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MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much. Thank you very much for your attention today.

And we now will call the regularly scheduled meeting of the First 5 commission to order.

We ask our secretary to please call the roll.

(Roll called.)

MR. KAUFMAN: This is Neil Kaufman. I'm here. I think you said my name while something else was happening.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much.

Let's then proceed to the business at hand as it is indicated in the agenda.

But we first want to proceed with a few remarks on a couple of occasions.

We want to pay our respects in terms of a moment in silence in memory of Commissioner Yancey.

As many of you know, Dr. Yancey passed away on April the 23rd following a tough battle, but a courageous battle with lung cancer.

She devoted her career to promoting the health of children and eliminating health issues.

She was a passionate advocate of children for healthy living and for social change.
During her two years on the First 5 Commission, many of you had a chance to get to know her well. During her time here, we remember her many corrections to policy and programatic work of the commission.

She authorized a motion dealing with the issue of autism. She authorized an activity-break policy that continues to motivate many of us to move, those of us who can still move. She was an advocate for the work being done around Best Start, and she weighed in on issues related to obesity prevention, early education, the Safe Pilot at First 5's homeless investment.

I think it's fair to say that we will miss Dr. Yancey. We'll continue to celebrate her life by advancing the work that she deemed important, and the work that we celebrate in her memory.

So if you would join me just in a moment of silence for the memory of Dr. Yancey.

(Moment of Silence.)

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you.

Well, the occasion did present itself to make a presentation to Maria Romero, who is leaving the capacity of secretary of the Commission. And so we have prepared for her a nice scroll or commendation on behalf of the board.

And so let's give her just a little round of
applause.

MS. BELSHE: Mr. Chair, we'll have an opportunity -- I hope we'll have an opportunity to thank Maria directly at the next board meeting, but -- we are eager to have her come back for an acknowledgment of ten-plus years to the First 5 mission of Los Angeles.

The voice you heard is Paula Gomez, who has jumped in to be Maria's replacement for part of the time. And thank you Paula. And anything Paula can do for the board, please engage her directly.

Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.

May I then call for a motion to approve the minutes from April 23rd and April 11th of this year?

Is there such a motion?

(Motion moved.)

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Is there a second?

(Motion seconded.)

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: It's been properly moved and seconded. And if there are no commissioners wishing to be heard, all those who are in favor of adopting these minutes respond as usual with "aye."

All those opposed didn't come to this meeting because we are proceeding; so thank you very much.

MS. TILTON: Excuse me. You were asking for
approval of the last minutes. I wanted to comment on the summary action minutes of April 4th, 2013.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Okay.

MS. TILTON: That meeting was April 3rd.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Yes.

MS. TILTON: Mr. Delgado is listed among both those who were present and absent at that meeting in the board meeting minutes.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: So what are you trying to say?

MS. TILTON: Just for the record, in case someone wants to check on the authenticity of our minutes of the special meeting on April 3rd, it's listed as April 4th.

MS. BELSHE: The cover sheet -- you're absolutely right. And the reality is having both is an oversight on our part.

And with an acknowledgment of your attention to detail, we will make that change as so directed.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: So goes your alibi, Dr. Delgado. We were trying to assist, but Commissioner Tilton was too attentive. Thank you very much.

We will make the changes to these minutes and cause them to be -- appear with what actually occurred.

Are there any other corrections of the minutes as they are before us? We thank you and are admonished at
this point. Thank you so much.

Item three is before us.

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

Before you, staff is presenting the monthly financials for the close of March 31, 2013.

The monthly financial statements are consistent to the prior months and are presented as a soft close and are unaudited.

If there are no questions, I turn it back to the Chair for your approval.

Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Are there any questions or comments regarding the report pertaining the to the monthly financial statements?

Commissioner Tilton, you set a precedent.

Commissioner Swilley, you wish to adopt the minutes? So let's proceed in that tradition.

MS. SWILLEY: I'm sure this is just for my information. In terms of reading the financials, when you say daily expenditures and then the remaining balances, those balances are very large.

Is it because those contracts are very -- include several years expectation? They are not to be used by June.
That's all there is?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Sir.

MR. ORTEGA: It would reflect the balance for the proposed budget; so it goes to for the fiscal year 12-13.

And just for you to keep in mind, even though they are the March financials, in our accounting software, when you look more into the detail, we're usually about a month to two months behind. We catch up in June.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Any other questions?

Thank you, Commissioner Swilley for that question or clarification regarding the monthly financial report.

Is there a motion to adopt the report as submitted?

(Motion moved.)

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you. Seconded?

(Motion seconded.)

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Properly moved and seconded.

Any other interventions at this point? Seeing none, we'll move this forward and file for audit with the appropriate policy to do so.

All right. Let's move to the next item.

MS. BOSCH: Good afternoon, Commissioners. It's that time of year to request approval for our contracts and grants, which are scheduled to be renewed for the
upcoming fiscal year.

I wanted to point out information that we include in our summary table in the back of the packet such as grantee name and dates and amounts.

We have included another segment entitled satisfactory project or grantee. And that's item four -- page four in your iPad, or if you have a hard copy, it's page 26.

The purpose of adding this section is so as you approve these renewals, you know that each is in compliance. And for us, in compliance mean that's a grantee or contractor who is meeting all of the terms of agreement and their scopes of works outlined.

By indicating yes in the box, the program officer is in fact in compliance.

Before you today, we have a total of 352 agreements for your approval. Two are new agreements that are part of our current fiscal year, and are just for a short run to June 30th of this year.

We also have 50 agreement renewals. These renewals fall into two primary areas.

17 of them are part of county-wide investments and prior strategic planning. One is from administration and is to coordinate the claims of administration, Medi-Cal administrative activities. Note that these 50
renewals will not be effective until July 2 or after since the Commission will need to approve the programatic and budgets next month, and therefore we're requesting that the commission approve or authorize that to complete upon approval of the board approval today.

I'm also requesting approval of the 50 agreements as discussed and authorization for staff to proceed with those contracts.

That concludes my report.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: We thank you very much.

Are there questions or comments?

The report is before us for our consideration and approval.

Commissioner Dennis, please.

MR. DENNIS: Yolanda, I appreciate the satisfactory category. I assume that if they were not in compliance, we would not be seeing them for renewal; so I assume that if it comes to us, it would be for renewal. It means yes, the contract is within the standings set forth by the agreement or whatever they are.

So if there was a no, we wouldn't see it at all. I guess that's the question.

MS. BELSHE: We would call it up. And, you know, if there was a grant that reached a level of unsatisfactory performance, you know, we would want to be
calling that out. But you're right. We're only bringing forth ones that were recommended.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Are there additional questions or comments on item Number 4?

MS. AU: Just to be clear.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Commissioner Au?

MS. AU: This -- you're asking us to approve this recommendation and -- and the impact on this is also contingent on our approval of the financials or the budget for the next fiscal year?

MS. BOSCH: Correct.

MS. AU: So I don't have a problem, technically. I don't have a problem in the spirit of this. But technically, it's approving the operation budget before we get to see it and review it.

Just to be clear.

MS. BOSCH: So basically we're requesting the approval now because next month we're going to be bringing about 120 renewals. We brought them forward with the understanding -- and the contractor and grantees understand -- it's all contingent upon the board approving the budget in June. Even though we come today, it's not effective nor is it even -- are they executed until the budget's approved.

MS. AU: Okay. Thank you.
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Good clarifying questions.

Are there additional questions or comments that any member of the commission wishes to raise at this point?

Seeing and hearing none, is there a motion to approve item Number 4?

(Motion moved.)

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: It's been properly moved by Commissioner Fielding. Is there a second?

(Motion seconded.)

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Seconded by Commissioner Kaufman.

Are there any objections?

Please record a unanimous vote on item Number 4.

The next item is before us, which would be the executive director's report.

MS. BELSHE: No further comments from the chair at this moment in time?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Item number six is before us, which is the executive director's report.

MS. BELSHE: Then it's my turn.

This report to the Board has two principle issues. Number 1, is to provide a quick update on where we are with the review of our Best Start initiative, and
second to provide an update on our initiative.

On the course of the past time in developing the outlines of a results-based framework for Best Start. And the intent of this framework is to provide the board with a complete picture consistent with Best Start to provide the Board with a sufficient amount of information to form an understanding of and decisions regarding some of the big picture questions on the Board.

And the staff have been grappling with Best Start the intermediate outcome business which we will assess progress and proposed activities associated with the goals that we seek.

To develop this framework, we've been drawing upon a number of resources.

Number 1, the departmental team within First 5 LA that recognizes our organization but rather is an organization-wide initiative and priority.

That team has been assembled to really take the first crack at developing a framework with the direction that it be firmly anchored in clear results.

Secondly, that it puts accountability for those results at the center of Best Start and to the fullest extent, evidence of best practices or promising practice.

In addition to drawing upon your internal organizational wide expertise, we're looking at Best Start
communities and partners.

We have effectively been going through what is about a 18 to 24 month planning period. And we have been working very closely as an Best Start community partners and we've learned a lot relative to their priorities and their approaches for improving outcomes.

And children in their communities to help further inform our understanding of what we're hearing and can learn from our Best Start community partners.

We're also undertaking a series of regional meetings with all 14 Best Start community provide an opportunity for me and John and Antonio and our Best Start colleagues to listen to learn from your community partners with how they identify success, how they think about impact, engaging residents and parents in particular in community based problem solving and action with a particular focus on the core results we seek for young children.

We anticipate that these meetings with be initial conversations and one-on-one meetings with the 14 community partnerships as longer convening of all the partnerships.

Third, is standard learning and incorporating evidence, learning from the research, learning from social science evidence, looking from experience to inform what
works or what are some of the challenges place base
community change initiatives.

We wish to tap the expertise of many consultants
who are deeply steeped in both the challenge of place
based community change and help us understand what are
some of the promises and practices for strengthening
families, building healthy communities, which we view as
absolutely essential.

These strands of learning and the work of this
organization over the course of the past couple of years
has really highlighted what I think we understand our role
to be, but it's important to say out loud a very
fundamental truth. And that is child outcomes are shaped
and influenced by their parents and by the strength of
their parents.

And so when we think about strengthening, when we
think about strategies for strong families, we need to
think about the community environment within which they
live.

Excuse me. Strengthening families. How do we
promote and advance health in communities? To
fundamentally -- as an organization, as a staff, Best
Start members is really testing if we can strengthen
families, build healthy communities, we have essential
building blocks for children which is the fundamental goal
of our Best Start initiative.

Given the importance and the complexity of the Best Start, I didn't remember daily long or half a day retreat to enable the Board to really grapple with a lot of these big questions that don't lend themselves to a 45 minute or hour and a half discussion at a Board meeting.

So working with the Chair in his office, we want to be coming back to you with some suggestions regarding the timing of a retreat which likely would be in June. Informed by that conversation, we would then develop the more detailed implementation, evaluation, and work plans that we would be coming back to the Board with to inform action in September.

The existing grants for our partners extend through the end of September. And it is clearly our understanding as a staff and our belief as a staff that we need to have these critical questions both at the strategic level and implementation level grappled with, and addressed by early September so we and the Board can move forward.

We're anxious in order in clarity of what we are trying to achieve. The strategies, sense of progress, and the mean business which we're going to measure performance.

As I said in my ED report in the Board book,
place based work as you know from research from our
community leaders here in Los Angeles.

It's really hard work. It's complicated. It's
difficult. But it's enormously exciting and promising; so
I think we really have an opportunity to effectively begin
a time of planning to action to do so in a way that is
informed by our experience, informed by what we hear from
communities, and what we understand to be the most
effective ways to work in a place based context.

Briefly, I wanted to touch on another L L and L
effort, which is really in the home stretch. And I noted
in my Board report an important milestone was completed
about a week or so ago when we closed the grant survey we
sent to contractors and grantees.

Roughly 300 received the survey, confidential
survey, and 40 percent responded, which is a pretty decent
response, though not the 96 percent response rate of our
staff. But I was delighted that so many of our key
business partners viewed this as an important opportunity
to give us feedback on how we're doing both in
implementation of our plan, our role in advancing outcomes
for feedback on our business processes.

Experience like so to speak in terms of doing
business with First 5 LA. Through this strand of inquiry
to about two dozen interviews. Business leaders, faith
base leaders, foundation leaders, interviews with the Board, deputies of the Board supervisors our internal staff survey as well as focus groups.

So taking all that information to move to the next stage of analysis to identify some of the key themes and issues that are emerging both in terms of our strategy, direction, or role. Our impact, partnerships, opportunities to accelerate impact for young children as well as operational issues.

Are we structured? Do we operate? Are we staffed in a way that maximizes our ability to deliver on our promises and on our goals? It's a really exciting time. It's one where we are learning a lot.

But the information is incomplete. And so what we want is to put all that learning together and have an opportunity to work leadership team, really the broad stuff to identify for the Board the key learning that is merged we intend to take short term.

Those that may take some longer time.

And finally to bring to the Board some of the complimentary pieces of L-3 including an update on learning and accountability report which will be past year looked like relative to our program work. But really to provide the Board a picture of where we are midway through our implementation of our strategic plan. Where's our
money going? What kind of organizations have we been  
supporting? What kind of programatic areas related to the  
goals are we investing First 5 dollars.  

And, finally, what we're calling the  
environmental very important context in terms of  
environment within which we do our work.  

We are not an island space related to zero to  
five. Focusing on both political and policy trends an  
overview that are working in these issue that's we care so  
much about.  

So as I said, it's an exciting time from  
listening and learning to leading, and the leading really  
is a function of staff. And most importantly the Board  
and probably again in July with some specific ideas  
informe by the L-3 process.  

Again thank the Board.  

I'll leave it at that, Mr. Chair.  

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much. Members  
of the Commission? Are there questions or comments on the  
executive director report to the board?  

Commissioner Kaufman followed by Commission  
Figueroa-Villa.  

MR. KAUFMAN: One question about the Best Start  
in September time frame, do we have a sequencing problem  
if the grants end in September and we haven't made
decisions until September. What was the issue of
decision?

Just thinking about that. I assume you'll come
back to us.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Commissioner.

MS. FIGUEROA-VILLA: So I'm trying to be clear on
Best Start while we're at it.

And I want to thank you for the work that you're
doing around Best Start because I really need to
understand it better.

The -- is this going to come back to our
Commission for any type of approval before we go on the
retreat? Or what is the process?

MS. BELSHE: Our recommendation would be that we
would come to the Board in a retreat with the broad
framework relative to goals, intermediate outcomes,
strategies. So really the overarching strategic
questions and use them as the basis for Board.

Some of the key issues we are grappling with, and
need some feedback and direction on. We need further
conversation with the Chair in terms of reaching agreement
on the approval, but I could anticipate an approach
whereby we have an initial conversation with a retreat,
get feedback from the Board which we would then bring back
for final approval by the Board.
MS. FIGUEROA-VILLA: And the community meetings?
Are is there an opportunity to chose to go to some of those meetings?

MS. BELSHE: Absolutely. We'd be happy to share that schedule with Commissioners if you are interested in attending one or more.

There are six that have been scheduled over the course of the next two and a half weeks or so. So Mr. Chair, if you're comfortable with that, we'll share that with the Commission. I think the only issue would be public meetings, but I think that's a manageable task.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: I think that would be the appropriate thing to do. And Board members should make themselves available to the extent that they are desirous of doing so.

And Commissioner Figueroa-Villa, thank you for that suggestion. That's a good one. And Ms. Executive director, I would like to get to all of those meetings and I'll be there early and I'm going to stay late.

MS. BELSHE: We are going to the Antelope Valley on the evening of early June. We will look forward to having you there.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: I think I'll start now. Any other question or comments? Commissioner Dennis, please.

MR. DENNIS: The -- the retreat, Kim, in June, it
is a meeting and so considering that we probably will have an audience, to what degree do we plan or will there be time for the audience to have input into that retreat or how is that going to be -- dealt to.

And in this as far as logistics, are you planning to do it here or off sight or whatever you have?

MS. BELSHE: We could -- an important point.

You're absolutely right. It will be a Brannock meeting. It will be noticed and we were working through the logistics and where it will be and how -- not sure if this U shaped configuration is the most feasible for a retreat kind of conversation. But those are some of the issues we're trying to grapple with for public comment.

Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Any other comments regarding item number 6, the executive directors report?

All right. Commissioner Tilton?

MS. TILTON: First, I'd like to compliment you on your report. It was extremely comprehensive and in rapid fire you covered a hundred miles; so thank you for giving us so much information.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Again. If you like.

MS. TILTON: Do it now actually. No. Don't.

Just with regards to the retreat in June that's coming up
pretty quickly. And I know there are a lot of other things happening. And for some of us we would need to know the date in June so would be able to perhaps clear a few dates in June.

MS. BELSHE: We'll be working with the Chairs office next week and will be following up shortly.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thanks very much. The Chair votes for Antelope Valley.

Let's see if we can proceed to the next item on the agenda which is item number 7. Discussion item and the power point is up. Sir, we ask you to proceed.

MS. BELSHE: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm going to make just very, very brief comments and then turn it over to Raul Ortega who is teeing up this discussion is Number 1 this is a budget preview on the 90 minute fairly detailed discussion with our with which we are three of our four fiscal budget, fiscal committee member meetings there.

Then, as now, I characterized this budget as a transitional budget. I use that term purposefully. I've been on the job I think it's six months today. John has been on the job five months; so we are still new and learning about our 554 separate initiatives and the projects and grants and the work we do as well as our underlying assumptions and trends.
Second, we are as I just touched upon, still underway with our L L and L initiative. And I really do anticipate that emerges from that work that will have Board level relevance as well as third, we talked with the Board about the compensation study that is underway which similarly may have implications that we may need to bring back to the Board.

Finally, as we just touched upon and that in turn will have a programatic and potentially operations are learning and inquiry are occurring at the very time that we are bringing to you for consideration initial consideration this budget. And I am confident as I said that learning that will emerge from these different strands of inquiry.

Very likely we will have necessary and appropriate we would be coming back to the Board early in the next fiscal year with specific ideas and recommendations.

With that, by way of context, let me ask Raul to march us through fairly high level budget presentation. And I would note Raul has offered, and I believe reached out to all the commissioners to offer an opportunity to answer specific questions or comments related to the budget. And I want to make sure that that resource budget rule.
MR. ORTEGA: Thank you. Good afternoon Mr. Chair, commissioners, and thank you Kim for that intro.

Before you for discussion purposes only is the fiscal year 2013-14 proposed budget. Very quickly, my plan is to highlight background on the budget progress. Budget overview, operating budget, program budget, revenue and our next steps.

As Kim mentioned earlier, given the new leadership recently joining First 5 LA, staff has developed what we consider a transitional budget. 2012-13 budget is aligned with the strategic plan as amended.

Management acknowledges that there are several critical efforts, L-3, best start, place based inquiry and compensation study. That program operating as Kim mentioned we're projecting to come back during quarter two to address the impact that these efforts may have on the budget.

Improvements within this years process includes incorporating less things that we're learning through implementation of the quarterly reports or quarterly updates and also the creation of an internal quality assurance team made up of mid management.

All efforts aimed to further improve the accuracy of our financial and program budgeting projects and
promotes accountability. Staff acknowledges that this will always be an ongoing process and looks forward to what lessons we are learning under the current process currently underway.

And building upon our lessons learned we have incorporated the following changes. To the format. The performance plan once previously called the work plan for fiscal year 2013, 14. Move our focus on measurable outcomes outputs and/or deliverables and remove the focus are from process oriented activities.

In addition, we consolidated the cost associated to program evaluation. This enables to us track within the guard rails of established within the strategic plans 5 percent and promotes flexibility in determining the appropriate level of funding for each project each fiscal year.

Moving now to budget overview. The total projecting budget for fiscal year 13-14. Is 2 or 7.5 percent. The budget set presented in two elements which is the operating and program budget most of the commissioners received their packet back in April 29th. The operating budget is 17.8 million and increase of 11 million or 6 percent.

The total administrative budget equal 4.57 percent the administrative costs are costs incurred for a
common or joint purpose.

Cost center one cost objective. It supports the general management and administration of First 5 LA. The administrative cost pull for First 5 LA consists of the administrative division less management grants management and includes a cost related to directors and their administrative assistants from programs.

Programs staff directly involved in program design delivery and oversight will continue to be part of the program cost. And are administrative -- our administrative cost as 4.57 is within the average 5 percent that the Commission has always aspired to have.

The increase to the operating budget set primarily related in the area of salary and benefit. Which represents 80 percent of the overall operating budget. The increase reflects three additional staff positions two in programs and one on the administrative side. And in addition, reflects a cost of living adjustment of two percent.

Additional highlights and assumptions for the operating budget can be found on pages 58 of your packet.

Moving on to program budget highlights the second piece of the proposed budget, represents 196 $2,000,000 which represents 92 percent of the overall budget. It consists of five components which is place based county
wide strategies. County wise initiatives and prior strategic plan developments and decrease of is primarily relate today contracts grantors receiving full funding in this fiscal year and projects that are ending.

Please note that the proposed operating budget as I discussed earlier in the slide before reflects cost for ongoing program management relate today those grantees and contractor that's have received full funding this fiscal year. This slide summarizes the breakdown of the five different components and it's a comparison from fiscal year 1213 to 1314.

The amended budget column of 2.46 reflects all action through February and the column for 1314 reflects the proposed program budget as proposed in the packet have you received. Program highlights under the current strategic plan place based investments are under the zero based budget platform and draws down from uncommitted fund balance Oh and/or future revenues.

Community level funding only represents 17 percent of the total place based budget funding through September 2013.

As Kim indicated earlier additional funding will be based on the result of the inquire y and further Commission action in the next fiscal year. Family strengthening represents nine contracted hospital and
fiscal year 2013, 14. And one additional contractor and oversight entity. This budget reflects progress towards implementing up to 24 hospitals within Los Angeles county with the goal of reaching 80 percent of children born in participating hospitals.

Moving into county wide investments. County wide investments consist of two core areas. The county wide strategies and county wide strategies are investment that draw from the zero based budgeting platform. It's dependent on our uncommitted fund balance and future revenue. For the budget represents 22.6 million compares to three is .1 million for fiscal year 1213.

More detail on each of these programs Oh under the county wide strategies 70 through 76 of your Board packet. County wide initiatives detail of each of these initiatives and programs can be found started on page 76 represent 62.1 million or 31 percent of the overall program budget these investments draw down from their Commission approved allegation and reflects programs implementation and ramp up of services.

Moving to on to the plan investments the proposed budge et of 75 point represents 39 percent of the overall program budget of that 75.8 million LAUP 69 percent investment from the prior strategic plan the 352.2 misdemeanor or LAUP is an increase of 4.9 million compared
to the current year.

As noted on the First 5 LA staff will work together and in a collaborative way on statement through policy and add alternative business mad mold all investments under this component will brought down from their original allocation from balance from Board approved action. Then we wrap up the program side with research and evaluation.

The total research and evaluation costs projected at 8.8 million or 4.5 percent of the overall program budget. 201,314 will include best start home visitation, data partnership network, and LAUP. Revenue for fiscal year 1314 is estimated one 88.4 million a key line of 4 PERCENT from what we projected for fiscal year for this current fiscal year. The 88 .4 million represented only 41 percent of the projected cost to be spent for 2013, 14. Projection s are based on the most recent for cast provided from the state department of finance and the First 5 LA financial update back in January 24.

Staff is currently looking the go on the govern nor's may revision other program revenues include $9,000,000 signature program and revenue from the lease agreement with the child care center on the first floor.

This time I would like to just really quickly talk about our next steps. Staff will reconvene with the
budget finance committee towards the end of May or
beginning of June.

We'll review and discuss any feedback from
today's meeting and start incorporate rating any of these
appropriate changes. In addition, we will also review
with the budget finance committee the year end projected
fund balance with an eye on the impact to the long term
financial projections and demand that the zero based
efforts may have on those uncommitted funds.

We will also begin discussion on opportunities on
how to best improve and structure future budgets and then
in June present to the full Commission as an action item.
At this time I turn it back to you Mr. Chair to open it
for discussion.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Members of the Commission
there are questions that you may wish to pose. We begin
with commissioner Au followed by commissioner -- do i see
you wishing to be heard. No. Okay.

MS. AU: Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Commissioner Au.

MS. AU: I guess there was a question that I had
that's maybe --

MS. BELSHE: Nancy can you lower your mike just a
bit.

MS. AU: Sure is that better?
Is this sort of a previous conversation we had almost a year ago when we were talking about budgeting and at that time there was a recommendation that we may want to consider doing two years budgeting and contracting and this was in response to a number of feedback that -- or a number of our grantees had present today us. Is that still on the table for consideration? Or where are we in terms of that -- that question.

MS. BELSHE: Terrific question and one which is as I said so we're on a path for a two year budget. So I take responsibility for that and we talked with -- it was actually one of the first agenda items we brought to the budget and fiscal committee and our recommendation was given the work that had been done last year that was really important and foundational to how this organization approaches it's budget. Craig and our consultant team and our staff rule touched on. It was my recommendation to the budget fiscal committee that we hit the pause button on a two year budget to make sure we get the basics in place informed by that foundational work shared with you, you know. It is a work in progress. And John, in particular in terms of leadership they brought to this effort because a budget is not just about finance. It's about the organization as a whole.

Nancy and I would suggest that we do so some thing more
about it. And colleagues can come back to the full Board in terms of our capacity and readiness to November. To a two year budget being clear as to benefit trade offs and considerations. But it was my assessment that we were not ready and that won't have been good for our community partners.

MS. AU: Just as we are to take that to the next step in terms of consideration, and I agree with you. I think we're not quite ready to move into a two year budgeting and contracting structure, but I think given prior to us seriously considering that. I think given that we are realizing the -- the clear reduction of revenue year to year; and the projections have been pretty right on, we projected about 4 percent decline and this was done about five years ago I believe. So it's -- it's becoming a reality. That I think as a Board we also need to look at the long term picture. Just taking into consideration that financial reality. And I think we really need to engage in that conversation now in terms of -- because there are some strategic decisions that we'll be making that will impact the long term impact when we begin saying we have no more dollars to allocate and be able to maintain the same level of -- of financing. Given the financing. So it's also really being clear to a
number of our grantees because it's easier for them to --
to make whatever adjustments they need to make in the
context of sustainability. Especially that they can
anticipate what it's going to look like down the road for
them operationally, and for us as a Commission.
We can then therefore have a fiscal parameter as to making
informed decisions about what we strategically invest in
and move forward.
So I think my recommendation, Kim, and in the context of
this critical decision making process, is that we talk
about scheduling that conversation maybe in the context of
moving towards a new strategic planning process. I think
having our financial pictures clearer to us as a
Commission.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Right. Any additional
questions or comments on these particular items
Commissioner Dennis.

MR. DENNIS: Two questions.
In the packet from last year, we underestimated our
earnings. I think you said in the packet that the amount
that we actually received is greater than that which we
had anticipated. And what happens with those dollars?
Can we carry those dollars and if we can, how is that
reflected in the budget material?

MR. ORTEGA: For the revenue purposes, any
revenue that's above what we project ends up in the
general fund balance. In the uncommitted fund balance.
As for programs that are under the prior strategic plan
and the county wide initiative all those investments have
allocations.
So those funds would remain within the allocation and
would remain as committed funds for the organization. The
delta from anything from the zero based platform, which is
the place-based strategies, and the county wide
strategies. And just increase the uncommitted fund
balance.
Even so, the same thing $8 million and the actual tax was
greater. Then it would just go into the general fund
again.

MR. ORTEGA: Correct.

MR. DENNIS: And my second question.

MR. ORTEGA: And the second part for the next
presentation. The next item is that we're starting to
implement guard rails so that we can strategically start
planning on what truly is available on uncommitted fund
balance. That there is an uncommitted fund balance and
people's initial. That's great, but when you reconcile
that to your strategic plan and two major county wide
strategies that are based on those uncommitted fund
balances and future revenues.
MR. DENNIS: My second question was around you -- you describe a quality assurance mechanism. And you spoke to that, that the quality assurance would be a cross section of the managers within the organization. And the integrity of any quality assurance is to -- in my estimations someone who's independent and not associated with any program. So I mean, I would just want you to think about how you develop quality assurance.

MR. ORTEGA: Okay. Good point.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Are there other questions? Commissioner Fielding.

MR. FIELDING: I just had a few questions. One, are there any opportunities for us to better invest the money that we have. I know that we get very little, and I just wonder if this is the time to ask that question again.

Because we still have quite a bit of dollars that could be earning more than they do now. But not necessarily with our strictures. So I just want to ask if there's any reason to look at that again. I don't know the answer.

MR. ORTEGA: Right now our policy can go up to five years, and communicated with the treasurer's office anything outside the five years is -- it's not. I do not know if he would much more within the county pool. So to go along for five years just to earn two points above the
.77 that we're averaging right now is -- we don't think it is.

MR. FIELDING: And we don't have the flexibility to go outside of the county pool for anything other than triple A, or whatever.

MR. ORTEGA: Correct. Well we can strategically pick what we want to invest but we still have to go through the treasurer's office.

MR. FIELDING: We can pick whatever we want to invest in.

MR. ORTEGA: Yes.

MR. FIELDING: All in debt. I mean, if we've been in a little bit of quite over the last year we would have a lot more money than we have now. Not arguing that the best receipt spoke to scope but I'm suggesting that at least that be something that we look at, as well as the trade offs.

Second question, is it seems to me that one of the difficult typical issues we're going to face are not only the many strategic and tactical issues, but administration that is -- administration is staying under 5 percent which it is instead of $200 million in spending and we have $8 million coming in. That's come down pretty drastically calendarly. When we make clear what our priorities are, but I just highlight that because right now it is more
than 11 or 12 percent of the money that's coming in.
Which is the not the best way to think about it, but it's
over time.
My third question, and the last question is, there was
such a big push to stop smoking with a print or television
campaign that suggests that that's accelerated or not
decline in revenues.

MR. ORTEGA: Based on the report that was given
at the First 5 California meeting back in January, those
projections are impacting the revenue that we're
expecting.

MR. FIELDING: Very nice presentation. In a way
that we haven't had before. So thank you very much.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you very
much for your presentation.
As is indicated, I think the Board wishes to express it's
appreciation. You have spoken long enough now. You can
step down.

MR. ORTEGA: If I can just have a second to
acknowledge my staff. This is a cross department input
from all the program departments. I want to call out to
Katy Fallon who did a great job with performance, and also
our honorable John Wagner who's been a great coach.

MS. BELSHE: He's honorable now.

MS. BELSHE: Objection.
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: I want to say now you've talked to too much now. Let's see if you can redeem yourself with item number eight. Mr. Ortega.

MR. ORTEGA: Good afternoon commissioners thank you for having me back.

MR. KAUFMAN: Are you honorable?

MS. BELSHE: Yes, he is.

MR. ORTEGA: Thank you. Before I ask for approval of the reserve policy, I would just like to inform -- to give you a little background. Staff presented in January 2013 the long term financial projections to the Commission of the staff the work of the budget and finance committee, to consider a policy fund balance reserve.

This recommendation comes at a crucial time for the organization, as our revenue and uncommitted fund balance are projected to decline in the next five years. Strategic plan, as amended reflects programs such as family strengthening and fully born, demand a significant demand on current and future resources.

A reserve is an unrestricted fund balance that is set aside to stabilize the organizational finances and should not be use to cover a long term or permanent income statement plan.

This fund, which allows the organization to whether
serious shifts and fiscal changes. The recommendation before you proposes an amendment to the fund balance policy. It claims 5 percent reserve based on the operating and program budget to be adjusted and approved on an annual basis by the Board. And staff review of the reserve policy from other First 5 county commissioners city reserve policy, and LA county offices of the Board of supervisors.

In addition we looked at published articles from the government finance offices nonprofit assisted funds and pronunciation from the governmental accounting standards board. The proposed reserve policy sets funds aside for the sole purpose of cash flow related to delays received from extreme events. Those are unanticipated events or natural disasters, or budget stabilization in the event of a revenue shortage.

This recommendation was brought to the budget finance committee on March 4, 2013 where the changes to the policy were reviewed and discussed. Support of the budget and finance committee.

If this policy is approved, based on the proposed budget that we just addressed the projected reserve would be roughly $49 million. The $49 million would be set aside from the uncommitted fund balance alternate June 30, 2013. This concludes my presentation and would turn back to the
Chair for discussion and approval thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much, members of the Commission. Perhaps the chief of budget and finance wishes to weigh an alternate to this point. Commented on in this, by way of recommendation if there is such to be done.

MR. THOMPSON: He isn't here today.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: He didn't delegate?

MR. THOMPSON: I read through most of the stuff but I wasn't privy to the discussions.

MR. FIELDING: I think that having a reserve is quite reasonable. Probably a little more additional discussion about how much generally would you have three months operating revenue. And on the other hand our revenue stream is pretty secure. So that needs to be taken into account. For example, I don't know if the state has ever given us money in a timely manner. Cash for purposes. And also whether we should do it based on this year or whether we effect to be spending over the next five years or start at that level. So I think the committee's very supportive, and this level may in fact be a good level but maybe warrant just a little more discussion about the exact level of that. On the other hand 25 percent is certainly reasonable, and it's not like we have other uses for that money right now.
THE COURT: All right. Any additional remarks on that? Commissioner Browning.

MR. BROWNING: I had a question about where these funds would be invested. Would they be in an account that would be more liquid since they're short term reserve or less liquid.

MR. ORTEGA: These funds would always be in the uncommitted fund balance and it would be -- it would have to keep it at the most in a position where it's that we can liquidate it as quickly as possible. Yes.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Okay. You good with that Commissioner Browning?

MR. BROWNING: We do give up some of the interest that Dr. Fielding had indicated. It would be nice to strike a balance. This would be in a reserve used for emergencies.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: I think the fiscal implications of what the quote unquote loss would be is something that the Board would go into knowing, as you talk about the $10,000,000.

What would be the loss in terms of interest bearing? That would be the case.

MR. ORTEGA: Well right now all of our funds are ingested in the general accounting pool which is a liquidable asset that we have for the organization. If we
were to move as what Dr. Fielding was talking about in the last presentation, to go into a specific investment pool we would -- we can have funds that are locked up three to five years. But right now currently our best bet is to keep your money within the county pool based on the term and what we're getting in return for the investments.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: I think you need to address more squarely the question of whether or not whatever interest would have been realized in terms of status quo. Is there a difference that is to be appreciated? I think that's what Commissioner Fielding was seeking to get at as well as Commissioner --

MR. ORTEGA: Right now it would be status quo.

MS. AU: Along that same line, are we current -- let's see. Your recommendation is that we create this reserve fund with this year's unexpended or un-- uncommitted funds?

MR. ORTEGA: Correct?

What we would do at the end of June 30th after we realize all of our lights. We have an uncommitted fund balance; from that uncommitted fund balance we would put that aside.

MS. AU: Okay. And the impact on next year's budget is not an assumption is that that will not I am
past that.

MR. ORTEGA: Correct.

MS. AU: Okay. And this is going to be a one time fund creation. This reserve fund is a one time deal.

MR. ORTEGA: Yes. We would revisit is it on an annual basis based on the operating and program budget.

MS. AU: So would we, if we're projecting down the road that we will be essentially seeing reduced operations because of our declining revenue, then the assumption again was that that reserve fund can be changed.

MR. ORTEGA: Would decrease appropriately.

MS. AU: Okay. Got it.

MR. ORTEGA: And just to add to Doctor Fielding's right. Now this proposal does cover for 90 days of program and operating just for to you --

MR. FIELDING: What's the argument against doing it?

MR. ORTEGA: The argument against doing this is to give you more flexibility to invest your funds and to any specific program. But I form that with caution because of the current strategic plan. And we have two major investments under the current strategic plan that are at zero based efforts. So that's the caution that I throw out.
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Right.

MR. FIELDING: Thank you. Let me acknowledge Commissioner Figueroa-Villa.

MS. FIGUEROA-VILLA: I believe that I remember in our budget finance committee we had a lengthy discussion about this, and I can recommend that we bring this to the Board with a recommendation to go ahead and establish the reserve fund. And we talked about possibly considering four to six months of reserve, and they were going to come back with that recommendation.

So our budget and finance committee did meet. We discussed it. We talked about pros and cons, and our recommendation is to go ahead for -- and approve establishing a reserve fund.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Commissioner -- thank you Commissioner Figueroa-Villa. Commissioner Dennis and I are going to interpret that as a motion that we'll proceed.

MS. FIGUEROA-VILLA: We spent three hours.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. We will not be repeating that experience. Thank you.

MR. DENNIS: Raul, do I understand this to mean that with a $45,000,000 reserve for three months then the remaining fund balance should always be committed so we should never be in a situation where we would have an
uncommitted fund balance, thus drawing attention as had
been the issue in the past? Where people are looking at
our fund balance and saying look at First 5 with all that
to money?

MS. BELSHE: And if I may.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Please.

MS. BELSHE: As Raul noted in his parenthesis, as
we discussed with the budget and finance committee. This
was a policy that recommended that we brought to the
policy and full Board. Looking at what other First 5's
are doing others start from scratch. We try to, across
First 5 Commissions. So if you were too look alternately
most First 5 reserve policies are very consistent with
this.

MR. DENNIS: But with this we still have the
to potential of having general fund money.

MS. BELSHE: Absolutely and we're saying as a
matter of responsible fiscal stewardship it is important
to have some level of reserve.

MR. DENNIS: I agree -- I agree with that. I'm
just -- I'm just more concerned about the -- the remaining
funds and if -- will all those funds be committed?

MS. BELSHE: Over a period of time as we discuss.
And we'll discuss further in the next meeting, we will be
reaching a point where the uncommitted unreserved balances
are no more and we are an organization that is living on a single largely on a single declining revenue source.

MR. DENNIS: And that's when it comes very important.

MS. BELSHE: Absolutely. We are spending -- we have been spending through our program and operations budget in excess of our revenues since 2007. So we're basically living off, if you will the unexpended balances of the past. And as we've shared and used as a context, those -- those lines are dropping quite dramatically. And it is going to compel some decisions and we think a reserve.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.

MR. FIELDING: All organizations of this type have reserves. I don't know that anybody would argue that this is not a fiscally responsible conservative approach. And the organization should be conservative at least fiscally.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Commissioner Figueroa-Villa does move. Is there a second paragraph?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: It's been moved, and has been properly seconded that we move forward with the recommendation of staff with respect to the reserve fund. It is scored at 25 percent. Are all Board members, and all commissioners clear as to the specifics of which we're
Is there any further discussion to be entertained on this item? Are there any objections? Any abstentions? Please record a unanimous vote.

Let's proceed to the next item before us.

You did well, sir. You can sit down now. No water for you today. Item number nine the honorable John Wagner.

MR. WAGNER: Good afternoon Mr. Chairman.

Members of the Board, item nine before you contains three strategic partnerships. And I'll make some brief introductions of the partnership before you and then turn it over to staff who will go in a little bit more detail just as recap. Two of these partnerships, that's the first two that we will be discussing, were discussed at the last board meeting. And the third is a new item that we're recommending action on the first two. And the Board may want to take action on the third. We have this information and action to provide you with the flex on this third item. Given it is the first time you will have heard this item. As discussed last month, there are several circumstances under which first five LA staff can come before the Board and recommend a strategic partnership. That means that a contract goes forward without a competitive solicitation.

And since we covered those situations at the last Board
meeting I won't go into all of them but I did want to
highlight the key justifications for the three
partnerships before you today. Though I won't mention the
key justification, I think it's important information and
point out that in Board materials the memos for each one
of those strategic partnerships provides a checklist for
all of the reasons why a strategic partnership can occur.

And based on Board approved policy and that checklist may
have multiple justifications, and in fact they do. And I
want today to call those to your attention which are on
the Board packet. And the final point before going into
the three specific partnerships, that's I'd just like to
call out is that an action -- the action we're asking for,
is to authorize staff to engage in a strategic
partnership.
And what then that means is, once that authority given to
staff contracts, scopes of work and other variables with
this partner that will come back to you in the form of a
contract. And scope work that you will again have an
ability to formally vote on.
So the first strategic partnership in your packet
recommends a partnership with the child care alliance of
LA. And the Los Angeles county office of child care.

MR. DENNIS: Chair, I must recuse.
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Proceed.

MR. WAGNER: The LA county of child care and education workforce registry. So while our senior research analyst Kimberly Hall is here, I will just mention that we are justifying and recommending this partnership due to the unique ability of the alliance and the offset of child care to tap into an existing and significant provider of networks targeted for conversations.

At our last Board meeting staff had worked to incorporate Board work and follow up on these discussions between staff and the Board as far as interring individual questions that are reflected in this latest proposal. So I will turn it over to Kimberly.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. That will be fine. Doing so on summary fashion will not be met with any objections from members of this Commission. If they do object they will be duly sanctioned and there will be no question about it. Proceed Madame Hall. Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you Ms. Hall. Good afternoon item nine is a partnership.

MS. HALL: A partnership as was mentioned by Mr. Wagner. This partnership was presented at the April Commission meeting. We've incorporated the feedback and are returning with the current recommendation for your
consideration. As a reminder the registry will serve many important functions for first five LA as primary source development outcomes by First 5 LA's investments comprehensive workforce development evaluation.

As a reminder, our approach to workforce development efforts is raised comprehensive, as the distinction workforce invested in. And in support of this, the registry will serve as a single source of data on par with advertised outcomes across several programs. And allow us to monitor the size and characteristics of ECE workforce, and inform current and future workforce development. And also it can be use to identify policy issues, and to advocate for new and approved policies.

As indicated in the memo by Mr. Wagner the proposed partnership meets multiple criteria in a policy established by this Board before providing the justification of how we meet the criteria.

Table on the slide. The slide presents the table results of an analysis in LA county. The results in this table will be referenced as a highlight appears on page three of the memo along with the sources of data. In terms of cost effectiveness the proposed partnership criteria.

Q Three ways. First it provides access to early existing networks of over 10,000 licensed child care providers. The alliance of the office of child care up to
date, and comprehensive family child care providers in LA county. As you can see in the table no other provider network in the county currently has a licensed child care provider. This resource is needed for the registry in order to maximize participation and representativeness and saturation.

A competitive solicitation would need to include additional funding to recreate this existing network. The second way in which this criteria inset will have blind relationships trust and credibility in the child care communities. Competitive solicitation fund for the staff time and other resources to pursue and develop such relationships.

Finally, the license agencies can use existing resources to perform any of the at reach reach functions of the rectory industry office.

Existing resources include staff who are ready to have relationships with providers and interactions with them. As well as more tangible resources like newsletters and mailings that are used to get the word out. And finally, the existing 14 offices puts them in close agreement. You can't perform a competitive solicitation. Would need to include fund for the staff to do outreach to create mechanisms to raise awareness of accessible physical locations.
A second pro tier I can't say is expeditious or not. A timely launch of the registry is towards the development evaluation. The evaluation is played at the beginning 1314, and given it's reliance on registry day attachment, would be operational as soon as possible. The alliance and office of child care are well positioned to launch the registry office more quickly than any other entity, given the list of existing licensed child care providers. The strong relationships and the existing organizational infrastructure and resources already in place. I'll conclude my presentation by once again requesting your consideration of the proposed partnership. At this time I'd like to turn it back over to the Chair for discussion.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much for your presentation. Members of the Commission are there questions on what we would consider nine A at this point. If not we're going to dispose of the A, B, and C. Now I note the hand of the Commissioner Tilton. Move with dispatch please.

MS. TILTON: Commissioner.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Yes.

MS. TILTON: I just realized that Mr. Dennis has
also managed to be present and absent at the same meeting
and so in his absence at this meeting let me say that his
involvement in this project has -- has been a benefit to
us in the understanding he's given to us about what his
project does. The information he's shared, and over the
years I can say these two organizations, the alliance and
his the county child care program are outstanding.
They're excellent and I can't say enough about how
important it is that we establish this partnership for the
sake of children, the quality of child care for children.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Great any additional comments
on the matter Mr. Superintendent? Commissioner Delgado.

MR. DELGADO: Thank you for the chart. The
identification chart load, if we can get that every time
that's really helpful. The only other question I have
would be with the -- the expediency that for which you're
trying to go towards as being one of the justifications.
I haven't heard a time frame as to what I heard you say
today that you would like to have it done as quickly as
possible. That's very broad for next year ten years from
now. What you mean by that. So we can feel the same
sense, of you are general feeling with that. And my
concern is of course that when you have the criteria that
you have for going forward with this type of an
appointment for contract that really any one of those four
can be a justification behind closed doors for the purpose of transparency. A lot of those types of data call out to the Board so we can at least examine it first.

MS. HALL: Thank you. So in terms of dates, our hope is to enter into a contract to establish the registry office in the first quarter of the fiscal year 1314. As I mentioned at the last Commission meeting we're interested in executing a contract for July 1. And part of the reason for that -- the sense of you are generally is that through the workforce investment that is First 5 LA. Currently, funds we've been collecting. Data and information, and are already starting to do recruitment for the registry. And one of the things we have now is a lot of information that needs to be moved into the registry. And so we have -- we have data essentially stacking up on us, and until we can establish the registry office we're just kind of holding on to information in our desks and part of the information registry has to do with the workforce development evaluation.

We have First 5 LA is invested in the workforce development projects of the ECE workforce consortium. Third year of a five year so our -- our need and are you generally around, having the data conducted part of what's driving the need to get this underway quickly.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you for
your question and your response commissioners. Are there additional questions on, or comments on nine A.

MS. AU: Just a clarification.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Clarification Commissioner Au. 11 the numbers of providers.

Are they unduplicated numbers or is there an overlap because you have 10,000 for the alliance and then the -- the other entities are far less than.

MS. HALL: Yes.

MS. AU: But there is a potential across these different providers knelt works so the other entity shown is the providers sub set of the provider who are the office of child care and the alliance networks.

MS. AU: All right. Thank you. Appreciate that.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you. All right. What is your pleasure with respect to nine A the justification having been given this was contingent from last month. So this additional work can be done.

What is the pleasure of the Board? Is there a motion to move forward on nine A?

Moved and seconded. Are there any objections to moving forward pertaining to the staff recommendation? Seeing none, please record a unanimous vote.

We'll proceed to nine B.

Now honorable one, we understand that honor is a virtue.
Let me to comment that is as well.

MR. WAGNER: Okay. Thank you Mr. Chair. The second partnership, as we discussed was also brought before the Board in April. And this one involves the public health foundation enterprises WIC program. And the proposal is to extend, and expand the current one step ahead program. We are relying on a strategic partnership given the existence in our First 5 LA investments have made with this grantee and the fact that all seven WIC agencies in Los Angeles have signed up. And memorandum of understanding to collaborate as one entity for the purposes of this grant in administering this partnership that this is providing.

Board input on, and questions regarding sustainability that was raised last month. And as well, adds on performance. And John, our senior programs's office specifically taking into account the.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Ma'am please proceed.

MS. JOHN: Thanks, John. Good afternoon Supervisor and as this presentation is related to nine B in your packets. The last Commission meeting of April staff presented this item as an informational. We're returning this month with a recommendation to enter into a strategic partnership with P M F E WIC. We will be
providing a very brief background on the program and then primarily use this time to address some of the key questions raised by commissioners at the April meeting. Particularly around sustainability. And just to reiterate the recommendation of one step, a program in the amount of 28.7 million over six years. And the second piece of this is to extend the contract with P H F E, which is set to expire June 30, 2013, in an amount not to exceed three months effective July one 2013.

And this second part is to insure that there's no gap in services in communities where the pilot is currently being rendered immaterial.

So in terms of the strategic partnership justification, this partnership with P H F E would meet three out of four stated criteria. And the details are listed in your packet. And as John mentioned earlier the key criteria that we're basing this on is that the partnership can implement the approved program or initiative more expeditiously than resources that would be objectoined through a competitive solicitation. To give you a very brief background on the project, builds on the literacy program originally developed little by little. Little by little, was I told between 2003 and 2008 funded by First 5 LA for $4.7 million. And the program successfully helped a thousand children evaluation of the program demonstrated
that the intervention significantly informed school readiness. On January 2011, the First 5 approved $30 million allocation over five years for the one step ahead program as a county wide initiative. It is essentially an era of little by little with an added state safety component. So from December of 2011 to currently, P H F E has been piloting one step ahead and three WIC sites. Key lessons, primarily process related and informed the expansion estimates and recommendation that are before you today. In terms of sustainability some key questions requested by commissioners of the April meeting have also been addressed in the memo.

For today's presentation we're focusing on those questions related to sustainability. So in fiscal year 1314, staff will work closely with P H F E to develop multi-year fund development and a sustainability plan that will include program expansion estimates and fuel fundraising targets to be monitored in succession annually. The contract will be performance based each year to insure progress and scale and funding level in the subsequent year. In developing the sustainability plan, staff will work with P M F E to explore various strategies such as establishing a reserve fund, developing a brand for the one step ahead program, including various marketing and
communications strategies with a goal of soliciting support from corporate and private funders. And furthermore, during the pilot phase of the program, conduct a development assessment. An assessment of the development capacity of various WIC agencies and sites found that this capacity varies greatly across those sites. Key strategy will include building the development capacity of agency. Various topics including major gift solicitation endowments, individual fundraising, grant writing, and et cetera.

Finally, it's important to note the full, rather partial commitment from First 5 LA, and of P H F E. Significant leverage in soliciting other funds for the the one step foreman program. And details about P M F E's responsibility as I lead the agency are included. And that concludes this portion.

If you have questions my colleagues Nancy and I are available.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you for your presentation. Commissioner Fielding.

MR. FIELDING: So I'm not clear. How do you think it's possible it execute a contract? When would this start? When would the program start at the first five sight? I'm sure you said the year 1314, so I'm just trying to get a better timing. The pilot for one step
ahead is currently running, and we're asking for a three
month extension to continue those the pilot sites. And
then starting first we expect the program to fully kind of
take off.

MR. FIELDING: Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Commissioner. Of the sites
you're talking about, how many of them are in Best Start
communities?

MS. JOHN: So currently with the three pilot
sites, we know that one of those sites is within a Best
Start community. In terms of expansion to the 20 sites,
those sites are to be determined; and you know criteria
that will be used to determine that, will, you know be
looked at. The size of those WIC agencies will be looking
at the capacity of the individual WIC agencies and sites
to both implement the program and also, you know, their
development capacity to fund raise for the program.
So basically there will be various criteria that will be
used to determine where those sites will land ultimately.
Most likely -- I think, we can say with a locality of
that, there will be a good number of those sites that will
fall in Best Start communities, but we'll have to come
back to you with that.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Commissioner Au.

MS. AU: Just inform follow up on this question
regarding Best Start communities. Again, one of the concerns I always have is when First 5 LA funds projects and initiatives that we always are struggling with connecting the programs together. So that we have more of a cohesive approach and I -- I'm -- rather concerned about this particular project in terms of how it fits into our place based Best Start work.
And the family strengthening piece because family strengthening, welcome baby, and the home visitation, it's up to a certain point. But we need to look at what happens when that particular initiative or service is no longer provided. What happens to children, and what -- how it fits into our other investments.
With the WIC sites, they do work with mothers that are expecting babies. And the first -- at least the first year I believe.
So the question is how do all these components fit together. And I -- I like for First 5 LA to have a level of clarity. You know when we look at funding these things. So that when we talk about our investments and how it impacts families and the areas of our goals, that we can speak to it in a very comprehensive manner. Right now, I don't see even the narrative to support that.
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. I have a few additional questions that might augment those concerns.
But Ms. Belshe, why don't you proceed.

MS. BELSHE: Thank you Mr. Chair. I just want to offer a reaction to Commissioner Au's.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Okay.

MS. BELSHE: Which I think is a very important one and represents a very important theme coming through our listening learning and leading exploration in terms of what is our unifying principles, and programs, and objectives and as a rule shared in the overview of our budget, you know. We have five major areas of activity, and two components are just two of those five. So we have a locality of investments that reflect our previous strategic plan.

County wide initiative that were supported by the Board back in 2011. Within nodes of implementation, are plans of approval. So this is something we're trying to get our arms around in terms of, and we'll talk with the programming and planning committee. Opportunities to better integrate and coordinate all these different first five initiatives. And as part of your Best Start where are the most significant connecting points between our county wide initiatives and the work is unfolding in -- in Best Start.

So we're not answering it with this specific initiative. We are moving forward with Board aproved policy and
direction, but we are going to need to be more intentional in terms of it's relationship with best start.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Commissioner Kaufman. We'll he wishes to address some of the points raised by commissioner Au then and there.

MR. KAUFMAN: One is to sort of further what Yancey is raising. I see that there are really the problem with early childhood is there is no child care to go to so they can do everything in one spot for example, at school. Three WIC, child care, and health care delivery. You can argue there are others but if you're not talking about the systems and the like. 95 percent of poor pregnant women, and it goes age five. Kids drop out a little bit but it goes up to age five, that's where the poor pregnancy come in for First 5. Child care we know, does some of that clearly for a large importance, not everybody can afford health care. WIC 25 or 30 years ago I think, was realized, in that nutrition was critical. That was their mission, but that they had access to the highest and most reliable services in the nation. And back number of years ago one of the WIC sites decide that one of their WIC moms and babies got immunized. That was revolutionary to think about, because it wasn't part of the culture to pay for the needs. And all of of the WIC programs, as around the country. And LA has been a leader
of that with our seven different ones. It has added more
and more and more things on their platform.
Practicing 20 years ago, developmental screening and even
developmental treatment, or so I think, that if you look
at where are the Best Start communities where there are
the WIC sites where there can be found the child care aid,
and the medical assistance, it's going to happen. And is
already happening. So I do really believe that while it
might not be articulated in this project if we look at
what WIC does, and WIC could do.
And we bring together some creatives, I think this is an
amazing investment personally. So I have nothing left,
but to go where the money is, and rob the bank. And go
where the kids are, particularly the poor kids. And if
you see it differently, I think that we do need to remind
ourselves, obviously that we have to work on that. We
have to identify it. Measures show their is a facility.
But I personally feel it's the right places have been
investing in WIC in many different ways in the past.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.

MR. KAUFMAN: One other comment relates to the
same action, if you want to come back to me on this. Or
do it now. I really like what we're describing here, but
I think within the contract that were this approved, I
would suggest two things.
One, is that each year's next year's spending is contingent on how much other people's income comes in. That doesn't mean it's a match necessarily. Like a percentage, we basically say how much are we putting in this year? How much additional year support First 5 money should come in? So rather than staying dependent it turns out that this takes five, six, or seven years to get enough money to make it sustainable. I think we should do that. Outside of this, a large proportion of this program are the cost of goods. There's personnel and this then there are goods. There are books, there are things we give away. And this grant could pay for that. We should try not to pay for products. We should figure out if we can calendarly move appropriately, and under what circumstances should WIC receive free stuff. And again that means advertising potentially. It means we're not taking from tobacco, and giving it away as free cigarettes, or something. But there are some standards that could be done away with to make it sustainable. Lower proportion of dollars needed to cover the administrative and infrastructure, and other people are putting money into the goods, so I think if we can sustain this fundraising opportunity it's not going to work.
There is no way, in my opinion, that $567 a year will be WIC, just like we've learned from other partners that there's just not that kind of money around. The cost could be zero, because appropriately with proper guidelines, you have a slow small administrative that might cover it.

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

Commissioner Dennis.

MR. DENNIS: I just kind of have a question from Neil. In your description of WIC, do they do early screenings and assessment for young children? Is that within the work that they do?

MR. KAUFMAN: I'm going to let somebody from WIC answer that.

MR. DENNIS: That's an important piece if that's done universally, then that's a big piece and I didn't know they did that.

MR. FIELDING: It's not done universally as far as I know.

MR. KAUFMAN: It's an opportunity it's a platform, it's a location. I did it with my team once and actually gave away books so there's been tests. I don't know, a small proportion of which get a size pack site at the WIC site. Is that true.

MS. AU: Small.
MR. KAUFMAN: She was shaking her head question.

MR. DENNIS: So it's not a routine practice.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Commissioner Au.

MS. AU: You know, one of the that can also maybe be helpful for First 5 LA to be able to track, is again the duplication of services, and there are many organizations that are getting the same families. And I'm just wondering whether or not it would be helpful for us to be able to get some semblance of these families being serviced with the same kinds of services from multiple entities. Not to say that there may not be a need for that. But I would benefit from -- from knowing more about the -- the interface between families that are in need of support and services, and where those access points are. And the multiple areas of access that they do seem to experience overtime.

So I'm not sure if this is the place to do it, but I think that something for First 5 LA to keep in mind because we've got a number of literacy and school readiness initiatives. From the libraries to the child care centers preschool LA and up. They do a whole lot. For my partnership for families there's always this sort of multi-completion, multi-level approaches that they all seem to do. So -- I think it would be helpful not to.

MS. JOHN: I just was thinking about vantage
point from First 5, we fund so many programs that use WIC as an access point, and connected to you are oral health programs, our various nutrition programs, our health centers, et cetera. And so the more -- the ways we can integrate are through outreach, information and resource sharing between all sort of points where we were funding these programs, so you know. We have a specially vantage point in that sense.

MS. AU: Yes. And based on that sustainability, and reading what was described, that the -- the -- the plan for WIC is that they will not do a full blown expansion of this program. They're taking it in -- in steps. So we may realize some cost -- if you want to call it cost savings or they are less than the full cost of our allocation. Perhaps we can take a look at this as well. It's not going to be 4 million every year is my guess. It's -- it's going to be a portion of it as they begin. It is to ramp and expand, John, it's a phrased implementation. So it's at three now, it will go to nine, and then 16. And the potential for 20. So it's phased.

MS. AU: Okay.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Commissioner Swilley.

MS. SWILLEY: I don't have any concerns. I think WIC is the way to go. I still so do have some concerns.
I like your assurance that the Best Start communities will be concluded, but if part of the process is the ability to show sustainability, I think some of the communities in greatest need are the very communities that cannot demonstrate that.

So that in terms of criteria, in 20 sites that should be taken into consideration. Maybe that's the fear that's not real, but that's the concern I have. John there are 90 sights across the county. They are looking at sites that are ranging in size from you 2 to 3,000, to up to 9,000 participants. And so I think all of the criteria have to be sort of looked at in terms of the selection piece.

And we'll be working you know, closely with them on that piece.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right on that very point it seems to me that the selection criteria is yet to be fully defined or is that it -- and that gives some degree of pause.

Perhaps can you speak to that a little more carefully? The specific concern about the sites selection criteria for the pilot phase as one concern that I'd like to put on the table. And then there's an additional question about the at risk pregnant, and post partum clients that are to be served and how that integrates into the program with
respect to site selection. There's an additional question
that I think is worthy of our consideration in terms of
increase in cost per client. There's an increase of some
40 percent and so I think the Board is due some
explanation of those things if you can offer it at this
point.
In terms of Commission, I have readiness to relate to
these specific concerns, and if we can pin them down here
and now that will be fine. If we need to revisit this at
a future meeting that will be fine as well.
John I'll take your last one first in terms of per
participants piece.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: 32 to 45. Is that correct, John? About 36 to 42 per participant for just taking
direct service cost and dividing by the number of
participants, so not very -- not including, sort of the
lead agency's centralized function cost if you add in
those costs it gets up to 51 to 53 participants. Based on
the work that's been done through the pilot.
Things may vary moving forward because each site has a
different -- you know, operating cost, and those kinds of
things the -- the average could vary moving forward.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: I understand your
explanation, and it is that very explanation that gives me
pause. I would like for that to be pinned down more
carefully if in fact it is possible.

With respect to this second set of questions that I posed about site selection and what say, yes?

MS. JOHN: I'm sorry, in terms of criteria for sight selection.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Correct, Ms. John, so basically that includes at this point a number of participants served by WIC agency readiness capacity of the sight to implement a program of county wide geographic data, and also there will not be an assessment of the development capacity of the agency, or I'm sorry of the site itself.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Are there additional questions? I want to say for the record those responses don't seem to me to be completely sufficient, and I think more work is no doubt due in that regard. Madam executive director. That is the view of the Chair at this moment.

MS. BELSHE: You know one site selection I think has articulated a number of key criteria that we are having developed. It's unclear, or if there's some additional criteria, that would be helpful feedback. One approach we could take as presented, we are recommending that they retake a phased approach to implementation. And I think the Board has made it clear that you're looking
for greater clarity in terms of where these sights could be for the Board to approve moving forward with the strategic partnership which as Ms. John reminded us, to go to a head attorney into which we will come to the Board at that time.

We can come back with greater clarity focus on Best Start communities which we know are some of our most under served and at risk communities, number 1. Number 2, what I heard from Neil is that there have been some increases in cost but it's not entirely clear what per capita is -- or if the per capita cost experience is an increase over the -- the -- the identifying lot, or if it's reflective of just -- I want to make sure we're comparing apples to apples, and not apples to oranges. Ms. John, there's a cost per participant range based on just the direct service cost. There's also a cost per participant based on the cost of the program, so taking the full amount dividing by cost per -- dividing by the number of participants. So those vary about ten to $15.00 per participant. Does that make sense?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: I do understand your response. No it does not make sense. So I think that's some of what -- I think requires a bit more work. That would be my view. The request to be heard by wave public comment I'm going to call anyway. Did I at this point in
time and then we'll revisit the balance.

SPEAKER: We had this problem last time. Can I hold it in my hand?

It's too short.

MS. BELSHE: Yes, it is too short.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Is there some reason for your solidarity, ma'am?

SPEAKER: I wanted to start my brief comment by thanking staff. We know though that you're able to start this strategy partnership so thank you for the phone call had with you since the April 11th meeting and you do a better job for WIC than I so you're now honorary.

MR. KAUFMAN: I have.

SPEAKER: I suppose the first thing I would say is what questions I could answer maybe she had a little light on are questions and cost changes. Would that be worth your time for me to do that.

So here's the thing about the seven WIC programs is that we're geographically in different places sow have the antelope valley WIC program you have the east WIC the Pasadena WIC program the Watts WIC program and inform as far you know where all those are. Which basically covers spot six and we have our friends from LA buy here and we also have northeast valley here.

And who am I forgetting just us I think just us
so then have you P H F E the doughnut the whole way around everyone else. Three through eight but not in spots one or so with thinking about the roll out of one step ahead across the seven WIC programs the goal right now we have it in three WIC programs hours out in Pomona. Northeast valley which is in Panorama City and LA buy which is in Huntington park. So in the first fiscal year of expansion we would go out just six new sights at six of the seven WIC programs the reason to not all seven is Pasadena needs a year to get ready. Any WIC program.

So we want to get a new director in place. Roll out in Pasadena in year two. So what that means in year one able to put new sights everywhere in the county. You know, not everywhere. We can't go to all sights in the multiple registration be ones. The first will be Palmdale because we need to get up there. So that's high on your list and family is Best Start and then east LA obviously somewhere in Watts because we have Watts health care corporation Long Beach WIC program.

So does that give any help or have I made the picture more?

MR. FIELDING: Have you looked an at how those comport with the Best Start communities?

SPEAKER: We do to to some degree. We know that in Antelope Valley we're going immediately. We have to
balance two things we have to balance that. Strategic partnership because we're be a strategic partner, yet I think we've not been able to have the close talks like this that we're lacking forward to the second week themselves because while all 90 wing nutrition not all can house this program both because of space because of staffing issues so while we might love to put bun in all 14 of the Best Start communities.

I can't dell you WIC sites really would have the capacity to be successful. I think -- I mean I'm pretty confident that at least half of the communities could have them.

As we roll out to get into 16 and possibly up to 20 sites. So we're very open to that and really welcome working with you and staff on covering strategically Best Start regions and not Best Start regions with what we call one step a is the across the county.

We see this a county wide initiative. Breath targeted on your because we have aren't worked closely. Thank you for your testimony.

MS. BELSHE: Mr. Chair. You had also raised a question on cost would it be appropriate for also speak to the participant cost issue you rised.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: It might be but none are we to held ultimately responsible for what happens one way or
the other. Are you the point to be the budget analyst on all that. Speak i can tell you what I know. And I think what I knows true.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: That's an escape clause.

MR. KAUFMAN: That's always good.

SPEAKER: I'll only share with you what I know to be true. I believe the question might come and cost increase from the first time you funded this project from 2002 to 2008 us now the second time around is that the question because that dollar amount that I'm hearing I believe was relate today program implementation of the 117,000 that we served from 2002 to 2008 and it costs March more now. Is that -- is that the question.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Partly that. It's also the question of apple to apples.

SPEAKER: Right.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Apples to apples. Apples to apples.

SPEAKER: So the reason.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: So the math was beginning to.

SPEAKER: The math is always the problem.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Fuzzy than I would have hoped or expected.

SPEAKER: Well, I would agree or I would like to make it less fuzzy. And we have accounting people.
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Board to do this level of
drill down so that you have to justify. It would seem to
me.

SPEAKER: I think it's important.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Pardon me if you don't mind.
Some of these questions are pretty basic and fundamental.
That's essentially what I'm attempting to make clear. And
so madam executive director, the response that should be
afforded the Board or the Commission is not from the
similar in my view. It is from the staff who recommends
it and therefore we hold the staff accountable. The staff
holds the similar intelligent agencies act.

MS. BELSHE: Absolutely.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: I have spent a considerable
amount of time on this height and I feel you have done
your best to aid us in your our of distress.

SPEAKER: I'm here for you any hour. You know
how to reach me.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much.

SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Members of the Commission
what is your pleasure?

MR. FIELDING: When was this first approved? Was
it like two years ago because it seems like it's been
going on for a long time. And I'm glad we're getting to a
point where we can feel more comfortable I think one of
the wonderful things here there's two wonderful things I
pediatrician Neil does poor disadvantaged socially
disadvantaged education WIC program. So building on this
platform is I'm very convinced right thing.

And the second is this is the first instance that
I remember all the time that I've been on the Commission
where we've funded a program small program fully evaluated
we found it worked and we're now if I a position to say
okay. We're going to go do this on a broader scale so I'm
very supportive.

I understand your questions. My own preference
would be to approve it. And to say but it has to come
back with the criteria the overlap issue with the dollars
you know. Great clarity answer those questions but at
least give them that feeling of partnership.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: I consider that to be a
motion, is it not Commissioner Fielding.

MR. FIELDING: Yes.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Second?

Seconded. Commissioner Figueroa-Villa is she
mentioned that there was no conversation about Best Start
communities, did I understand that right. And the I guess
my maybe if there wasn't that maybe the next time it come
that's that would be part of the -- part of the motion and
the conversation.

MR. WAGNER: If I could answer that. Would I --
what I heard her say is that the action before you today
would authorize us to establish a strategic partnership
once we 1) µ1 staff can be begin to work with PMFE WIC and
they can begin to talk about scope of work you know.
Including deliverables and things like those kinds of
conversations with can start and we can bring those back
and highlight those when we come back with a final.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: This is a conceptual approval
of the question that's- V been raised staff will interpret
as needing to be respond specifically to those questions
and at our next Board meeting trust that we can seek
clarity on all these questions and move toward a more
definitive I am brace of the programs the program but the
question that's do to be clarified.

Is that reasonable? All right of there's are not
been a motion by Commissioner Fielding and seconded by
multiple members of Commission.

Commissioner Au yield not to temptation.

MS. AU: I just need Dr. Fielding to restate his
motion, please, so I have clarity.

MR. FIELDING: I was suggesting that we approve
this strategic partnership but final approval of the
individual contract come back to the Board answering the
important questions that the Chair and Sandra have raised.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.

MS. AU: And others.

MR. FIELDING: Yes, others every question that's been raised by anybody.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Those questions that are anticipated. Yes. All right. Any more questions or comments on item nine B. All right. It has been moved and seconded. Are there any objection or abstentions on the matter as it comes before United States. All right. We proceed with the full consent of the Board and we will move on to nine C. Thank you.

MR. WAGNER: The third and final strategic partnership in your packet is in fact a new strategic partnership proposal and that is with the LA trust for children's health. This is -- this would enable First 5 L as to tap into the resources and establish network of LA U.S. D's well fitness center or school based ness center we think this is an exciting new proposal we would be enhancing six LAUSD we sites to better meet the needs of families with kids zero to five. So I'll turn it over to to provide a little bit more.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Jessica? The floor is yours.

MS. KACZMAREK: Good afternoon, Commissioners.
To share with you information pertaining to the proposed strategic partnership with the LA trust for children's health.

Staff recommend that's the Commission approve the establishment of this strategic partnership to implement and oversee the development of early childhood pilot program in six of the 14 LAUSD wellness centers. This will be a three-year democrat project for a total budget not to exceed $2.9 million. Now as was presented by the chief operating officer, this strategic partnership opportunity was vetted against the Commission's policy on strategic partnerships. Staff determined that this opportunity met two of the four criteria as shown here as well as being in alignment with our strategic plan.

We would like to provide you with a brief overview of the context around investment opportunity and how it came to our opportunity. Wellness centers through conversations with LAUSD and when they shared with us the goals of their new infrastructure that they were supporting with bond funds the purpose of these newly constructed and renovated clinics known as wellness centers, population-based focus to providing medical, and offer healthcare to underserved communities.

The wellness centers promote prevention and the corresponded nation of services as discussed and promoted
in the affordable care act as well. Although LAUSD a broad strategy foreign gauge with the communities surrounding the wellness centers they do not have at this time a strategy for intentionally targeting families with young children and this presented an opportunity for First 5 LA.

By developing the early child linkage to wellness project community based infra structure that been built and expand the reach of the wellness centers to our target population continue um of care for families to access the wellness center services and par with the LAUSD school district where many of the children matriculating. Finally, many of these communities served by the wellness center as line with our Best Start communities and they're -- they surround investment that's we've made in areas such as oral health. This presents an opportunity for us to insure that for families learn about First 5 LAs work and they are connect today those service that's First 5 LA has in misdemeanor of these communities. At this point I'd like to turn the presentation over to my colleague Monday who will provide you with more information about the goals of project.

MS. BENITEZ-ANDRADE: Thank you Jessica.

Good afternoon, Commissioners. The goal of this project is that children are raised from zero and one of
the thing that's this project will do is measure a set of intermediary outcomes that are shown on the slide. And the proposed three year Jessica mentioned $2.9 million the slide that you have before you really breaks down where those dollars go.

And I'd like to spend a little bit of time briefly talking about the main components of project itself. There are five components and the first really has to do with oversight and administration provided by the LA trust.

A second component has to do with the creation of early child link an to wellness teams. Three teems put together fade up of a facilitator and navigate and these together will serve adds ambassadors to communities between the communities to the wellness centers. The base I go of the navigator to be conduct outreach insuring that family s are connect today commune based resource s but also to First 5 LA investments such as oral health and nutrition pack and our Best Start efforts. The facilitators certified personnel such as nurse or social workers.

That have the capacity to really refer families to developmental assessments as need and had when appropriate but also they will be anal to really broker relationships between the large assist that is LAUSD as
well as the health care system itself. Overseeing all of
the teams. A third component has to do with creating baby
friendly spaces.

The centers are really designed 14 and this
project would purchase equipment that would make the
spaces comfortable for a families by including preschool
furniture, having developmentally reading materials in the
waiting room. Baby scales as wells references for
families.

A fourth component has to do with learning and
evaluation. I'm sorry the fourth com has to did with
training through this pro we hope to really lay provide
teed at the ices but also to the wellness center staff.
So in addition to really learning how to dole and how to
care for young children we want to make sure that they're
also train today be able to communicate to families and
developing child.

Then there's a evaluation and learning the LA
trust will be putting learning sessions where across the
center sights and to these early childhood linkage team $\$
y they will discuss best practices that they're able to
really talk about the best grate engagement family that's
and the evaluation contribute to this larger discussion
policy discussion about the roll that school based health
centers flay in providing care.
Now, I would like to direct your attention to this map the selected six sights are here by pink dots the multi colored areas are the Best Start communities. So as you can see there's nice spread and you can see where these we Wellness center in relation to the Best Start communities the selected sights are Belmont high school. Jefferson high school.

Elizabeth learning center Washington prep lock early education center and in the south Carson high school. As you can see three of these sights are in the Best Start communities of southeast LA west agent s and broad way man Chester.

These sights were chosen because they are fully operational and ready to integrate the early childhood wellness project. Certified population and I die verse range of capacity for meeting the needs of young children for example the Belmont has a very row bust that can serve as I best practices model in the addressing the needs of young children.

This next slide summarizes the various public and private investment that's have been made across 14 of LAUSD's well centers in total of have already been spent on building this infra struck. The development proposed today would really go towards extend that go reach of the wellness centers to include our zero to five population
for three years. With the information collected over these three years, LAUSD will determine the future scale and sustain ability including whether this pro is correct today other there are sustain ability but the strategy most important to us are the one that's front and center. We expect that LAUSD will consider local education agency funds Medi-Cal administrative activities fund, various levels of policy add si for funding and grants through the LA trust.

Commissioners once again, thank you for this opportunity to bring this recommendation for your consideration to enter into a strategic partnership with the LA trust. With your approval staff will begin contract negotiation s with for a projected start date before I open it up to questions I would like to just take a little bit of time that Mary help us answer any questions you may have.

Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you very much. Members of Commission. Questions or comments to the staff on this item. Commissioner Browning followed by Commissioner Dennis.

MR. BROWNING: I may have missed this but how many children are estimated to have been served.

MS. KACZMAREK: Clinic that's are running ness
center's they estimate about 120 clients per week they'll be able to serve ten percent of those would be children. And we extrapolated that out to a three year total across all the six ices to be about 9,000 children.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Okay. Is that right. I guess it ten continue is it sounds a little high. But maybe that's correct.

MS. KACZMAREK: 5,000 per year.

MR. BROWNING: Those are different people and ten percent of those would be children zero to five. 500 children per year per clinic.

MR. BROWNING: Okay.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: We good all right. Thank you. You sure now. Commissioner.

MR. BROWNING: I'll get my calculator. Get big one the one with big digits on.

MR. DENNIS: The clinic model requires obviously that parents must take children and bring them to the clinics. Within their infra structure they're making a nexus between health -- and well and early childhood education is there any opportunity to look at some of mobile sights so that we could take the sight to like head start centers out of LA UP centers and perhaps other child care centers see this infra structure require that's the parent and the child to come to the clinic. Can the
clinic come to the child and is that a part of the
thinking.

MS. KACZMAREK: Well, I think first and foremost
the factors and and a half will be out in the community
and building those relationship with members and yes.
Encouraging them to come into the actual sight which is on
a school cam.

However, there is the broader network of -- of
wellness. The other feeder school that's support the --
the high school where the actual clinic is at where you
know the -- there can be service that's will be provide
and outreach will be done to families in those other
feeder schools. I think Kim or Mary if you could talk
about how -- if there si mobile component to the wellness
centers and what the --

SPEAKER: Good afternoon. I'm Kim Wade I
actually am in charge of medical services in LAUSD. I'm
also an ad hoc Board member of the LA trust.

In response it your question about mobile service
$ I think you are hitting upon a an actual new area for
health care there are a lot of thing that's get paid for
by Medi-Cal in a four wall clinic and then there are also
opportunities that can be blown wide open with health care
re in terms of kind of services screenings and particular
and hopefully opportunities for more wellness like
activities including health promotion and health education that don't have to happen in the four walls of the traditional school health clinic and so I think awful these concepts are of our wellness initiative trying to get prevention health promotion and the types of health primary health care that might not need to happen in a clinic per se.

Happening in our and we couch it all as wellness services.

SPEAKER: And I just want to say too that thank you for the question about the concept of this model of a full service community clinic object on eye school bring the clinic to the family in the communities to a place where they come every day any which. So you know we're talking about the community of family that's live right around that school who would have easier because as I result of this wellness center.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Additional questions or comments at this point. All right. I'm sorry. Superintendent Delgado followed by Commissioner Au.

MR. DELGADO: I just learned that the youth policy institute was selected to get a promise prom initiative grant. Will these be touched by any of moneys that will be coming in for That.
MS. KACZMAREK: Well, the sites that have been selected are not in that geographic air at this point in time. However, you know, I think what we're really trying to learn here from this democrat project is how school based health centers and comprehensive view towards wellness can be taken to other sites. And so as we learn the that this has on children's zero to five and the benefits it can provide we would take that information and share it with our partners and there are -- and there's another school that is you know in that geographic area that's supported by LAUSD that maybe something that would be extended inform them.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Commissioner.

MS. AU: If you could, show the slide that shows all the various funders of this. Because I -- one of the questions that I had I initially was how could 2.9 -- less than $3,000,000 from First 5 LA really create and provide this level of service for all these children and so this pretty much answers my question. Because re really talking about our portion of our investment is really to address children's zero to five.

Whereas this funding picture is much more real list tick to me because you're creating onsite clinics on these various campuses. So and I think that folks that are invested in this project are at this remarkable people
-- I mean organizations to do this sort of thing in partnership as W. So similar to the WIC thanks around the WIC viewing them as -- as primo strategic partner in terms of furthering our goals and objectives I think LAUSD and the -- the trust people I forget their names we wellness people may be a good partner as well. So I thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Attention has been called to the fact that there are a significant investment made by a range of stakeholders which is a good thing. Conspicuous absent of county investments in terms of those resources with public partnership dollars as well as mental health dollars this is a really important undertaking where we talk about school-based health centers they are smart. They are efficient. They meeting the need of a population that would otherwise not be as effectively serviced.

That is middle school and high school populations of these school health centers and hats Oh off to First 5 for that is for focusing on zero to five this is a new piece of business and an important piece to that. And. Four or months and.

Five such clinics and a six month will be coming Monday. These are good things for our respective communities so I want to acknowledge how important this work is and I'm pleased that it's moving beyond the
Commissioner Kaufman

MR. KAUFMAN: I agree with what the supervisor said. I'm very excited about this. I mean it make as I rot of sense. I have one philosophical and political question. We have hundred dollars funded program that's relate to other organizations like LAUSD and LACO and others and negotiate memorandum understanding with the school district Los Angeles trust for children's health is an intermediary. Wonderful organization but they don't have the ability to commit to sustaining and to integrating and going stale.

You're not supposed to, but LAUSD does so in the throws or thinking about how this become scalable and sustainable that's going to be with LAUSD maybe with other school districts if they come to us also. It is there an opportunity to specific M U O U that describes because we're giving you some money and going to be doing certain things and we're going to be doing certain things.

MS. KACZMAREK: So we have gotten letters of support from LAUSD and we have been met with the representatives from their Board to discuss a resolution and then the is going to be key to their decisions about sustaining and scale ability but they are definitely very
interested in work with us closely to see how they can use funds such as the local administration dollars and even fending from the prop 30 that got pass today how this can be sustained and scaled.

MR. KAUFMAN: All of those are promise and appropriate. We have had -- and I wouldn't call it a bad experience but we have not codified some of these understanding in writing that both organizations have signed so we can hold each other accountable for what's going on.

I think that other school construction activities that we have funded so I would suggest that within the motion there is a specific target and I'll leave it all to you as to whether that should happen three months or a year but that very specific deliver rabbles holding accountable both us and the school district around kind of thing that's we're doing because otherwise I fear that that won't work quite as well.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: This is a reasonable suggestion. It patterns the motion that was a deposit bid the Board of supervisors to do precisely what you're talking about, Commissioner Kaufman, another example of that apparently in the county for such a motion or a memorandum of understanding or struck so let that be a part of the instructions to staff to pursue that as well.
Are there any other questions or comments at this point Commissioner Fielding.

MR. FIELDING: Real quick I assume that this is going through a nonprofit so you don't have to deal with the contracts that rifles are owned in the county. It's a real competition but I'm glad you're exempt for it.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: There is no contracts that rivals that of the LAUSD Commissioner Fielding. Nine quick question. The money is to the clinics versus funding the services within the clinics is that right.

MS. KACZMAREK: The money will actually be shared across these five components so a portion of the funds will go to the LA trust for oversight and they are our primary partner to insure implementation and the majority of the funds will actually be subcontracted to LAUSD who will be hiring to go out and do the outreach and the navigation for families.

MR. DELGADO: Thank you.

MS. CURRY. Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Any other question or comments at this point. Members of Commission the item is before us that would be nine C. What is your pleasure.

MS. AU: Move to approve as amended.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Is there a second second
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Any other comments objections any abstentions seeing none please report a unanimous vote and it's invention the honorable one. Can you relieve you of your pain and suffering at this point.

MR. WAGNER: In the sake of, thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: God bless you. Let us then proceed to the balance of the agenda with the appreciation for the staff and it's work on those three items. Items nine A, B and C.

MS. BELSHE: As requested, overview of the First 5 LAs investment in autism and developmental disabilities. And are you addeded for a new point six grants of no less an 300,000 over a three year period there is that allows for flexibility and allows responsibility and to propose how they would meet the four previously approved First 5 LA goals of this grant. First 5 should be report back to the Board of commissioner on implementation at the November 14 meeting of the Commission.

Staff to report back at the June 13 meeting on options for contention funding of the 211 screening and care nation project. Report back should include an analysis of sustainable options, opportunities to improve to services options and coordinate with the above mentioned autism and anticipated program outcomes.
This is in pursuit of supporting September 2011 motion that indeed by Dr. Yancey follow up that the Commission in it's totality I am embraced this item. Pursuant to a presentation trust summary fashion.

Proceed ma'am.

MS. BELSHE: Let me underscore Chairs of mindfulness of time, and interests in moving forward I do want you to encourage to hit the high points full explanation that you were prepared to give.

MS. IIDIA: Well, commissioners and supervisors, our presentation actually covers five years and, as listed here first I'd like to just give you an overview of the investment that's we have to date. Approximately.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Take full advantage of the mike ma'am. Other people doing other things that were there.

MS. IIDIA: Thank you. And our convince. Have been in the general areas of early identification intervention as well as capacity building and policy adds more details of our convince investment are attachment A.

Here list some of our lesson that's we have learned from investment our most salient lessons engaging parents and providers relate to what parents need first education and support to make sure that they become more
knowledgeable about healthy child development the signs and symptoms of delay and the value of developmental screening and early intervention.

Parents also need call competent staff who can present appropriate and in their primary language. Moreover, Simply referring them to various agencies not sufficient and fine left lane in terms of providers we learned that subject training and on all screening and early intervention raises your capacity as as well as also insure that go developmental screenings will be done alternate regularly recommended age intervals.

Next, to help the Commission I just want today review how the had decided to focus on autism investment which is the last item on this slide here staff had convened the autism ad hoc committee on July 29th of 2011. This was following the boards request at the June 9ths 111 Commission meeting.

The list here represents the top priorities identified by the committee as the most pressing issues faced by families with young children with autism in LA county.

Staff reported the above to the Board at the September 8th, 2011, Commission meeting and it was at this meeting that the Board selected barriers to early identification.

The barriers identified by the committee focused
primarily on the limitations provided by the providers such as their lacking training and screening to developmental issue early.

Not conducting the screenings on a routine basis at risk stages of a child's developing reluctant to screen because identified children for services. I should also note that the commissioners added referrals to early intervention services and their final approval at the September meeting to insure that any child identified as having possible delays will be link today appropriate services.

There are other barriers, however associated with early identification and intervention. These showing here have created disparities among children who have or have not been able to be screened or diagnosed or received. For example, white children have been found to be diagnosed earlier than African-American children on an average almost two years earl .

African-American children on the other hand have been found more likely to receive diagnoses of global or conduct disorders before being diagnosed with autism spectrum disorders also barriers cultural stigma with having a child with autism and I lack of parental awareness to seek for instance raise concerns discuss the questions or learn from providers about how their child
should be growing and developing.

And I know physical disparities in public funding have made it difficult for some children and families. In 2011, the California of developmental services spent almost twice as much on serving white children or African-American children.

So where are we now in terms of our current allocation at proved allocation is presented here this allocation represents the late Commissioner Yancey's motion which was approved by the Board at the June 9, 2011, Commission meeting her primary interest in intervention and her vision to support relatively small community based organizations serving and who will list California under served families.

Thus the overall intent of this investment to support the development of a pilot project to be diverse under served communities. And including culturally competent partners each communities three areas noted above. They also represent the key lessons learned from related investments as well as the key issues ad hoc commit hence now staff has included all of the above to draft of the R P which has been pending discussion and direction from the Board.

The next two slides are I think the motion that's the supervisor has just introduced.
Would you like me to go over these?

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: If the commissioners deem it appropriate, I don't know if I think necessarily think the thrust has already been read in as a matter of record and is there any need for further explanation.

Is everybody reasonably comfortable?

Commissioner Browning.

MR. BROWNING: I am. Has that motion been approved.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: No. It's been moved and has been seconded. Thank you very much. Were there any additional comments you want to make before the Board disposes of the item.

MS. IIDA: No. I think you also next month we'll come back to fundings for possibly continuing 211 and recommendation to augment the existing allocation for the autism R F P.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: That's all in the motion that I read. All right. Is everyone clear commissioner Dennis.

MR. DENNIS: Supervisor you suggested that in your motion that it reads autism and perhaps it could be autism and other specially means because that would be a lot more inclusive and that would give you know provide us to not only deal with the autism spectrum but other special needs as well.
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: I think that's a reasonable intervention I don't know that this in anyway dilutes the matter is in a generic sense I think the motion of the spectrum refers to autism or other sorts of neural developmental disorders. And so to the extent that it can be understood that they would have I broad application I think commissioner Dennis is suggestion is accepted as a amendment Commissioner Kaufman.

MR. KAUFMAN: So I want to speak in favor of the two elements of the motion and then really talk about a third part which I think does round it out. The first is to increase allocation makes sense to me.

The second is to understand how 211 is a cognitive approach to using telephone based screening.

I think that we have to step back in addition to those two and that identifying ways to screen children who are close to 18 months, less than 24 months is really not what they need they need screening re and screening general nonspecific and that's why it's standing the motion but the real capacity that we need it build is actually not at WIC where we do the screening but it's really within the developmental specialist.

I can't and we've worked on that over the years in a number of different ways to try to improve the quality and we do a terrible job screening children.
We don't use the instruments that we know are effective. We're not screening them appropriately. We're not being appropriate as far as it's a problem that's been known for 20 years getting better part of this motion but part of the initiative part of what we want to think with it really to figure out do we have an additional health care delivery to increase the capacity of those effected by the screening for developmental problems autism spectrum disorder and make appropriate referrals because that's what we've been doing in the past.

Programs we should be explore that go in addition to whether included in the motion for today.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you very much Commissioner Kaufman. Is there any moving forward at this point 11 will not just a comment. Just taking my cue from Commissioner Kaufman. We had invested in another coalition or a round autism and I'm trying to remember if that's.

MS. BOSCH: Yancey.

MS. AU: Yancey. Where the focus was on providing training for I can't to do the more focused assessment and evaluation of children that may be suffering from autism spectrum disorder. So I'm not sure where he had is at at the moment because they sunsetted so if they're still in existence.
I think we need to capitalize on their tour so we can pull the two together so we -- we address the issue that Dr. Kaufman raised.

MS. IIDA: First in terms of early intervention services that is part of the Commissioner Yancey's entire concept of this investment. So it's not just bringing children for possible delay buzz then making sure once screened that they would be refer today various services so that referral piece is included and certainly we would always capitalize on our past he had si is one of them.

We cited other investments and that's in your Board packet such as the special needs 211. And many other smaller grants that we have extended through or granted rather through the opportunities funds so taking all that. That's how we built the concept of this investment to date.

MS. AU: Excellent.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Tell excellent. Thank you very much. The item is before us as properly amended. If there are no objections we it will be reflected a unanimous vote with the appreciation from the staff for it's work. We are now at 4:30. Which is our scheduled time to be adjourned.

We have a few more important items to address we
ask that you hang in with us to try to do it within a half
hours time. But the objective here is now to give
appropriate acknowledgment and proper attention to what to
do and for members of Commission who need to respect
their the instructions of the we're going to have a quick
break here and Carla.

(Brief recess.)

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Don't tell Dr. Yancey, but I
had to go out and get a paramedic for Commissioner dennis.
Now. Left you question my commitment anybody else got a
demeanor with 7,100 step on it today?

MR. KAUFMAN: I got 2822.

THE COURT: I'm not talking about cumulatively.
I'm talking about today.

MS. BELSHE: Mr. Chairman, and members if we can
move to agenda item 11 and as we know few I think county
Commission that's has explicitly and making and child
acknowledge if we really want to we serve engage not
guilty public policy and add and so consistent with board
commitment we have retained services of a strategic
legislative partner.

And John on landscape overview of what is some initial
learning and observations about opportunities and two of
our priority airs home visitation. John bent.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Now, John this will not be
your last opportunity.

MR. BENTON: Thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: And there is a way to insure use your imagination. Proceed there.

MR. BENTON: Thank you Mr. Chair. On behalf of California strategy colleague Steven over here who's in your Los Angeles office I won't go you California in it's the packets in of you who we are and also on the Web site get a sense of other partners up and down the state.

I wanted to start with this slide the initial scope of work. This is what we've talked to Kim and staff about doing is the immediate future here. On sustain ability we're talk look agriculture the long term public funding for the a number of the funded programs and particular we're lacking at two hour childhood education and the second is home visitation we're going down the chart there the public policy issues this is the 4,000 bill that's introduced every year in Sacramento we try which ones may impact your programs and work with staff on those.

We want to have First 5 LA be a trusted and leading voice in Sacramento so we'll work with Kim and on that messaging up in Sacramento and work with your first type of county Commission mothers and other stake holders up in Sacramento ask and lastly defending against raids on
prop ten funding.
Brief political overview I'll cut to the chase on this.
   Everyone probably reads a lot of Governor Brown. One is his fiscally conservative quantum
is one of his points that he pulls out that basically
mean take only what you need and that is an item as you
look through the et through programs bills and signs or
vetoes are we doing too much or do we really not need what
we're doing it here.

So in essence the passing down stream to so they
are a better ability to do to deal with issues I want to
mention relative to the budget there's a lost lately that
impact program that's are important to First 5 LA the
governor rebench of of those program that's so.
Proper levels and I don't need inform go back to prior
levels.

In terms of other early childhood education
for million $ in cuts he has not included this all the
alternate you will 3039 or in the may revise despite you
will calls legislate tour. Terms of California tour.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Let me intervene right there.
He obviously is a ban did noting his training. He is not
focused on early childhood education Ridley-Thomas has
said that the bible says a child will lead them. I
introduced a motion here to support the Weber resolution
that he will be faced with that and he ought to do the
right thing. And don't let down saint I go in.

MR. BENTON: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: And that comes from a property instant. Thank you.

MR. BENTON: The 40 new members in the is . They're hear until 2024 which allow uses to us is no building al lies within that 40 member caucus.

The Senate has become much more progressive and in terms of interest? Early childhood education there's several bills that we're tracking the Webers resolution that the chairman mentioned I think we're going to participate in that on Monday on the capital steps it's on our list high up there. Home vision unfortunate a has not been anyway goal is to take sure it becomes that. In terms of budget I'll read through the side the most important thing that's in the budget for the governor formula it might turn out to be one of the most important thing s for us strategicaly.

But in essence it switches school districts and allows them to move forward where they're needed and had also increases fund for the those districts that have high percentage of English learnings low income families and also foster youth and so?

Potential possibilities there. There's also as I mentioned earlier in the mayor resize funding child
education program.

The legislative annals office is has recommended 172 million for school that was not included in the governor's may revise this is a quote that I might interest you this is directly from the governor may revise you could tack early childhood education and it would be applicable and I think as we move forward this is something that we can rely on it in terms of the motivations of what he wants to do with local control funding.

It applies to our programs as well. This formula starts with the baying strand based on the number of learners. You may be able to learn as up then I concentration grant over 50 percent of those populations. In terms of our issues down here T raises the question if LAUSD and other local school districts receive a block grant what is the opportunity for First 5 and LA and our your work early childhood education home visitation and some of those plans.
Is obviously there's a committee meeting last week or yesterday actually on this is the reply. Riverside chief operations officer specifically mentioned that he would like the ibility in this plan to be able to ply learning to three and four year olds in preschool because their
attachment needed not in kindergarten and first grade.

First 5 LA priorities we're lacking at these two areas.

In terms of the everyone up in legislate tour at least has an early child I think good education that will year even though we have some legislates that's pending there's really nothing that's going to really be dramatic.

It's kind of plowing the field. 2014. Where you develop kind of a shovel ready for shovel ready early childhood education framework in anticipation of the foreman moneys.

In terms of home vision unfortunate late it is not part of the discussion we need to make it part of the discussion up at the department of public health that only has 500 families 3492 vision its as of January 13. The First 5 had stepped in and are doing much more significant work in home visitation in the counsel did Is. Fund amount is how you convince public pairs and pairs that this is an important benefit for children. And I think that's our goal some observations moving forward I think that policy makers are generally uninformed about what you do down here and the program that's you support and part of our goal is to really educate them on that. Certainly with the new class we have up there we're able to do that. There's a real per of up there.

Staff and consultants and members that proposition ten was past shifted almost the entire responsibility over to the
First 5s for early childhood issues and I think that's something that we have to cure the state still has responsibility for these programs and I think that's something important for us to talk about.

There are a whole slew of early childhood education groups up in Sacramento. They are do a wonderful job but they've been playing defense for all these years and we all have been coordinated and focused and there's other 12 have not been engaged in Sacramento on our issues and I think that they are important we need to get them engaged also so to don't traditionally get in here. The Silicon Valley leadership there's other group that's benefited from what you do down here and they need to know how they bing fit from that and are willing to articulate that to the legislate tours and the governor.

Again the governor is very skeptical. And cost effectiveness of these programs in terms of these opportunities education has a higher likelihood of success largely declaration in this air home visitation will have some significant ground to do on that. We think it's a great issue for us to work on. We look forward to it. It's a much tough pull in terms of local flexibility there's a real opportunity as in the local control funding formula. To be able to work with your local education groups down here on developing part of the plan.
that includes early child add education and certainly I think we can leverage the govern nors quote to apply that to our policewomans. And then moving forward next steps we're continue it own L-3 process listening learning and leading up in sack we've been doing that here. Down in Los Angeles. We're going to work with First 5 LA staff to identify bills this year that we might have a say in woman Shirley webers bill and then we're going to come back in June a little bit more of a strategic plan so we can show you some vision path way moving forward.

Mr. Chairman.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much for that comprehensive yet suck si presentation you can come back any time you wish. It's quite all right. Members of the Commission you've heard an initial report it is the intent of the executive director to schedule these at if not an a monthly basis every other no so that we can stay on of the legislative agenda that advances the work of First 5. I think it is insight and insight that we ought to lay claim to. It's time to move from being on the defensive and advance an agenda that's innovative construction type of that is forward looking on behalf of the population that we are Commissioned to both represent and serve. Toward that end, I think it should be noted that we have already been doing sew that is First 5 in collaboration with lay
and in terms of LA E CE works project they've been
working very hard on this agenda I think commissioner
Dennis participated in some activity inSacramento recently. There's been a convening of
legislative body dealing with the subject by the Chair of
the legislative black us on communication has come to the
Chair's office advocating support for the Weber resolution
so we are already in the game and I do not think it's
irrelevant that First 5 and lay copartnership and the
partnership members and related individuals CE works
have begun to lay the ground work or is to as it were so
that we can build on that and do the kind of work that we
knows important. The University of California calendar
Los Angeles has been a partner in this pursuit with their
an actual conferences so this is moving beyond the
confines of those who are the atraditional stake holder
advocates on the early child education fund but move it
into the context of what it means to have I strong
capitol.
Start agriculture the zero to to five and going on. Is to
there's a lot already being done a lost good work that has
been done and the invitation to assembly member Weber to
step forward is directly attributable to the partnership
work of lay and First 5 and E CE works to a lot again is
happen not guilty capitol partners capitol strategies to
come into the discussion to in that work broader level but
specially in a specific way as well. So this is a good
report I sub the motion to you for you so that it can
be memorialized and communicated on behalf of the Oh Board
and the activity that's take place in Sacramento. The
topic we comment are what is your pleasure is there a
motion to adopt the resolution that's before us. Going
once I'm sold evelyn woods you remember here don't you.
I felt every course I could in Evelyn wood.

MS. BELSHE: While members are readying want to
underscore a couple of that John from strategies has listed
Number 1 we have some opportunities but also some work
to do so one of our recommendations is that we inform by
this conversation. That California strategies it
adds learning to engage first of program in and planning
committee on a more detailised set of ideas that we would
maltly bring from the Board in June specifically focused
on the two areas are either vested today or increasingly
will be invested going forward and that's our early hood
education important I object vests in children and so ing
with California strategies we'll first and program a
planning committee at end of the month and then come back
in June.
Building on your about. Chamber Dell and Evelyn Berg who works with commissioner Dell, and myself the early childhood education team and it was a terrific example of of johance about partnership. And lay coand First 5 LA are strong Los Angeles standing paper partners with the business community which increasingly here in early years particularly quality early

PROSPECTIVE JUROR NO. 3: School is not just a nice thing to do but really is a business imperative that's prepared to be successful in the 21st century economy so as we think about key audiences we need to be thinking more broad by. I think the issue before you relative to this specific resolution is one that is very well aligned with our big picture senseibilitys and to the economic implications of early child education in anticipation.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS:

MR. STEELE: Can I just suggest that as part of the information on the meeting that you add this item to your agenda specifically because there is an up calming hereing as a need to take.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Excellent?

A You've heard the recommendation from counsel in to establishing this as I part of the agenda in light of the impending action in Sacramento on Monday. What is
your readiness in that regard on the process of adding this to the agenda. There any recommendations hearing no objection let's then go to the subject of the er is there a motion regarding a second to the motion regarding the resolution 45 weber? It's been seconded. Any discussion seeing no discussion we will then record a knew unanimous muss vote of the First 5 Commission with respect to the support of AC R 45. Thank you very much. And the appreciate the presentation capital strategies and we look forward toex peck tiff director.

MS. BELSHE: Thank you Mr. Chair members and thank you john again and we will look forward to inviting ow down regularly as we do some glad to have you you as a partner. And thank you very much.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Don't forget to that message to he had G. Brown, Junior. A K A Jerry brown.

MS. BELSHE: We will be can you coming back other messages to a radio variety of important decision makes and audiences but I think you state that had very well. Stayy lee is going to be provide a quick overview of the suggested criteria that we are here to get the boards feedback on to guide the development of legislative general knew to the Board but we consideration to what kind much wait weight we should apply to the find the right spot in terms ing direction to the Board to
narrowing of the hundreds of bill or thousands of bills focus on more fully as well as thousand work on a consistent basis with the Board as the always fluid legislative process unfolds stay si.

MS. LEE: Thank you Kim just most of the presentation so I'll just go in smaller chunks.

MS. BELSHE: Then that will stand me well this the Chair. Please.

MS. LEE: Commissioners we also like to wonderful commitment they made in the pub policy clay as one of the strategically s within the plan. Today we're just giving you an overview of our legislative advocate si share which get some back from you on our criteria? Access for the legislative agenda. We will looking at the add work in three buckets there ask the traditional policy agenda focused state level that align with the policy ageneral we're looking at agency focused policy that's affect First 5 LA directly such as tobacco tax legislate to proposition $10 the third et is sustain action focuses on our major investments particular reply? The childhood and home visitation. Our legislative work will be focused in these component areas with will be talking mostly about the legislative agenda component today at the program and planning committee meeting and the at the June meeting strategy.
At California's bill that's we cull down to a list of a few money and from there we aim to bring it down to about ten to 30 bills support more actively. We use criteria that I will talk about more closely to where the in a few slides and we also look at budget which is introduced in January and revised just this week in May to see how it a our priority areas and investments. Should an issue land on our legislative agenda. A video right. Support from our agency ranging from leadership involvement as the chairman mentioned our commissioner Dennis was supportive of an activity E CE works project as well as several other commissioners over the years and we look forward to continue to using your leadership to engage in activities from advice with policymakers provideing testimony promoting issue awareness and through our Monday morning reports and active coalition as well as official letters of support.

There are six areas on our tier yacht bottom five were created during the strategy plan to and we've added the first area here which we call alien mien. Should align with your policy agenda and our investments impact we look at reach and the value of the bills in terms of how the it will a children to five. Add we look at what different might make ability we look alternate some challengings to the bill does it have some issues with the structure or
other thing that's might cause it to be I am plausible in terms of pass or implementation we look at timely is there some increases opportunity due to a window or deadline and Tuesday does it-v prevention approach. From higher for the item on the top and lower on the bottom just in terms of importance of the agency to help us figure out which policies we should be supporting.

We've developed this recommended process that the Commission would approve the criteria that the staff would then apply to cry core tier I can't with consultant feedback. We would work to support those bills and issues on the legislative agenda. And then we would provide regular noly updates to the Commission. There's many considerations in terms of insuring that First 5 LA is I policy player and able to take full advantage of our leadership and resources with our consultants. We must keep in mind that we must be flex that bill amendments are constantly changing the nature of bills so while some bills may initially look unfavorable change them them with the support of our consultants to provide more benefit tower areas of which is the next point as well.

And also we're considering things like the at certain times it be behind the scenes roll and other times it will be more important for us to play a very adviceible up front roll in the political considerations to take into
consideration. Real late today the nature of our agency being a public agents and along the way. Next steps as I mentioned will be at the May program and planning committee to further discuss this criteria. As well as some option late today our sustain ability plan in terms of our add si work. In June we expect to present to the Commission and in July we expect to talk about additional resource that's might be need today support that strategy. I'd welcome any questions all right. Any questions? For our parenthesis on this item?

Continuation of the further the earlier conversation Mr. Bent set of broader set of circumstance legislative work and policy work. We thank you four your presentation. Madam executive director. It is yours to.

   MS. BELSHE: Mine to be brief.

   MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: No it's yours to give the final decision.

   MS. BELSHE: I want today share with the Board I just passed out an overview of the draft state legislative agenda that reflects the application of the criteria that stayy just I didn't thinkly walked through so we'll have an opportunity at our income tax meeting to talk more fully. Criteria. The and the product of that. Certainly as we eye counsel and director of the Board feet back on the result s do the gore as all the of those cry tier why.
And the expectation on a monthly basis would we would be providing duplicate priority areas as well presentations by California strategies we have and will continue to look for ways tone gauge members of Board directly in the hearing last -- last week and certainly we have an opportunity to with our and vice Chair on time sensitive legislative issues call out some of the opportunities where we see Board engagement being most helpful and con struck type of. And look forward to the follow up discussion on your next Board meeting.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you.
MS. BELSHE: Final item.
MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Somebody said music to my ears.
MS. KELLY: Good afternoon Mr. Chair and commissioners annual update regarding the LAUP contract renewal. Each year LAUP and First 5 LA staff negotiate revisions to the performance matrix and the an actual budget I'll be discussing these as well as provide the Commission with alternative budget propose the al s for consideration. Please note that this item will return action item. This year six revisions to the come targets have been identified. You may find a full performance matrix as attachment it the LA memo. Fiscal year 1314 are
identified in bold. I'll just very quickly go through the proposed revisions under outcome one we've add a milestone to assess the ability for better tracking teacher retention rates and our outcome three a couple of additional milestones one adding a social emotional growth target.

Our external evaluation the universal preschool outcome study has consistently ed in this our added to the performance matrix in recognition that it's the compi nation. Emotional growth that are kit calendar to school readiness. The second addition to come three is this will be our first year including targets around the classroom assessment ing system or class assessment. Which measures teacher child interaction. Under outcome 52 milestones been added to insure ongoing collaboration with First 5 LA and research and evaluations staff with LAUP and our contract math mat to work goals to establish a to access the long term out comes LAUP programs changes to cut comes six and seven ongoing conversation lap sustain ability.

Given the close of the LAUP contract approaching in 20 have been actively collaborating on prayer legal track. First 5, LAUP policy efforts recognizes that public is critical to extent preschool. Track two to address what LAUP would be should public funding not be ful. And support the development of alternate business models.
Therefore letter track milestone has been out added to Oh outcome six for LAUP it's expect that had LAUP will hire a consultant for include potential income strategys and to track a milestone has been add today outcome seven to align policy and add si to support as this is of interest to first 5 LA insure coordinate and had tomb complimentary plan is in place. Specific targets will be add to this outcome area once the strategy is developed.

It's important to note that as in past practice the LAUP Board approves a draft version this year while First 5 LA LAUP agreed upon the revisions to the matrix that are proposed the LAUP seen six and seven and will be viewing the draft within your Board packet at their meeting the first week of June. This slide Oh outlines the proposed LAUP 14 the source s of founds you may find the budget in your packet as attachment C memo. This s proposed budge set approximately 4.9 million detail regardth increases in just one moment. Just very briefly on this side note that the rid number on the slide remit the piece s of LA autopsy that are either not First 5 LA Sundaying source s are prior years and therefore are not reflected in the LAUP line item in the budget reviewed by rule earlier. The first component of the budget increase that I want to highlight is the one .five due to shifts from sub did I providers. Period of time master agreement spaces last
through addition with other providers in past LA up has
been largely able to re provider s with other sub however
this year this sub Santa Ana hall loss of earl I didn't
remember learning programs resulted in the need to replace
sub si dyesed basis with unwhich are more ly Oh LAUP still
in the same graphic air this is today have Juan on the
budget for next year. The other increase to provided veer
payment search and seizure due anticipated banes it LAUP
star ings in fiscal year due to the in of the class
assessment to LAUP star rating provider ratings decreased
budget decrease of approximately one empty $ since that
time focused much of it's immaterial in teacher
child interaction class assessment star rating that's
would to the budge etcetera.
The second area of the budget et increase next year is for
IT infra structure LAUP had an IT and found significant
ask efficiencies in the system the upgrades are attempt
today improve efficiency and more compelling sustain
ability an example would be the collection of child level
data by providers such as attendance data or developmental
assessment day attachment different provide he shalls the
written by hand and by L LAUP intends to use the data to
date and better tell a compelling story to policy makers
and funders other founders longer term costs are
agency reduction of five to six positions in the financial
calendar year 1415 budget. Additional costs are also factored into the production projections for fiscal year 1415. I insupra 12 to 18 month intrastructure development project.

Component. Increases bum et is the sustain ability planning as mentioned yearly in the parenthesis first 5 and LAUP staff have been in conversations in recent months a regard two approach to sustain action toward pub funding of high school through a communications assessment by LA up several strategies were identified to better leverage the current federal moment and to effectively build public will in support of you be pick education testimony campaign of quality preschool and has resulted in a rebranding for LAUP. These are anticipated to be ongoing annual increases. To prepare for the and second to prepare for the possibility that funding of preschool is unsuccessful the second of sustain ability plan development of alternative basis models and examples can be fee for service quality rateings registering the capacity that's been ed star rateing and it's recent race to the top experiences are y a fee for service sight. The development of these possibility models was outcome six and the performance matrix. This is -- this is something that was recommend bid First 5 LA leadership and has been included in the budget as such. This would be a
one time experience but continue shally could have implement depend on results business plan. This slide represents the projected budgets for the future years submitted by LAUP I want to draw your attention to just a few items on the slide. $4.9 million increase to 1314. Second there's a line about the expense and revenue areas for business plan implementation this is intended as a placeholder these costs may or may not be necessary and increased properly plan during the 141-2314 fiscal year. Third as propose the the projections decompletion. Sustain ability fund this however assumes that the requested for bids plan implementation are necessary in future years and final alley I would note that all expenses seen on this slide throwing the proposed budget cranes are within the original LAUP. So we have reviewed with you the LAUP 1314 as propose and had now just want to prosecute vied a few option s for consideration. If the Commission desires to keep the same level of funding as in 1213 this would be what would be necessary in term deuced spaces. Options three represents the proposed however I want to make this very clear that these option s are not in all in order of staff is not recommending any option over another. Options one and two explore the potential. Levels while allowing at addition al in struck and you are. To option
one and option 2. Is that option one represents an limb
nation of preschool spaces beginning the fall of 2013
where option natural a of
School LAUP until the
fiscal year 1213 budget levels were reached to achieve F Y
121 sustain ability cost proposed the LAUP network would
have to be reduced by approximately 1,100 s. Natural a
this would likely take just over two years spaces are lost
to to a each year. Based upon discussion and direction
Commission today return to June with refined estimates.
In and finally next s as mentioned there an action item
that in the in June also the LAUP Board final draft of the
performance might . In the fall following completion of
the analysis of child pro report on LAUP's fiscal year 123
performance I just want to highlight the key activities
sustain ability staff from First 5 LA will LAUP clap
tiffly on both assigning our and afford quality preschool
and will support LAUP in the alternative business models
take any questions thank you.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right thank you very
much. Members of Commission madam executive director.

MS. BELSHE: If I may Mr. Chair couple points I
want to emphasize. We have.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: We have two persons who wish
to be heard on this item.
MS. BELSHE: Thank you for a quick run through of a important and complicated contract number 1 the scenarios are not intended to reflect a staff recommendation but rather to respond to a question that came the context of a our budget fiscal committee implications and potential concern considerations with increasing the budget as proposed by LAUP. One reasons we have been spending a lot of time in LAUP is to ununderstand that the 4.9 until $ increase to make sure that we can make come back support of that level of investment because fund amly anchored in our shared goal adds round sustain ability so this the additional investments with will building policy add cast and as we think is quite important and there are resources within the existing allocation to support this additional investment.

The -- the options one and two under the different scenarios was intend today responsibility respond to this question. So the Board could say we want to hold funding level and so we want today give our Board a picture of what that would mean relative to reducing the number of slots supported so we're still doing our work with the staff but you know. We confident where this Board the augment grounded? Good day it and terms relationship sustain ability but we also wanted have a picture desire
was hold funding level what should of the considerations
and trade offs would be.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Thank you very much. We're
now going to hear public comment. I'm sure commissioner
did you wish to be heard.

MR. DENNIS: My only issue this was a I mean as
Kim said really complex and very context you'll
discussion. Unfortunately. Not a lot of us are here.
And to that end, this could be a major discussion at next
month's meeting unless the there's some preparation for
commissioner who's are not here because they will be
hearing the presentation and engaging in discussion for
the first time. Then second darely if the I object tent
is to take action next month in preparation for July 1st
implementation, we may be somewhat disadvantaged I mean a
lot of folks just had to leave so I feel this is important
significant and complex.

0 MS. BELSHE: One decision I might make is we have
a programing and planning committee meeting scheduled at
the end month. And we could make notice of the full
Commission if they were interested and put this on the
agenda if the Chair might thinks more conversant
knowledgeable and.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: I think whatever
opportunities can be inged would be good because it is the
intent to see us take this item up at the next meeting and
dispose of it accordingly. All right. Commissioner Au
and then I'm going to hear from the two person who's wish
to be heard by way the public comment David grips and see
keel I can't eye .

MS. AU: And keeping with the sensitive about the
times I do have a need to to get further clarification
about LAUSD's role in the subsidized, unsubsidized, and
the impact on the increase as well. So because I don't
quite -- my mind can't quite.

MS. KELLY:

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: Why don't you hold that
question. For the so be prepared to respond to that for
the entire Board and the committee context and ultimately
the next Board meeting to the extent that you deem it
appropriate. It's a good question. Commissioner Au.

Public comment please.

SPEAKER: The head of the Board of supervise all
another good people who are left. I'm David s and I
recommending the LAUP Board of directors we want to thank
the First 5 for what you've done with the budget but let
me say just a couple of things. These are complex
political and very at this indicated times we have to work
together. Not just staff to staff, but Board to Board.
It doesn't look good and I'm glad to see what you said Kim
that the staff only found out a few days ago that not only additional performance milestones would be added to the contract, but also that the First 5 staff is proposing those three options.

We can't operate this way. We've got to work together because we have a Board a very strong Board and we have a strong relationship with our staff to go through everything. As I said are complex at this indicate and had political time that's we're in. I request tell you right now our Board will want to serve every child not for reduction but we want to look at it system calendarly. Not separately. I beg -- I beg -- I plead he let's work together.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right.

MR. DENNIS: I just need some clarification. Is there another presentation coming forward. All right. Thank you very much. Commissioner den .

MR. DENNIS: I just need a clarification from Dave ace's comments because it suggestion that's stuff just happened a come of days ago with regard to requirements surely if that's the case there is some -- there would be some concern as to requirements and parameters and metric that's can still er on in the process as opposed to early on in the process.

MS. BELSHE: And if I may I really want to
underscore as I John and I shared it one of our first
meetings early January when we had the opportunity to meet
with LAUP Board collaboratively with LAUP and to do all we
can to support their to sustain the important work that
they do and I'm delighted by the collaborative work team
undertaken together and the investment of a significant
amount of time to develop a what we have ark characterized
a parallel track or two step approach to sustain ability
that involves both policy and add cast si and I'm -- I too
am a little perplex only a few days ago LAUP learning of
some additional milestones and outcomes weeks that very
have had. In my comments the presentation of the
scenarios were not presented as recommendations and so I
appreciate the opportunity to again clarify the intent
which was to respond to a made in our may one Board
meeting budge and it finance LAUP where one of our
accommodation s made the point that I mentioned earlier
and providing the Board as we committed to doing.
Look like if the budget would be held level. So that was
the intend to provide that picture in response to our
Board and have deferred to share that with LAUP. And if
we could have done a clearer job in terms of intend then I
will certainly take responsibility for that. Page in
terms of working collaboratively to find ways to sustain
the important work that LAUP does and to do so in a spirit
of partnership.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Are there any other comments to be enter contained at this particular point in time. I think the engagement needs to be as comprehensionive as is reasonable I take the point that the staff should in fact be in direct communication with each other. That is fundamentally expected. There's nothing that preludes Board members from talking to Board members. And so to the extent that's there there's a need or desire to do so, everyone has a method by which to communicate and to the extent that that is the case, exercise that would be appropriate reasonableness and discretion to deem appropriate. All right. Anything more to come before us. Ma'am do you wish to be heard yes, I'm sorry. I had not put in with you I just want to because staff has been working very closing we appreciate the support the clarification is s of option and and I did have a conversation this afternoon because.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: And your name rank and serial.

SPEAKER: Executive director of LA up when my Board saw the recommendations as a possible cut they saw it as a possible cut. And it was a discussion that came as a result of a and development commit y and as Kim just sprains but when my Board had heard in May there were
really no problem or issues with your additional request for this coming year's fund that go we would move forward. So when we hear services possible.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: What do you mean you moved forward.

SPEAKER: To move forward in terms of request of the additional $4.9 million for weeks and so Kim is actually precise on her points that she made. But when it's written possible options for you as a Commission to consider as commissioner dennis is very on arrest target. This is almost June F. We are going to for this coming year adjustment as I possibility and it's not a recommendation we need today tell our school district like in March. So timing is critical. The others is in term process so I do want to clarify that we want to work collaboratively sustain ability of your investments are critical to our Board that are many of them are pointed by the supervisors as well as to the this Commission just a point of clarity.

So unless you have any other questions I know it's already 525.

MR. RIDLEY-THOMAS: All right. Thank you very much for that timely reminder. All right. This is for information purposes only. We'll proceed accordingly. Now at the point of entertaining any other public comment.
Seeing none. It is now 5:25. And we are adjourned. I assure you that I will make it up to you at our next meeting --