



MINUTES

March 12, 2009

1. Call to Order

This Special Meeting of the Imperial County Children and Families First Commission was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Commissioner Sigmond, Chair. The meeting was held at the Imperial County Public Health Department, Conference Room, located at 935 Broadway in El Centro, California.

2. Roll Call

Commissioners Present:

Karla Sigmond, Chair
Barbara Deol, Vice Chair
Robin Hodgkin
Supervisor Mike Kelley
James Semmes
Rebecca Green
Mike Colón, Jr.

Commissioners Absent:

Veronica Guerrero

3. Public Comment

No public comment was made.

4. Impact of State Budget and Legislative Update

Mr. Rodriguez, Commission Director, provided a summary of the impact to Proposition 10; included in the meeting packet was an analysis of the impact Proposition 1D will have if the measure passes. The following points were made:

- ✓ If voter approved, Prop 1D will transfer \$268 million annually from the Prop 10 trust fund over the course of five years; estimates pose a \$1.34 billion loss to the First 5 State Commission and to 58 county Commissions.
- ✓ The original measure was to divert 50% of Prop 10 funding, however, not taken into account were declining tobacco tax revenues of 3%-5% annually or a decrease in revenues due to SCHIP cigarette taxes.
- ✓ It is estimated that the Imperial County allocation will drop between \$1 to \$1.5 million per year; approximately \$5.8 million over the course of 5 years. The statistics were taken from the Board of Equalization's revenue projections.
- ✓ The School Readiness program will be impacted where no matching funds will be made available through the First 5 State Commission; the Kit for New Parents will probably be discontinued; similarly First 5 State sponsored programs will be impacted negatively.
- ✓ Prop 1D proposes that controllers at each county level will be able to borrow from the individual county Commission funds. At a local level the county auditor will sit as an "ex-officio" member of the Commission. All audits and reports must be directed to the local county board of supervisors and county auditors.

- ✓ Based on the measure, Prop 10 revenues will be used to fund direct health care services, early education services, child care and human services. The definition of “direct services” is flawed and vague, leaving room for interpretation. The measure prohibits funding capacity building and systems change efforts.

Discussion continued in regards to the language established for the voters ballot; the information is available from the Secretary of State’s website. Discussion was also held regarding the possibility of applying for federal stimulus funds.

Commissioner Deol made a motion to oppose Proposition 1D, seconded by Commissioner Green. Commissioner Semmes advised that the Executive Directors of the state’s Social Service agencies met to discuss the implications of measure 1D; he commented that they support the objectives of Proposition 10, however, the issue of the backfill funds as they are directed to social service programs puts them in a position where they’ll have to abstain from any action taken in regards to Proposition 1D.

Commissioner Hodgkin advised that the Public Health Department receives most of its funding at a federal level and that state cuts will affect them minimally; some of the programs which will be affected are those targeting teen pregnancy prevention programs and such. Commissioner Hodgkin feels they should set specific language as to why they are opposing the ballot measure.

Commissioner Colon commented that he is opposed to Measure 1D due to the issue of supplantation; the state is redirecting Prop 10 revenues to fund another agency who is receiving direct cuts from the state.

Commissioner Deol wished to clarify her motion stating that the Commission opposes pending a draft statement defining the reasons for the opposition which will be forthcoming; agreed to by Commissioner Green. Commission is requesting that the Director prepare a statement based on the points for the opposition and to bring back at the next Commission meeting for review and consideration. Vote in favor of 6; 1 abstention (J.Semmes); 0 opposed. Motion carried.

5. 2009-2010 Mini-Grant Update

In reference to Step 1 of the Community Development Mini-Grant application process, 17 agencies submitted a Statement of Interest to Apply. The Director noted that due to the implications of Proposition 1D his initial recommendation to the Commission was to suspend the process. However, the language written in the guidelines is unclear as to whether the Commission can suspend the process at this time. Commissioner Green is suggesting that rather than eliminating the mini-grant process the focus should be on prioritizing the funds. Upon further clarification, it was the general consensus of the Commission to proceed with the mini-grant process. No further action was taken.

6. Adjournment

Commissioner Sigmond moved to adjourn the meeting at 11:40 p.m.