based on an assessment of whether other possible service providers have the same specific resources needed by the Commission rather than by going out to bid to solicit the specific expertise required.

4 RESPONSIBILITIES
The Executive Director and the Director of the department seeking a strategic partner are responsible for implementing this policy.
5 PROCEDURES

To ensure that First 5 LA activities are aligned with the strategic plan goals, the Board of Commissioners works with Commission staff to develop a set of prioritized initiatives, programs and activities and proportionate allocations. Once a project or initiative allocation is determined, planning and implementation activities commence at which point an assessment of resources required is determined. The following steps are to be taken when identifying and procuring strategic partners:

5.1 Through assessment identify organizations and entities which have specific resources needed by the Commission that align with the goals and objectives outlined in the First 5 LA Strategic Plan. The strategic partners should offer First 5 LA an opportunity to leverage resources and build economies of scale.

5.2 Commission staff recommends a Strategic Partner to the Executive Director for review and approval.

5.3 Once approved, Commission staff works with the strategic partner on developing the Scope of Work, budget and on negotiating the contract.

5.4 Commission staff prepares a recommendation to the Board to enter into an agreement with the identified strategic partner along with a report describing the result of the assessment and reasons why the specific partner was selected. The assessment process must document that the strategic partner has the specific resources needed by the Commission. It must also document why the strategic partner was selected instead of other possible service providers, if any. The assessment process must also document why the strategic partner could implement specific activities in a manner that is more cost effective and expeditious.

6. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The Commission shall not select a strategic partner who has a conflict of interest, or with whom a Commissioner or staff member has a conflict of interest, except as permitted by applicable law. A conflict of interest exists when one has the opportunity to advance or protect one’s own interest or private interest of others, with whom one has a relationship, in way detrimental to the interest, or potentially harmful for the integrity or fundamental mission of the Commission. No Commissioner or staff member or consultant shall make, participate in making, or in any way use his or her official position to influence the making of a decision to make a strategic partnership decision for this Commission when he or she knows or has reason to know he or she has a financial interest that could be materially impacted by the decision. Decision-makers must recognize that even the perception or temptation of a conflict of interest may give rise to the disqualification of a proposer or the termination of a contract. Commission staff shall consult with legal counsel regarding potential conflicts of interest at the earliest opportunity.
Los Angeles County Children and Families First Proposition 10 Commission

Finance Department
Procurement Policy

1 POLICY STATEMENT
A fair and uniform procurement policy allows for a free and open competition among vendors and, when used properly, delivers quality materials and services from responsible vendors in the most cost-effective manner.

2 PURPOSE
This policy establishes a uniform procedure for the procurement of services and materials by the “Los Angeles County Children and Families First – Proposition 10 Commission (“Commission”) aka First 5 LA.”

3 APPLICATION
These procedures apply to all Commission departments, employees and individuals/consultants authorized to do business on behalf of the Commission.

4 RESPONSIBILITIES
The Executive Director and Department Directors are responsible for implementing this policy, and formulating and complying with appropriate procedures and guidelines.

5 PROCEDURES
Unless a specific exception to this policy applies, the Commission shall procure goods and services with a value in excess of $5,000 from the lowest responsible bidder after the issuance of Requests for Proposal (“RFP”) or other method deemed appropriate for a formal bidding process. RFP’s or other method for bidding shall be written to include the scope of work, specifications and terms of the proposed purchase or contract. Each RFP or other appropriate method shall provide sufficient details to
assist prospective bidders in calculating an accurate, unconditioned and stable bid. Each RFP or other method used shall provide explicitly that the Commission reserves the right to reject all bids and re-advertise for bids, and that failure to comply with bid specification shall be grounds for disqualification of bids. Each bidder or proposer shall be required to honor the price and specifications quoted for a minimum of sixty (60) calendar days following submission of the bid. The Executive Director or Commission may waive any irregularity in bids. The Executive Director and user department director shall approve all RFP's or other method used prior to issuance.

5.1 Purchase Requests (PR) are required prior to all purchases or service agreements regardless of the dollar amount. The PR should be properly completed, executed and delivered to the finance department. Proper supporting documentation must be included such as invoices and receipts. The department incurring the expense shall initiate, complete and execute the PR.

5.2 Purchases or services over $5,000 dollars require the solicitation of at least three (3) RFP's or other method used to qualified prospective bidders and receipt by the Commission of competitive bids (less than 3 is acceptable) for comparable goods or services prior to the procurement of the goods or services.

5.3 The Commission's policy against Conflict of Interest apply to all RFP's or other method used and proposals.

5.4 Each RFP or other method issued by the Commission shall contain a sample of the Commission's standard applicable contract for goods or services, with a statement notifying the bidder that the selected bidder shall be expected to execute the contract without substantive alteration.

5.5 If two (2) or more bids received are for the same total amount or unit price, the Commission may accept any one of such bids or may accept the lowest bid made by negotiation with the bidders after bid opening.

The sole exception is when single-source or two-source procurement is justified as provided below or there are less than three (3) qualified suppliers available. Each such exception shall be documented in writing for the approval of the Executive Director prior to the formal procurement.
Exceptions are as follows:

The competitive bid requirement of this policy shall not apply under the following circumstances:

(a) The supplies, equipment or services to be procured are unique because of their quality, durability, availability or fitness for a particular use;

(b) Such supplies, equipment or services are available from only one source;

(c) The Executive Director has determined in writing that exigent or emergency circumstances require the immediate purchase of specific supplies, services or equipment;

(d) Personal services contracts of less than $25,000 annually in the aggregate to any one service provider.

(e) Personal services contracts of $25,000 or more annually in the aggregate if the Executive Director issues a written finding prior to the award of contract that the proposed contractor is so uniquely qualified for the particular project that competitive bidding would not be in the best interests of the Commission.

5.6 Justification for using other than the three bid process for procurement over $5,000 shall be approved in writing by the Executive Director.

5.7 The Executive Director shall approve selection of a bid that is not the lowest qualified supplier or lowest cost of goods supplier from the minimum three bid process.

5.8 Emergency purchases or services for any reason shall be approved by the director of the user department and a PR completed, executed and delivered to the finance department by the next business day (within 24 hours) of the time the costs were incurred.
Item 15

Receive and File
Progress Update and Timeline for Implementation of the Public Education Campaign for the Los Angeles County Infant Safe Surrender Program
FIRST 5 LA

SUBJECT:
Progress update and timeline for Infant Safe Surrender Public Education Campaign

RECOMMENDATION:
Receive and file progress update and timeline for implementation of the public education campaign for the Los Angeles County Infant Safe Surrender Program.

BACKGROUND:
At its regularly scheduled meeting of September 8, 2011, the Board of Commissioners approved a motion to allocate $500,000 over a one year period to increase awareness of the Infant Safe Surrender program in Los Angeles County, direct staff to develop recommendations for a public outreach campaign and return to the Commission with a plan for use of the funds. The plan should include a specific, expedited timeframe for implementing the campaign, to be launched no later than December 2011. Staff was asked to return to the Commission with a timeline for implementation of the public education campaign and a plan for the use of the funds.

DISCUSSION:
Staff has already taken the following initial steps to implement the campaign:

- Public Affairs staff has conducted an assessment of the existing collateral materials and identified aspects of them that can be redesigned for future use. Those that will be retained for use in the new campaign will be redesigned with marketing/communications consultant support and input.
- First 5 LA Public Affairs staff has met with Supervisor Knabe’s office and a representative from DCFS to review existing materials from the previous campaign and to discuss possible updates and changes in graphic design and messaging. An opportunity to leverage the positive stories of families that have adopted safely surrendered infants as well as the experiences of the emergency response and hospital professionals who have “received” safely surrendered infants over the past 10 years and use them in public education messages was identified. First 5 LA and County staff will be working collaboratively to identify families and firefighters and hospital workers who would be willing to appear in collateral materials and videos.
- Public Affairs staff has also initiated a procurement process to retain marketing consultant assistance to provide support for all countywide public education and awareness programs. This work would include the implementation of a more expansive campaign for the Safe Surrender Program beginning in Spring 2012. The campaign would complement the distribution of collateral materials with efforts to target key audiences identified as most at risk to abandon an infant or those closest to those in the high risk group who might influence.
- The marketing/advertising portion campaign is anticipated to take place over a six to nine month period.
- Meanwhile, staff will be initiating an outreach campaign using channels such as social media, television and radio public service programming to remind people of the program and using a shorter version of the video that was produced for the 10th Anniversary celebration in September as a tool to raise awareness.
• To move forward and begin redesigning other existing collateral materials from a 2003 public education campaign would risk creating an identity for the program that may change when consultant support is available in early 2012. Staff recommends waiting to do that work so that it is only done once.

• A more extensive campaign should be informed by research our consultant can do to help us identify target audiences and areas to maximize our limited budget. Staff estimates that approximately 75% of the total allocation would be used for advertising and printing of collateral materials and the remainder for market research, graphic design and strategic support.
Item 16

Receive and File
Progress Update from the
Kindergarten Readiness
Ad Hoc Committee
FIRST 5 LA

SUBJECT:
Kindergarten Readiness Ad Hoc Committee

RECOMMENDATION:
Receive and file progress update from the Kindergarten Readiness Ad Hoc Committee.

BACKGROUND:
The Kindergarten Readiness Ad Hoc Committee, comprised of Commissioners Duane Dennis, Evangelina Stockwell and Cindy Harding, was established at the request of the Program and Planning Committee at its June 23, 2011 Committee Meeting following the Board of Commissioners' approved motion at their June 9, 2011 Commission meeting wherein a decision to extend funding for Family Literacy, Family, Friends, and Neighbors (FFN), and School Readiness Initiative (SRI) to June 30, 2012 was made.

During the course of the Commissioners' discussion at the June 9th Commission meeting, Commissioners recognized that currently funded SRI programs do not conform to a single program model. Hence, it was at this time, that Commissioner Williams suggested considering redesigning SRI in ways that would be unique to First 5 LA since SRI was the state Commission's investment. This suggestion was adopted and delegated to the Program and Planning Committee for action at its September 15, 2011 meeting.

At the September 15, 2011 Program and Planning Committee meeting, the Kindergarten Readiness Ad Hoc Committee was directed to preserve the infrastructure, and where appropriate, the outcomes of Family Literacy, FFN, and SRI in determining First 5 LA's future investment in kindergarten readiness. The directive from the Program and Planning Committee to the Kindergarten Readiness Ad Hoc Committee resulted in two changes to the latter Committee's charter: 1) inclusion of Family Literacy and FFN in its work and 2) modification to the Committee's report and Commission reporting timeline. The attached revised Committee charter reflects changes to the timeline as well as the inclusion of Family Literacy and FFN (Attachment A).

DISCUSSION:
The Committee and First 5 LA staff met on August 11, 2001 via teleconference to develop a plan of action and timeline to execute on its charge. The resulting action was two-fold: 1) conduct an analysis of First 5 LA's current investments related to kindergarten readiness (e.g., Family Literacy, LAUP, etc.); and 2) ascertain emerging evidence-based and/or research supported effective program models and strategies in preparing young children for kindergarten that have/are being funded by public and private dollars.

The Committee and staff also recognized the need to consider several factors in developing First 5 LA's kindergarten readiness investment recommendations: 1) the role of parents and parent's engagement as it relates to kindergarten readiness outcomes; 2) existing infrastructures created by current SRI grantees; 3) timing of the new funding opportunity relative to the expiration dates of the current SRI grants so as to either transition the Family Literacy, FFN, and SRI grantees into the new funding opportunity or treat the new funding opportunity as an entirely new and separate investment where anyone will be able to apply thru First 5 LA's competitive
RFP process; and 4) possible commonalities/inter-relatedness among First 5 LA’s existing kindergarten readiness related investments (LAUP, Family Literacy, ECE Consortium).

The first action involved the Committee and staff’s reviews and discussions of First 5 LA-funded initiatives’ evaluation findings while the second action entailed the Committee and staff’s convening a diverse group of local early care and education (ECE) experts to seek their advice on emerging field-based best practices and effective program models and strategies as well as lessons in developing and implementing First 5 LA’s funded Family Literacy, FFN, and SR initiatives.

Results of the Committee and staff’s actions of each are discussed in more detail below.

First 5 LA’s Existing Kindergarten Readiness Investments
The Committee met with staff on September 19, 2011 at First 5 LA to review and discuss lessons learned from the Family Literacy and SRI through First 5 LA-funded evaluations. Evaluation data of each initiative showed small, but statistically significant findings in favor of program participants that supported the positive impacts of the Family Literacy and SRI programs on preparing children (and their parents) for kindergarten.

Family Literacy - Some highlights from the Family Literacy multi-year evaluation include: statistically significant growth in children’s English vocabulary, emergent literacy skills, as well as early math skills. Parents’ reading assessment scores showed significant growth over the course of their participation as did their self-reported parenting knowledge and behaviors. After leaving the program, parents reported improved English skills, gains in employment, enrolling in college courses, and reading or telling stories to their children more frequently. The evaluation findings reinforced the value of integrating the initiative’s four core strategies (adult education classes, parenting education, parent-child interactive literacy activities, and ECE classes). However, it should be noted that the evaluation findings are limited to a rather small number of participating families since program participation requirements were very time intensive.

SRI - Highlights of the SRI evaluation findings have been focused on a subsample of children who participated in more intensive school readiness activities such as preschool, parent-child activities, and kindergarten transition activities due to variation in program design among the SRI grantees. Results of this sub-study showed that children who participated in First 5 LA-funded SRI programs made appreciable improvements in vocabulary, early literacy and early mathematics when compared to children who participated in State-funded preschool. It is important to highlight, however, that because of the vast differences in the nature and intensity of services offered by the SRI grantees, this sub-study excluded children who received less intensive or less pertinent services. This methodological challenge reinforced the critical need to standardize SRI program components and implementation across all SRI grantees.

In addition to lessons learned from the SRI and Family Literacy evaluations, the Committee and staff are reviewing the set of evidence-based program models whose evaluations have shown positive impacts on reading scores identified by First 5 LA staff during the planning process of First 5 LA’s FY 2009-2015 Strategic Plan as well as those used by SRI grantees.

Finally, the Committee and staff are analyzing the inventory of First 5 LA’s current and proposed early care and education (ECE) investments (Attachments B and C) in regard to their target populations, strategies, and intended outcomes to identify gaps in investment areas, as well as opportunities, to coordinate planned First 5 LA investments (e.g., Family Education, a
new countywide program approved at the February 10, 2011 Commission meeting) or possibly to integrate existing First 5 LA investments (e.g., FFN with LAUP ECE Workforce Consortium).

**Advisory Group Meeting**
A total of 14 professionals, many of whom included Family Literacy, FFN, and SRI grantees, as well as representatives from Resource and Referral agencies, Los Angeles Universal Preschool (LAUP), health and behavioral health-oriented agencies, higher education, and advocacy organizations convened at First 5 LA on October 4, 2011 to share field-based experiences in delivering their ECE programs for the purpose of informing the development of First 5 LA’s new kindergarten readiness investment. The Committee members or their designees and First 5 LA staff, including Chief Executive Officer Evelyn Martinez, were also present. Meeting discussion topics included:

- Defining and Measuring Kindergarten Readiness
- Emerging Promising Practices in the Early Care and Education Field
- Successful Program Models and Strategies
- Challenges in Implementation
- Building Partnerships Within and Across First 5 LA Investments
- Peer Learning

Overall, the meeting generated a wealth of information for Committee members and staff. Some key themes that resonated strongly from the meeting discussion included:

**Child-Level Considerations**
- Program activities aimed to develop children’s social emotional growth (e.g., self-regulation) are important to help increase children’s readiness for kindergarten
- Developmentally appropriate ECE programs emphasize the importance of play in supporting children’s learning
- Follow-up studies of participants into elementary school can inform the effectiveness of ECE programs in improving kindergarten readiness outcomes (e.g., accessing data on third grade reading scores of children who participate in ECE programs)
- The needs of dual language learners should be considered in ECE programs

**Family-Level Considerations**
- Kindergarten readiness begins at birth; therefore developing a positive parent-child bond is critical to optimal development
- The mental health of parents impacts children’s kindergarten readiness outcomes
- It is critical to engage families in ECE programs
- Developing parents as leaders and advocates is crucial to engaging more parents
- Children and families need support for the transition from preschool to kindergarten

**Program-Level Considerations**
- Linking ECE programs with elementary schools would benefit preschool programs that children are attending and the kindergarten programs they will later enter.
- The development of transitional kindergarten is an important new factor to consider in kindergarten readiness programs
- There should be more emphasis placed in professional development efforts on enhancing teachers’ connections with children
Teachers need help in achieving their own professional efficacy; individualized coaching appears to be more effective than teachers attending workshops and group trainings.

Full meeting minutes may be reviewed in Attachment D. A separate meeting with the FFN grantees is planned for early November to learn about their implementation experiences since only a few of the FFN grantees were able to attend the October 4, 2011.

Next Steps
The Committee will work on several action items over the next two months as it develops its investment recommendations and has devised the following guidelines to further its work: 1) develop a countywide competitive funding opportunity; 2) maximize the number of participants to be served while maintaining costs; 3) prescribe a set of required program elements for multi-faceted programs/initiatives so their development and implementation across grantees will be uniform and standardized. Committee members have also requested to coordinate future investments with other First 5 LA ECE investments such as LAUP and the planning efforts for ECE family support components of Best Start Communities’ plans. Any ECE services that are developed will use community-based models and approaches that complement, but do not directly support LAUP programs.

First 5 LA staff will conduct further research and analysis to inform the development of First 5 LA’s new kindergarten readiness investment. These include: 1) ascertaining the type and amount of investments First 5 LA has made to date in preparing children for kindergarten; 2) conducting an environmental scan to assess the amount of financial resources that currently exists throughout Los Angeles County for ECE programs and services; 3) assessing the demands/needs for ECE programs by analyzing calls made to the Los Angeles County 211 call center, as well as other readily available and accessible indicator data that reflect need for ECE programs throughout Los Angeles County; and 4) developing a logic model to identify the short-term, intermediate, long-term outcomes, indicators, and strategies establish linkages to help the Committee and staff conceptualize how First 5 LA investments in kindergarten readiness will be able to make measurable improvements in First 5 LA’s kindergarten readiness priority measure, percent of children in Los Angeles County reading at grade level at third grade.

The Committee will present draft recommendations on the investment amount, timeline, outcomes, target population, program design, and funding mechanism to the Program and Planning Committee at their January 2012 meeting, and deliver final recommendations for approval to the full Commission at the February 9, 2012 Commission meeting.
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BACKGROUND

According to experts, if a child has not acquired the skills to read by third grade, the odds are that he/she will never catch up. Poor reading skills are a cause of poor school performance, which in turn leads to a negative outcomes for children including, lower high school graduation rates and lower wage earning potential. In a working paper on childhood development and their environments developed by the National Scientific Council on the Developing Child, it was noted that investments in high-quality interventions in early childhood will generate future returns through increased taxes paid by more productive adults and significant reductions in public expenditures for special education, grade retention, welfare assistance, and incarceration. In addition, higher high school graduation rates, significantly fewer criminal arrests, and increased home ownership have also been linked to high quality early education.

First 5 LA, since its inception, has made the goal: children are ready for kindergarten, a central part of its investment approach. Support for LAUP and other investments such as the School Readiness Initiative (SRI) are reflective of the Commission’s desire to ensure that children are ready to learn when they first enter the K-12 educational continuum. These efforts have been additionally supported through First 5 LA investments in developing the early care and education workforce. On June 11, 2009, the Commission adopted the FY 2009-2015 Strategic Plan which included “children are ready for kindergarten” as one of four main goals to focus its investments through a combined Countywide and Place-based approach. The Strategic Plan currently encompasses ongoing investments in LAUP, establishment of the ECE Workforce Consortium, and transitioning of SRI.

At the June 9, 2011 Commission meeting, a motion was approved to extend funding for current SRI grantees until June 30, 2011. SRI was discussed in the context of limited knowledge on initiative’s effectiveness given that currently funded SRI projects do not confirm with a single program model.

At the June 23, 2011 Program and Planning Committee meeting, the Committee directed staff to assist the Commission by establishing the following process for review at the July 14, 2011 Commission meeting that would:

(1) Convene a First 5 LA Kindergarten Readiness Ad Hoc Committee with 2 or 3 commissioners in order to examine the Commission’s investment approach to kindergarten readiness with a focus on the effectiveness of various approaches in achieving the kindergarten readiness goal in the Strategic Plan. New and existing investments to be discussed include SRI, the potential for a “defined” First 5 LA SRI model as well as other programs and projects.

(2) The Ad Hoc Committee will report back specific recommends to the full commission within no more than 90 days.

---

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP AND INFORMANTS

The Committee will consist of the following members:

- Two Commission representatives and one alternate
  - Commissioner Stockwell
  - Commissioner Dennis
  - Commissioner Harding

The following representatives will serve in an advisory capacity for the committee and will not influence decision-making where they may enable them to potentially benefit from decisions made. Should these representatives advise First 5 LA staff on the content or development of a funding opportunity arising from the committee, the individual or agency will be precluded from applying to receive the associated funds.

- SRI grantees
- LAUP
- Additional members to be discussed by the committee

COMMITTEE CHARGE

The First 5 LA Program and Planning Committee will establish the Kindergarten Readiness Ad Hoc Committee. The charge of the Kindergarten Readiness Ad Hoc Committee will be to produce recommendations to the Commission, in coordination with staff, on investments related to kindergarten readiness.

The First 5 LA Kindergarten Readiness Ad Hoc Committee will develop a viable sustainability plan that preserves the infrastructure and, where appropriate, the outcomes of the following initiatives:

- School Readiness Initiative
- Family Literacy
- Family, Friends, and Neighbors

COMMITTEE DELIVERABLE

Recommendations should clearly identify all Commission investments related to kindergarten readiness to be continued, modified, or added to maximize the Commission’s ability to achieve the goal: children are ready for kindergarten. Opportunities to integrate kindergarten readiness strategies and the connection to other strategies in the FY 2009-2015 Strategic Plan should also be clearly identified.
COMMITTEE TIMELINE

The Committee will adhere to the following timeline for completing its work.

- Mid-July 2011 – Appoint all members
- August/September 2011 – Convene two committee meetings
- September 2011 Program & Planning Committee Meeting – Present Committee’s work at Program and Planning Meeting
- November 2011 – Provide an informational item update at the November Commission meeting
- January 2012 – Present a recommendation to the Program and Planning Committee January meeting
- February 2012 – Present a recommendation and action item at the February Commission meeting
<table>
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<th>Attachment C: Early Care and Education Workforce Development Investments</th>
</tr>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kindergarten Readiness Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
October 4, 2011

Present First 5 LA Staff and Commissioners: Evelyn V. Martinez, Evangelina Stockwell, Duane Dennis, Kevin Donovich (Representing Cindy Harding), Elizabeth Iida, Aleece Kelly, Bill Gould, Tara Ficek, Armando Jimenez, Mario Snow, Melinda Leidy

Present Advisory Group Participants: Lillian Lew (St. Mary Medical Center), Dawn Kurtz (LAUP), Vickie Kropenske (Hope Street), Marlene Zepeda (California State University of Los Angeles), Ruth Yoon (Los Angeles Unified School District), Judy Sanchez (LACOE), Roberta Lanterman (Long Beach Unified School District), Julie Espinoza (Mothers' Club), N. Khalfani (St. John's), SP Andrade (Lennox School District), Liz Guerra (LACOE Family Literacy Support Network), Lilly McGuiness (Maternal and Child Health Access), Carla Virgin (Zero to Three), Ashaunta Tumblin (University of California Los Angeles)

Evelyn V. Martinez, First 5 LA Chief Executive Officer, thanked the members of the Kindergarten Readiness Ad Hoc Committee - Dr. Angie Stockwell, Duane Dennis, and Cindy Harding – as well as the Advisory Committee members for their participation in the process. Commissioner Harding was unable to attend today due to jury duty. The ad hoc committee was formed at the request of the June Program and Planning committee meeting. The intention of today's meeting is for staff and Commissioners to listen to the experts sitting in the room about Kindergarten readiness, about what recommendations we might be able to take back to our board in terms of different strategies. CEO Martinez requested introductions from everyone, including name, affiliation and identification of current or past kindergarten readiness programs.

Elizabeth Iida, Director of Program Development, thanked and welcomed everyone to the meeting. Dr. Iida provided an overview of the Program Development Department; the department is charged to plan, design, manage and implement a variety of programs that support both place-based as well as our countywide strategies. The programs are grouped around three focus areas – one is maternal and child health, another is kindergarten readiness or early care and education and the other is child abuse and neglect. The department is also charged with planning and managing many of these working committees of the Commission such as the Kindergarten Readiness Ad Hoc Committee.

Commissioners, staff and attendees introduce themselves.

Director Iida thanked everyone for their introductions and expressed excitement to hear from everyone. She reiterated that this was an opportunity to learn from one another's work. To add some structure to the discussion staff and commissioners have put together six focused questions as shown on the agenda. These are to be discussed over the next 90 minutes with approximately 15 minutes per question. Director Iida encouraged everyone to contact staff after the meeting with any additional questions, suggestions or other ideas following the discussion.
The first two questions – items on the agenda – are very broad to jump start the conversation. Later on the agenda under lessons from the field is where staff and Commissioners would like to hear from the group about experiences in implementing programs – some of the challenges around implementation and also any experiences around building partnerships. The meeting will follow with a discussion on opportunities to come together to share various lessons and experiences relative to how programs might cross over in serving all of the young children and families throughout LA County. The last ten minutes of the meeting Aleece Kelly will provide a summary, wrap up and next steps. Director Iida then asked if there were questions before beginning the discussion.

A question was raised regarding potential conflicts of interest by participating on the Advisory Committee.

CEO Martinez confirmed that participation as an Advisor would not be a conflict. The purpose of the meeting is to have a candid conversation about what’s been working with those that have had funding from us to implement School Readiness, Family Literacy or Family, Friends and Neighbors as well as what hasn’t. Is there a different or better approach than what we’ve been using, or if what we’ve been funding has really worked, there’s always ways to improve upon those specific initiatives.

Commissioner Dennis added that the Ad Hoc Committee wanted to get some field perspective and did not want to plan in a vacuum.

Discussion 1: Defining and Measuring School Readiness

LAUP convened an internal committee to have the same discussions. LAUP has identified outcomes based on the performance based contracts with First 5 LA. These include literacy, language, cognitive and social-emotional development outcomes. This is the starting point to decide what LAUP wants in regard to an agency-wide statement to be about Kindergarten Readiness.

In Family Literacy grantees worked with the American Institute for Research. They used over 12 different assessment tools in random site sampling. They use the MacArthur assessment for 0-3 and the DRDP; for the first 3 years that was used as outcome data but the next 8 years it was used for observational purposes only. There are tools that are used by the Even Start sites. These are specific tools that they use that they encourage other grantees to use. PPBT which is an oral language tool has been used. DRDP outcomes have also been used to look at individuals to ensure children are on track developmentally and prepared to go to kindergarten. When teachers are prepared they can really learn good kindergarten readiness tools. The PALS are letters of recognition. There are 4 tools within that package. We use the letter of recognition tool. There is also a phonological awareness tool and 2 others. Teachers and administrators need to pay attention to outcomes. The directors and teachers need to know where they are focused and where they are going.
Long Beach School District uses child observation records. They are moving towards CDRP but it's another assessment for teachers to utilize. The PPBT is a receptive vocabulary test. It provides critical vocabulary building. The plus to having the parent's literacy program is that the program works with the parents in this Parent education component and staff share this research so that they know the importance of oral language and show them what they can do at home and practice those skills under our guidance. It helps the teachers focus. They can really tie into KR and having successful readers.

DRDP is used because most state-funded programs are required to do DRDP. We want to continue to align with funding resources.

Staff and Commissioners were encouraged by participants to think more broadly about KR and mental health needs of children, a parent's ability to support their children, children's health and nutrition.

Commissioner Dennis asked if SRI programs use any type of assessment right now in mental health. Are there indicators of parent engagement for the factors just mentioned?

There are other mental health screenings. Prenatally, post-partum and parents. Both SRI & Family Literacy have incorporated them in some cases. It's also important to know that this is done in a hospital setting so they have staff and the resources to support their use. Without the resources the screening cannot happen.

Welcome Baby is funded through First 5 LA as a Universal Home Visiting program and includes prenatal Depression Screening. Depression and Mental health of the mom is key for a healthy attachment and for a child to focus in class, have a good self-esteem and develop social skills. Home visitors do not have training around connecting secure attachment and school readiness. They are linked. A mother talking to a baby is creating an attachment but it is also early literacy. There does not seem to be a lot of programs that link the two. Sometimes in a home there is a lot of silence. Families think of early literacy as reading books. They do not realize that just talking, singing and reflecting what the baby is seeing so the baby is mirroring with mom encourages healthy secure attachment but is also early literacy. Families get information that is not up to date or evidence based. Having zero to three intervention that is related to mental health and school readiness would be the key piece.

Commissioner Dennis clarified that few Family Literacy and SRI programs have parent/child mental health components but that these would be key to a program.

The parent child relationship impacts the school readiness of the child. Whether you bring in mental health services intentionally or unintentionally as an example; some programs bring parents together, they start to make friends and their depression begins to decrease. They build this healthy sense of wellbeing and suddenly the child begins to thrive. We have skill sets that we all use but they may not be included in our scope of work.
The Family Literacy programs are more similar. There is a clear prescribed Scope of Work for Family Literacy. SRI programs differ widely. It is a key component for many SR programs. For Family Literacy there is a set of services and outcomes that were prescribed for all programs.

One program did a case study of DRDP with UC Berkeley in their 36 transitional kindergarten classrooms. While the teacher thought it was helpful, it was a challenge to find enough teacher's time. The teachers loved the social and emotional part. This was missing in the Kindergarten assessment. This is something to consider.

The statewide system Preschool Foundations articulate skills children 0-5 will develop over time. There are Infant and Toddler Foundations and there are the Preschool Foundations. There are two separate issues - one is deciding what it means to be ready for school and the other is how to measure it. It is difficult to measure school readiness with one interaction with the child. It is something that needs to be done over time because there are many things that do overlap.

Commissioner Stockwell echoed that it is important to consider the two separate issues - what does it mean to be ready for kindergarten and how to measure it? What are the central ingredients to children succeeding and getting to kindergarten? Those are the ingredients we want to sustain and prolong. We know we can't do it all. So many different models of SRI are out there. Hopefully with a First 5 LA Kindergarten Readiness program you would be able to measure every program consistently.

The field is moving to social-emotional outcomes for children. Children develop within a relationship. Children need the attachment relationship. The context of what is happening in the parents' lives is also important. The Field is moving in that direction. We have to also consider learning through play, which we had abandoned for a long time. It is within the relationship with parents and within play that you can get the cognitive outcomes.

The other issue we have with measurement is that many children are not native English speakers. Many of the measures are not appropriate for dual language learners. Listening to what kindergarten teachers identify as important is also useful.

Commissioner Stockwell referenced a study from Harvard who focused on the social-emotional outcomes for children that impact kindergarten readiness.

Director Jimenez suggested caution in selecting measures based upon predictors of future test scores vs. the general wellbeing of a child as the child grows up.

Providers are in a catch 22. Providers must consider: 1) what is the program doing for improving outcomes? What are we doing with our parents and our children? 2) What is the teacher doing to improve this child and his/her development? Providers also have to consider what the funder is looking for.
Discussion 2: Emerging Promising Practices in the Early Care and Education Field

Response Intervention is something that is emerging. This is something being looked at in the K-12 system, and is starting to move into early childhood. It involves small group instruction, where you work in groups of three to four small children at a time with very focused instruction. Good preschool teachers have always known that this is a good thing. High school considers a small group ten. Teachers identify more effective ways to help children with vocabulary development, oral language development, etc. The practice also include a professional development approach that is individualized including a coaching model. This is a paradigm shift.

Interesting programs that are going on nationally include the Tools of the Mind Curriculum which is being seen more on the East coast. It has a focus of self-regulation. This helps the child's brain development. A lot of these ideas are coming from the science of brain development. We are seeing how capable children are at such a young age. This has been developed from the 1980 Zero to Three report. Tools of the Mind is in use in the East coast for Dual Language Learners. Head Start has picked up Abriendo Puertas which employs strategies of parent engagement. There is percolating activity around social-emotional development, brain development, around the importance of play and the pendulum is starting to move in that direction. This is a good way to link the infants and toddlers to the preschoolers. Then we have to link that to K-3rd grade. These are the challenges that we are facing. It can't be solved without a comprehensive support system all the way through. The challenge is supporting this all the way through.

The Neuroscience of attachment is becoming mainstream. People are beginning to understand it. Emotional well-being is the foundation to self-regulation and behavior issues. It is important for people to understand this to link it.

On a basic level- Language starts because of relationships. Babies begin to coo and respond because they are in a relationship with a parent. Absent that relationship language development is delayed. The ability to self-regulate has a lot to do with the bond with the caregiver.

It is important to look at long term not short term outcomes. When you only look at short term you look at how many words they know, can they write their name? Funding constrains the ability to look at the big picture. Children should be tracked into 3rd grade to see if preschool makes a difference.

Interventions should be monitored along the way attributing specific interventions to specific outcomes.

Director Jimenez mentioned that First 5 LA is currently engaged in a data partnership with LAUSD and analyzing data from participants of First 5 LA programs who are now students at LAUSD. This data has been very helpful. There are many legal hurdles you have to overcome. First 5 LA has looked at participants of Family Literacy and School Readiness and looked at
attendance and test scores. The data highlights the connection between children’s program participation and some of the key policy issues such as reading scores.

Parent involvement is critical. If a child’s parent does not speak to him/her or if the parent is in isolation, they are not bonding. That language is not happening. When they go to kindergarten the do not have a language. Getting the parent as a partner, educating them about where their child should be. When you are talking about kindergarten- the pressure is on the teacher to teach this child to read. The days when they had time to sit down and play with a child are gone. Speaking to the kindergarten teacher, they need to informed of where the child is by the parent.

Parent engagement must also include parent education. The parents should be educated regarding developmental milestones. They need to know what they can do to support that child. There are children who are showing up to kindergarten and have the language of a 3 year old.

Once parents have that foundation it helps them take a role in parent leadership. This is a component that Family Literacy and SRI have captured. Parents want to learn to support their own child and then end up helping children in their community.

Discussion 3: Successful Program Models and Strategies

Programs should support our parents in supporting their children in school. The caregiver can learn along with the child. Programs seek a trajectory of change that breaks the cycle of illiteracy and poverty. Parents tend to stay an average of two and a half years in the program. That’s long enough for them to go through several levels of change. Work toward resiliency which is a huge thing for many families who are living in poverty. Resiliency is families who can solve problems on their own, children who can solve problems on their own; it’s parents and children having the capacity to do the things they need to do in their lives. Whether it’s to go to kindergarten and listen to a teacher or whether it’s a parent who needs to go off and be able to talk to a mental health specialist about a special needs child. So we’re building these capacities that take longer. Many are dual language families. They’re learning English along with building their capacity in their own language. Parents read with their children by the time they leave the program – they’re very comfortable doing that there’s just no problem with that – that’s just a given when they leave the program. They know how to talk to a teacher, they know how to go and ask for resources out in their community, they’re showing others how to do that, so now they’re becoming instructors and it’s kind of a ripple effect in the community. In Family Literacy programs a parent is learning adult learning skills too. But in the long term they learn so much more when they stay for two and a half years or so versus six weeks or six months.

Commissioner Stockwell confirmed that one of the key elements or criteria that should be considered is durability – something that’s sustained for a child coming in at age four to be ready to start kindergarten.

As a three year old a child is just learning how to be me in the classroom. By four after a whole year of being in the program a child has much more self-regulation, they have much more capacity, they have much more problem solving critical thinking.
Commissioner Stockwell stated that the parent is the first teacher of the child – they're the only sustained teacher for the entire educational career of that child. There are key strategies for working with parents.

The programs are seeking to build self-advocacy – that's not for every parent. First 5 LA needs to look at all the communities it is invested in, and identify those communities with incidence of low literacy that may need this type of intervention. In our communities I think the families do benefit from capacity building.

It's important to get parents to stay long enough to see the older children succeed – if they have a kindergartner who's gone through the program and is now doing well in school they see the benefit. Some programs have a wait list for "second children" whose siblings have succeeded due to our program. Parents whose children have benefited tell their neighbors and friends.

The intensity of Family Literacy makes it is not necessarily the right type of program for all families, but it is an option that could be available in every community because of the outcomes that match well. The program is very demanding in terms of how many hours parents are required to attend – Pomona site is more accommodating by having classes in the evening so it can be specific to the needs of a community. St. Anne's is focused on teen parents so they have a lot of classes that work the parents toward a diploma – programs in different communities can be responsive to the needs of the families in that community. First 5 LA Family Literacy is one of the best programs because it has the three components of direct service, capacity building and external evaluation. My hope is that whatever program is next invested in has those three components.

The capacity building of the agencies has allowed us to move on to request funding for additional programs. For one program, North Valley Caring Services, they took the families/participants from Family Literacy and encouraged the families to become entrepreneurs in child care occupations. Capacity building activities have not only improved instruction, but the ability to use data to improve instruction and now the focus is on program sustainability. How can the data be used to improve sustainability? There are certain key elements that over the last ten years have become clear - which outcomes we want to achieve. However, the measurements are still challenges. There are issues with the training and expertise that the staff brought – because that's all over the map too. In Family Literacy we didn't have highly qualified practitioners. Our practitioners range from paraprofessionals to highly qualified and everything in between. Now we have our state foundations and state funding is tied to highly qualified staff – times have changed. All of First 5 LA's initiatives have provided tremendous outcomes.

**Discussion 4: Challenges in Implementation**

Funding has been the biggest challenge for us. It was a surprise that Family Literacy has less funding than FFN. Family Literacy has so much data, so much evaluation to it – rich in data which makes it an easy sell for foundations – it's easier to get a grant for Family Literacy as opposed to FFN which doesn't have the data. Programs are restricted by capacity with many people on wait lists. Expanding is something that is desired. Another element is follow-up. There is a lack of staff to follow up and see where families went after the program – did they get a job?
Can they be the voice of the center? Follow up is difficult but necessary. There are so many needs due to poverty, to gangs, etc. but lack of funds restricts ability of programs to serve the community.

Many of the programs have created a strategy of having a holding place for a family until a spot opens – that’s not unusual. We’re creating our own kind of longitudinal data studies – several sites collect report cards for kindergarten to third grade to find out if what is done in early years is working once the children enter kindergarten. Those are independent activities that are going on that haven’t yet been coordinated. I think a lot of the lessons learned are in terms of data collection and building a culture of quality and accountability.

The issue of evaluation and being able to track is key – successful programs have strong internal evaluation in place and are able to track data to look at outcomes but also program management. It’s a key component of any program. Another challenge is finding well trained, culturally competent, staff that understand these communities and understand this work and then holding onto them. Some of the changes in funding have resulted in loss of staff, and it’s going to be hard to replace those staff. So I think in terms of investment – there’s an investment in facilities, investment in communities, but there’s also an investment in staff – it’s the staff who are doing this work. There is a need to invest in staff, keep staff and provide support to staff who are working in these challenging fields/communities.

In the Welcome Baby program staff are paraprofessionals all the way up to masters level. Everyone receives reflective supervision, which is a mental health model that allows staff to have someone to go to when they encounter a situation that is difficult. This has been key and has been a positive experience for staff and has facilitated integration of training. Without that opportunity a lot of training is wasted because the staff don’t fully absorb the information.

Programs are designed to have individual and group supervision of staff. I don’t know if that’s something that should be required of an agency? It is important to ensure that training is not lost and that it’s integrated into the program. It’s important to talk about how to make this a requirement in program design.

This is similar to a zero to three model. A zero to three model that is good practice always has a way for staff to talk and reflect on what they’re doing. It’s called reflective supervision – that’s the zero to three model that the three to five model going up can learn from.

The challenge is time because teachers are teaching all day and so are the assistants, so they get to talk only about once a month.

Some sites are able to release teachers for that planned reflection time – but it’s so rare. Usually it’s just getting nap time and it’s an hour and the teachers are so stressed during that time because they’re worried about what’s going on in their classroom and they’ve got to go back and they can’t really think things through – so time is really a huge factor for doing professional development and then taking it to the place where it’s going to be implemented and then making the change.
It's professional learning over time.

Providing them the time and the space to have professional development rather than just trying to fit it in is important. LAUP has the same issue with this – carving out the time to actually allow teachers to be deliberate about professional development rather than asking them to fit it into what should be their lunch time.

There's a wasted resource in the foundations of curriculum framework. I think a lot of programs don't even know they exist yet and I think they really are the foundations of ECE practices. That training needs to get out.

The challenge is the turnover in the field. Retention in the field would help as far as information getting out and being implemented. Plus the models that are used for training are time intensive so it's costly and we're very limited in terms of who can receive training.

A related issue is the turnover of staff and the degree to which supporting staff has an impact on turnover. The ability to provide necessary support may affect attrition and the cost to programs. I think it's important to look at programs and ask what the attrition rate is and what the impact is on cost and service delivery.

I think something else that is interrelated is the economy and budget cuts and the perception among staff that their job is not secure. If they are offered something they perceive to be more stable – even if they are getting that professional development and support – they are likely to leave.

What would be the profile of the perfect SRI worker/Family Literacy worker?

They need to know child development and how to implement the ideas of attachment and communication and one on one. Learning about it in theory is different than actually knowing how to implement it. One of the things we struggle with in higher education is good quality practicum experiences for the people who work with zero to five year olds. We don't have an Early Childhood credential in the state of California and so we have some of the lowest requirements for people to work with this population so that's why you get staffing that's across the board from 6 units of ECE to an MA degree. The research is equivocal about what makes for a good early childhood teacher – it's clear that special education training is important. At the program sites it's very different when working with the children and families and trying to make those connections to implement. Both theory and practice are necessary.

The special education school is constantly sending their students over. They're saying they can identify the student who has the child development training from a teacher who doesn't have the child development training when they're in the classroom. That's really critical – but the other side of it is helping them and mentoring them to learn once they're in there because it's important to learn that children are ego-centric or other theories, but it's qualitatively different once you're in the classroom.
Staff are also needed who can make relationships with parents and make relationships with families as well as those who have an appreciation for the communities that the families and children are coming from and values that experience. Those are hard characteristics to teach.

Quality staffing is really about their ability to build relationships with the parents, their knowledge and appreciation of the landscape of the community, being comfortable in the neighborhoods that are worked in – because if they’re not comfortable it won’t matter how many degrees they have it just won’t work. Because staff who going into homes they need to know how to approach a family and go into a home and be respectful of the family. Welcome Baby looks at social worker or case management experience. How to be resourceful, how to link families, how to partner – those are key elements. If those elements are not there relationships with those families is not going to happen.

Commissioner Dennis asked the group to discuss the advocacy element that is included within the programs. Based on the profiles of staff that were just provided that would be hard to weave in. How are some of the advocacy issues trained or taught and how does that play into the picture?

Parents, like children, also have developmental stages. Typically parents don’t come in the first day and say, “I want to be a parent leader”. They might have it in them but they don’t say that. Programs begin with parent/child activities – reading and interacting with the child. The first step is not threatening. For the younger children a home visitation model is very good because again, it involves the parents with the child. Next step is a parent education class – there is a lot of success with that. The next level would be a soft parent leadership class and working with models and other organizations to provide that. From there a smaller set, a subset, of parents emerges that really want to be advocates and they’re not afraid. And those are the ones we nurture into advocates. It’s taking them in their own developmental stages.

In some school districts parents know what to expect. Parents get more involved. There are parents that have gone as far as the district level. It is teaching them to advocate and the right questions to ask. An adult education component is important. Parents have been involved when a component is no longer funded. Parents who have been through the program will continue that component. As long as the school provides the space we will still be able to have the elements in the community.

Discussion 5: Building Partnerships within and across First 5 LA Investments

Commissioner Stockwell asked the group address the challenge of helping kids transition from preschool to kindergarten?

There are transition activities. This is done only with schools where there are ECE partnerships. We need to create a system that encourages parents just do it naturally... it is harder if the program is not part of the school or district.

There is a big challenge in that ECE programs use a developmental curriculum that is very different from the kindergarten curriculum. This can have the effect of our children looking less
competent in kindergarten because of the change in structure. In ECE parents experience a sense of involvement and place. They enter an elementary school and they no longer have this. Another important aspect is having a more linked system - having ECE and K-12 systems come together.

Long beach has an early childhood committee where there are monthly meetings. Preschool- grade 3 is a best practice and should be considered.

LA County is working with transitioning to kindergarten. We are building a learning environment and bringing in preschool providers to talk about serving kids and parents.

LAUSD has a toolkit they are willing to share that supports improvement between their own teams and with community partners through SRI. That is on the learning zone.

Time is an issue in bringing everyone together.

Linkages need to be not just with schools but with mental health and others, they need to be cross-systems partnerships.

On average Family Literacy grantees have 14-17 partners. Nine categories of collaborators were identified. There is a matrix that is shared with Family Literacy grantees. It forces grantees to think of businesses or organizations as partners.

Commissioner Stockwell stated that we cannot do it all. She is happy to hear of the partnering. This is key criteria. First 5 LA can’t do it all. We and our grantees need partnerships.

Many of the participants used First 5 LA funding to leverage other funding, and have had partners doing other components.

The current wave is unemployment, mental health cuts, and program cuts. There are big parts of the city where more intensive services are not offered. Programs need to acknowledge the lack of services in some areas. There is a great need for mental health and home visiting programs.

Director Iida thanked everyone for joining the meeting and asked the advisory committee members to please contact First 5 LA if they have any additional information, resources, etc.

Aleece Kelly informed the committee that there is currently not another meeting scheduled for this committee, but should the Ad Hoc Committee be interested or identify other topic areas for input, the group may be reconvened. She thanked the group for their participation.

CEO Martinez thanked the group for the information that they shared.
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RECOMMENDATION:

BACKGROUND
The purpose of this item is to update the Commission on the progress in distributing the remaining funds associated with the Oral Health and Nutrition Expansion and Enhancement Project (OHN Project). This item is produced in response to the Commission's request for updates in June, September and November 2011.

At the March 2011, Commission meeting, staff presented a plan to the Board outlining the strategies and timeline for expending the remaining unobligated OHN funds, which was $12.8 million at the time of the update. The plan staff presented contained a number of strategies and incorporated lessons learned from First 5 LA's past OHN investments. The strategies presented included funding OHN strategic partnerships with four key partners; developing revised solicitations without a matching requirement – as requested by the Chair – with an emphasis on direct preventative and restorative dental services; developing a capital improvement RFP to expand and enhance the medical safety net by establishing new dental access points; forming an Ad Hoc Committee to advise on the implementation of the expanded OHN projects; and releasing an RFP to capitalize on the oral health provisions in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. The strategies aligned well with those proposed by Mayor Antonovich in the February 2011 Board motion.

In addition to this plan on OHN, staff also provided an update on the remaining funds from the Oral Health and Community Development (OHCD) project. During this March 2011 meeting, the Commission reallocated the remaining $5 million from OHCD to the OHN Project, thereby increasing the total balance of unobligated OHN Project funds from $12.8 million to $17.8 million.

As directed by the Commission, staff is informing the Board on progress that has been made to date to continue expending the remaining OHN Project funds, based on the strategies presented at the March Commission meeting. Staff is also providing an update to the timeline on any items that remain.

STATUS UPDATE

- At the June and September Board meetings, staff provided updates to the Commission on all activities conducted through the OHN Project to date in 2011. These updates included the development of four strategic partnerships with Western University of Health Sciences, LA CARE Health Plan, The Children's Clinic, Serving Children & Their Families, and South Bay Children's Health Center to implement strategies that increase access to oral health services for children ages 0-5 and their parents. These contracts were executed per the Board's original 2006 approval authorizing staff to enter in contracts. Together they expect to expend approximately $2.6 million over a three-year period. Staff also reported that the
first meeting of the Oral Health Ad Hoc Committee, a group of oral health experts, had convened on April 25, 2011, and that the second meeting was scheduled for September 21st. Finally, updates were provided to the Commission on the development of three different RFP's, all of which were released in the summer. These RFP's and subsequent contracts are in accordance with the Board's 2006 approval of the OHN framework, which authorized staff to negotiate contracts and grants necessary for project development and rollout. More information about each of the RFP's is included below.

- **Staff released the Dental Health Innovation Project RFP** that seeks to identify innovative pilot/demonstration projects in LA County that 1) align with the goals of the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation to lower cost (or at least not increase cost), as well as to improve quality of care and health outcomes; and 2) leverage provisions within the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, specifically in the areas of infrastructure development through dental health information technology (including electronic dental health records, tele-health and the use of portable equipment) and through strengthening the dental safety net to provide services in non-traditional settings such as, but not limited to WIC sites, Head Start Centers, school-based and school-linked health centers. Staff expects to expend up to $3 million in this effort. The RFP was released on August 31, 2011, and seven applications were received. External reviewers are currently reviewing applications. Award announcements will be made in November 2011, and contracts executed by January 2012, for a three-year period.

- **First 5 LA** will support Direct Services by funding a broad partnership that will include up to 12 community clinics. The RFP seeks to support direct preventative and restorative dental services, by establishing a Dental Home model in community clinics and providing training and technical assistance to providers in order to enhance their clinical and administrative operations necessary to adequately serve children 0-5 and their parents. Funding allocated to this project is $9.4M for three years; $2-3M will be awarded to an agency to provide training and technical assistance and between $5-6.3M will be awarded to up to 10-12 community clinics to establish a medical home model for dental care delivery. The RFP was released on June 30, 2011 and two applications were received by the deadline of August 30, 2011. A panel of external reviewers reviewed each application and the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) was identified as the lead contractor for the OHN Dental Home Project. Further, UCLA will execute subcontracts with the above mentioned 10-12 clinics. Staff expects to make award announcements in November 2011, and execute contracts by January 2012, for a three-year period.

- **Staff also released a RFP** to provide capital improvement funds. The RFP seeks to support the expansion and enhancement of Dental Safety Net by establishing new dental access points. It is expected that six new dental clinics will be established in Los Angeles County as result of this specific funding opportunity. Funding allocated to this project is $2.8M for two years. The RFP was released on June 30, 2011 and nine applications were received by the deadline of August 30, 2011. A panel of external reviewers reviewed each application and staff expects to make award announcements in November 2011, and execute contracts by January 2012, for a two-year period. The original Safety Net Expansion RFP anticipated up to five new dental clinics. However, the external review panel recommended funding six new clinics as some applicants requested less than the maximum $550,000, allowing a more rational use of First 5 LA OHN funds within the approved $2.8 million to support the expansion to six clinics.
The clinics that have been recommended to receive First 5 LA funds under this funding opportunity are:

1. AltaMed Health Services Corporation
2. St. John's Well Child & Family Center
3. Northeast Valley Health Corporation
4. Clinica Romero
5. Antelope Valley Community Clinic
6. Violence Intervention Program at LAC-USC Medical Center

- The second meeting of the Oral Health Ad Hoc Committee was held on September 21, 2011. Members of the Ad Hoc Committee were selected based on their experience and expertise working on early childhood oral health issues. The topic for September's meeting included issues of sustainability for oral health projects and opportunities to align oral health investments with federal health care reform. Some key issues that were highlighted in the meeting include the importance of developing a business model for community clinics serving underserved populations, ensuring community clinic board members actively participate in fundraising efforts, focusing on more prevention-related efforts when serving the 0-5 population, forging partnerships with community based organizations and providing information-sharing venues for dental providers. The final Oral Health Ad Hoc Committee meeting is scheduled for December 7, 2011.
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