



Imperial County Children and Families First Commission
MINUTES
Meeting of December 5, 2024

I. Call to Order

This Regular Meeting of First 5 Imperial was called to order by Karla Sigmond, Chairperson, at 3:35 p.m. The meeting was held at the First 5 Imperial, Training Center, at 1240 State Street, El Centro, CA.

II. Roll Call

Commissioners Present:

Danila Vargas

Becky Green

Michael Kelley

Joong Kim

Fred Miramontes

Karla Sigmond

Commissioners Absent:

Yurii Camacho

Barbara Deol

Staff:

Julio C. Rodriguez

Gustavo Galindo

III. Public Comment

No public comments were noted.

IV. Adoption of Minutes

A motion to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of September 5, 2024, was made by Commissioner Green, seconded by Commissioner Miramontes, and having noted no further discussion or public comment the motion carried with all in favor.

V. Consent Calendar Items

The consent calendar items consisted of the monthly financial reports from July 1, 2024. A motion to approve the consent calendar items was made by Commissioner Kelley, seconded by Commissioner Green, and having noted no further discussion or public comment the motion carried with all in favor.

VI. Administrative Report (Julio C. Rodriguez, Executive Director)

1. Request Approval to Terminate Contract No. 2024-7878 with the SURE Helpline Center for Mini-Grant Caminando de la Mano Project: Ms. Sigmond introduced the request and asked Mr. Rodriguez for a review of the matter at hand. He proceeded to inform Commission members of the request to terminate the contract for the SURE Helpline Center for the Community Development Mini-Grant funded by the Commission. He indicated that the SURE Helpline has provided a letter to terminate the contract and the letter is enclosed in the packet, where the agency is indicating that they are terminating the contract, though he noted that under the terms of the Contract it is the Commission that has the authority to terminate the Contract under the current conditions. He explained the basis of the request, and noted that they are

indicating that the rationale for the request is due to limited funding and the lack of resources to be able to continue with the project. He then indicated that their reasons are valid for consideration, namely due to the limitations of the Community Development Mini-Grant, of which the primary concern is that mini-grant funds cannot be used for indirect or administrative costs. He noted that when the funding award was issued by the Commission, one of the changes adopted into the Contract was based on ensuring that certain items in the budget for the project are cleared up and cannot be for indirect or administrative costs associated with the day-to-day functions of the agency. He provided specific examples and noted that there was a request to ensure that the purpose of these costs be clarified, where they do appear to be administrative costs, though many times with a small agency such costs could be direct costs associated with a particular program.

He then also expressed that other matters included the ability to increase the target population to include more families, and/or if the agency was only serving families that were victims of domestic violence or under supervised visitations due to separation hearings. Mr. Rodriguez noted that if the agency was specifically serving victims of domestic violence and/or individuals under supervised visitations then the overall target could remain the same, though if the families being served were from the general population then the total should be increased from 45 to a higher number. He noted that the increase was recommended due to another program that is being funded by the Commission that serves a significantly higher number of families that uses a similar parenting curriculum, and as a result of this the Commission had originally asked for an increase if the project would be serving families with young children through their parenting program in the general population versus the special populations noted. He further noted that the Commission also wanted the agency to work to focus on providing the parenting program at a higher frequency at an in-person level and work toward moving away from doing the program via an on-line platform. This recommendation was noted based on increasing parent engagement during the sessions, as it was not clear if parents participating were fully engaged through the on-line sessions. Commissioner Kelley asked what the bottom line for the agency was to make the request. Mr. Rodriguez noted that they had indicated in the letter that the issue for them was resources, although that the bottom line for the Commission is to consider termination of the contract due to convenience, which is clearly one of the modes of termination in the contract.

Commissioner Kelley made a motion to terminate the contract based on the Commission's ability to do so, and that is what the agency was requesting it to do, and the motion was seconded by Commissioner Green. Commissioner Sigmond asked for any further discussion on the matter, and with nothing additional to add the motion carried with all in favor.

2. Request for Approval of First 5 Imperial Annual Report Submitted to First 5 California for FY 2023-2024: Commissioner Sigmond asked Mr. Rodriguez for a summary of the request, whereby Mr. Rodriguez noted that he had provided a copy of the FY 23-24 annual report information submitted via the on-line portal to First 5 California. He noted that the annual report information must match the annual audit in specific areas related to the AR-1 section of the report. He noted that due to circumstance related to obtaining the services of an auditor, the annual report that was included in the packet had not been updated to reflect the information, though there is an updated version that was revised for the meeting, and the auditor had verified the annual report information. He then went over the annual report being presented to the Commission. He identified the revenue based on Proposition 10 tobacco funds, which was a

little over \$1.4 million, and then noted other revenue, such as First 5 IMPACT funds, the Home Visitation Program funds, interest income, and other revenue, such as reimbursements from grants, dividends and an accrual adjustment that the auditor included. He then provided a summary of the additional information that was included to match the revenue and expense summary established by the Commission's auditor, and particularly highlighted the expenditure details of the AR-1 report. He noted that total expenses under Improved Family Functioning were \$705,473, under Improved Child Development the total was \$532,027, under Improved Child Health the total was \$114,200, and for Improved Systems of Care the expenses were \$120,043. He further noted the totals for Program Expenditures, Administrative Expenses and Evaluation Expenditures. Mr. Rodriguez stated that the Commission will note that as of the end of FY 23-24 there was a net gain of \$200,743, which was based primarily on salary savings from staff changes and reimbursements for other programs, which corresponds to the total change in the fund balance, which was \$6,039,695 as of June 30, 2024. He then proceeded to highlight and explained the funding set by the Commission as Committed, Assigned and Unassigned for the total fund balance identified for the end of the year.

He then provided a brief summary of the AR-2 section of the annual report, also noting the demographic information populations served and primary languages spoken in the home, as well as providing a breakdown by race and ethnicity. He stated that of the total individuals served for the year were 5,888, of which 2,863 were parents, 2,597 were children 0-5 years of age, and another 428 were providers, primarily childcare or early care providers that work with young children. He further noted that the demographic and populations served were consistent with the populations represented by program type in the AR-1 expense section as it is reflected by service and grantee type. In addition, he provided a brief summary of the AR-3 evaluation and county highlight for the Commission, stating that the highlight for this year reflected a summary of family resource events targeting families in the catchment areas of elementary schools with a significant percent of families that were identified as "high-need" populations.

Commissioner Sigmond asked for a motion to approve submitting the First 5 Imperial Annual Report information to First 5 California. A motion to approve the First 5 Imperial Annual Report for FY 23-24 was made by Commissioner Green and it was seconded by Commissioner Miramontes; having noted no further discussion or public comment, the motion carried with all in favor.

3. Annual Audit Report of First 5 Imperial's Financial Statements FY 2023-2024: Mr. Rodriguez provided an update on the status of the Annual Audit report for FY 2023-2024. He noted that it is not complete, and that the auditor hired by the Commission to complete the report is currently working on the annual audit of the Commission's financial statements. He indicated that the audit was not submitted by the due date, namely due to the fact that the Commission need to procure the services of a new Certified Public Accountant that was available to complete the report, that is also certified to complete a government audit and that would fall within the budgetary constraints of the Commission. He noted that several auditors were contacted, and that it was challenging due to the need to hire a new auditor that can perform a government audit, and the issues related to the proposed timeliness, such as not being available to begin the process before February 2025. He noted that the Commission was able to procure the services of an independent auditor that would be able to complete the audit report, Roger Tubach, CPA. Mr. Rodriguez noted that Mr. Tubach had provided these services in the past for the Commission, and that staff had heard that he was still performing government audits and

therefore contacted him for engagement in this process. He is currently going over the Commission's books and working on adjustments as a result of the County of Imperial closing its books and making changes to the final general ledger reports for the Imperial County Children and Families Commission's account, and would be working with Allied Business Services, the accounting service for the Commission to reconcile both the County of Imperial's books with the Union Bank payroll account. Mr. Rodriguez noted that the County has provided the Commission with a report at the end of the fiscal year, though staff noted some year-end items not posted to the beginning of FY 24-25, which were the result of the County adjusting the general ledger prior to closing out its books for FY 23-24, which occurs around August. He provided an example where the Commission may have submitted a claim for payment to the County, where this request was submitted in June, though the County may not process the check until July, though, does make an adjustment in the general ledger as if the check was issued on June 28, 2024. Therefore, Mr. Tubach wants to ensure that these adjustments are made to the Commission's books and therefore he will be working with our accountant to ensure these items are accounted for and adjustments are made accordingly.

Mr. Rodriguez also noted that staff had requested an extension for the audit report, and that they were hopeful that Mr. Tubach may be able to complete it by then, though did also note that Mr. Tubach has other obligations that he needs to complete before he can focus on the Commission's audit report, and if Mr. Tubach cannot complete the report by the requested date, the Commission will need to adhere to the matter and adjust to the circumstance. He indicated that the problem was based on the fact that the original CPA firm, Fechter and Co., that the Commission had retained to complete the report had notified the Commission that they would not be able to provide these services any longer due to staffing and its ability to provide these services adequately. Ms. Sigmond thanked Mr. Rodriguez for the update, noted that Mr. Tubach had previously done this work for the Commission, and asked Mr. Rodriguez to keep the Commission informed if anything changes.

4. General Grant Request for Proposal (RFP) Funding Cycle 2025-2028: Ms. Sigmond introduced the General Grant Request for Proposal for the 25-28 funding cycle, and Mr. Rodriguez proceeded to provide Commission members with information on the coming funding cycle and the request for proposal that is currently used by the Commission. He noted the importance of establishing a timeline that is consistent with the process and reviewing the RFP document for any changes, in addition to considering the mini-grant process and timeline within this. He stated that this information was for discussion and that members would look at approving a new process during the February 2025 regular meeting of the Commission. Mr. Kim noted that according to the time line if the release would be on February 6th, where Mr. Rodriguez clarified that the Commission would be meeting on February 6th and the RFP would be released on the following day, February 7th. He noted that once released, documents would be posted on the Commission's website, and notices would be placed in local newspapers, as well as sent out to agencies on the Commission's mailing list. He further stated that there would be a proposer's assistance workshop that is presently scheduled for February 24th, and that this workshop was not mandatory, but would be held for proposers interested in learning about the RFP process and given the opportunity to ask questions. He noted that the workshop had previously been mandatory, though that this changed because many agencies cannot attend the workshop, therefore the Commission adopted within the process, the letter of intent to apply, which is mandatory and is used by the Commission to plan for the review of RFPs submitted for consideration, which would include hiring evaluators, adhering to the review timeline and

planning the overall process in accordance to that time line and estimate the total number of proposals that are anticipated to be submitted for consideration. For this, he noted that the Commission would work to contract with an evaluation team to review proposals, as these proposals would be due for submission at the end of March at the Imperial County Purchasing Department, and would be forwarded to reviewers the first week of April 2025.

Mr. Rodriguez stated that during the review process, copies of all RFPs received by the Commission will be provided to Commissioners for their individual review. At that time copies of the evaluations by the independent review panel will also be provided to Commission members. Then Commissioners will review this information and begin making their determinations on RFPs submitted to the Commission. He then went over the process for selecting awards by the Commission, noting that Commissioners will make a Notice of Intent to Make an Award, which is issued as a tentative notice of award pending the passing of the Protest/Appeal Period, which begins the week following the Notice of Intent to Make an Award, and then on June 5th the Commission will meet to make a final RFP Award Announcement. He noted that this timeline is tentative and there may be changes to the process, but that this was a good time to solicit any recommendations from Commission members for changes.

Commissioner Miramontes noted that the time line looked good. Commissioner Sigmond also noted that the timeline looked good, and asked what the Commission was doing for outreach to let the Community know that this grant is coming out? She noted that the Commission does place ads in the newspaper, though could do more to promote the RFP, and if we will be using social media or the newspaper. Mr. Rodriguez noted that the RFP will be posted on Facebook, that there is a mail out announcing the RFP that is sent to a significant number of agencies in our data base, in addition to newspaper ads. He noted that the Commission could work with the individual that does our social media content. Commissioner Green noted that it would be a good idea to promote the RFP in order to attract new agencies. Commissioner Sigmond noted that she has seen newspaper articles highlighting funding from other agencies, and that perhaps an article promoting the current projects would be good, and also something that could be placed on social media, where we can invite agencies to apply. Mr. Rodriguez noted that perhaps it will be important to highlight the RFP in other ways, and meeting with our social media developer may be a good way to start. Mr. Rodriguez noted that one of the hurdles for prospective grantees is that the reporting process is complicated and that may be a deterrent for some agencies that are interested in applying, which is something that the Commission may want to consider, though he would not recommend changing the reporting process as it has worked out well with respect to capturing the work that funded partners do throughout a funding cycle. Commissioner Sigmond noted that she does feel that the reporting process works very well and that there are no problems with it and would not change it. Commissioner Green agreed that the process has worked, and Commissioner Kelley agreed that a lot of work goes into the process and that the process has worked well.

Mr. Rodriguez stated that the current application has a section there that includes special consideration, and currently identifies a developmental screening piece as the special consideration. He noted that one change that the Commission may consider as a special consideration is a referral process within the program that works to close-the-loop for families that are in the program. He indicated that this process would work to ensure that families are not just referred for additional services, but the agencies would follow up on the referral and work to ensure that families are benefitting from new services, thus closing the loop on the

process. This would be viewed as a special consideration for the Commission, and is not something that is required and that also would not automatically provide a higher score, but the special consideration may be an incentive to include a very doable component to the proposed project. Commissioner Vargas stated that she felt that that was a great idea, and noted that a lot of the managed care plans are going with this type of service as well with other agencies in the Community, and that someone that is serving families may identify some that may be eligible for managed care though are not currently receiving these services, and such a referral process could help to ensure that these agencies receive some type of follow-up or new services. Mr. Rodriguez assured that this is the intention of wanting to include a closed-loop referral process as a special consideration, because, for example, an agency may report to the Commission that they referred 20 individuals for services, yet there may not necessarily be a follow-up report on how many of these are actually receiving a new service. He noted that an agency would state in their report what percent of those individuals are receiving a new service, such as medical or some type of behavioral health service, then that would be more powerful. Commissioner Sigmond agreed that it would be a good special consideration, and Mr. Rodriguez indicated that the change would be made to the RFP to see how it looks. Mr. Rodriguez further noted that there were a few other considerations to include. He stated that clarification on language related to submitting an agency audit, in addition to language related to allocating funding for completion of the annual audit requirement. Regardless, agencies must submit an audit with the RFP, though a new agency can submit financial statements in lieu of an audit report, if they do not have one. He noted that it would be important now for the Commission to clearly define what a "new agency" would be to the Commission. For instance a new agency would be working in the community for over 20 years, though it may be the first time that particular agency applies with the Commission or a new agency may be an agency that has only been around for 2 years and therefore is clearly new with respect to offering services. Commissioner Green agreed that the distinction would be important, and noted that an agency that is serving individuals will have an audit. Mr. Rodriguez noted that in the past some agencies were not considered because they did not have an audit report. He noted as an example, that the SURE Helpline has not had a current agency audit in recent years. Commissioner Sigmond did note that that could certainly happen and ask if any Commissioners had a recommendation on the number of years that could be used to define a new agency. Commissioner Green recommended that they should have been around for no more than three years, and Commissioner Sigmond clarified that if an agency should be around for no more than three years then it may be considered a new agency. Commissioners agreed that a new agency would be one that was created and began offering services for less than three years in order to be considered new.

Next there was a brief discussion on funding and the flavors ban on tobacco products and therefore funding will be about 1.1 million per year and Commissioner Sigmond indicated that the funding cycle would remain a 3-year cycle. Mr. Rodriguez did recommend that it continue to be a 3-year cycle. He also noted that the language in the RFP suggest that an agency could submit multiple RFPs, which is what the Commission would want to consider. He does recommend it continue to be the same, namely because the County of Imperial may be identified as an agency, though it is a large entity with multiple departments. Commissioner Green noted that it would be acceptable for an agency to submit multiple RFPs though that the proposal should be for a new program. Commission members agreed to leave the process open for the possibility of receiving multiple applications from one agency. He further noted that sustainability continued to be a consideration, as grantees are required to provide information on how they would sustain services and also provide a sustainability plan to the Commission.

Commissioner Kelley asked if there have been any successful efforts related to sustainability. Mr. Rodriguez stated some services have been sustained at a certain level but the reality is that without the current funding it may not be possible for agencies to have true sustainability for programs, such as the Family Tree House. In addition, he noted the investments that the Commission had at El Centro Regional Medical Center's Maternal and Child Health facility, where there were components that were being sustained, though when it closed down and certain services were transferred to Pioneers Memorial Healthcare District, those components that were funded by the Commission were not sustained. Therefore, the recommendation would be to have agencies that are funded to demonstrate to the Commission how they are leveraging funds to support services. During the discussion, Commission members agreed that that would be a much more realistic way to encourage agencies to obtain additional funding for programs. Commissioner Vargas noted that programs, such as the Public Health Department, find it difficult to work toward sustainability as there is a dependency on specific funds to do certain programs. Mr. Rodriguez then indicated that this new language will be included in the RFP. Finally he noted that it would be important to clean up language where the RFP may use language that is more informal, and that information will be changed, and noted that the maximum award was \$250,000 per year, and asked if Commission members would be good with that amount. Commissioner Vargas asked how many would be able to fund at that amount. Mr. Rodriguez noted that the number would be about 4 to 5 agencies, though with changes in funding it 5 to 7 agencies may be funded. Commissioner Miramontes noted that this is consistent with past trends and Commissioner Green asked for clarification on \$250,000 per year, and included that some agencies may need more at the beginning of their program than at the end. Mr. Rodriguez noted that in the RFP an agency could request start-up funds, which is set at 10%, though they could request more by asking for an advance in funding.

5. Community Development Mini-Grant Application FY 2025-2026: Next the Commission Chairperson transitioned into the discussion on the Mini-Grant application for FY 2025-2026. Mr. Rodriguez noted that there were two funding opportunities that would be offered by the Commission. The second is the Community Development Mini-Grant application, of which he noted that there were no major changes being recommended for the mini-grant application process. Staff would be updating the mini-grant application and the timeline that would be used to support the submission of mini-grant applications. He indicated that the process would work fairly well, and that the complexity of it is based on the fact that there will be two separate applications being offered to prospective grantees. He noted that it will be some work, though the staff does have experience and that it should not be an issue, and just a matter of coordinating the efforts, and this would include ensuring that both RFPs are not released on the same date and that the selection processes do not conflict with one another. Therefore the recommendation is that the mini-grant application will be released a week later. He noted the two-step process in selecting mini-grants of which the first step is submitting a Statement of Interest to Apply form, for where Commission members will meet to select which proposers will be invited to submit a Step Two application, which is the complete mini-grant application. The Commission will notify those agencies that are selected, and well as those that were not, and post the Step Two application for those agencies to complete. He noted that the Step Two deadline is May 8, 2025, which was selected so that it does not conflict with the General RFP process. Commissioner Sigmond asked for clarification on the date of the mini-grant selection as it appears to conflict with the General RFP selection date. Mr. Rodriguez noted that Commission members will select, for the Notice of Intent, General RFPs on May 22nd, and that is where the

major discussions will be for these grants. The June 5, 2025 date will be the Commission meeting where General grants are finalized and mini-grant applications selected for funding. He noted that there will be recommendations for the Commission and that any questions can be directed to staff. He asked Commission members if they would be comfortable with the two grants being offered during the same period. Commissioner Sigmond noted that the Commission has done that in the past, and Commissioners agreed that the process will be doable. Mr. Rodriguez then noted that he would update the mini-grant application as well and present it to the Commission in February. Commissioner Sigmond asked if there were any other Comments on the mini-grant.

6. First Quarter Summary of First 5 Imperial Funded Projects for FY 2024-2025: Mr. Rodriguez introduced the first quarter summary for all grants funded for FY 2024-2025 and stated that this was part of the Commission's general reporting process. He indicated that the Commission is funding 6 general or "major" grants and 6 mini-grants, of which 6 major grants and 5 mini-grants are included in the summary. The total amount the Commission has committed to major grants is \$1,025,681 and another \$122,985 for mini-grant projects. He then highlighted specific information in the summary report for both major and mini-grants. This information included that 841 individuals have been served by direct services, that as many as 117 early care and education providers have also participated in professional development or training. He stated that funded programs were providing services in areas that include family strengthening, early care and education and child health, in addition to system change efforts in these areas. The majority of services that were provided that were direct services were primarily class/workshop settings or case management. He further noted that funded programs have spent approximately 18% of the total allocation for FY 2024-2025, and that a significant proportion of individuals served were from the three major cities in the County, which are Calexico, Brawley and El Centro. He noted that for this year the majority of services are more intensive in nature, as the Commission is not funding any community events other than the UC Desert Research Center's Fall Festival. He then noted that this information is used to draft the annual report and quarterly reports, and then asked if Commission members had any questions regarding the 1st quarter report for FY 2024-2025. Commissioner Sigmond noted that there were no additional questions at this time.
7. Medi-Cal Managed Care Plan Memorandum of Understanding with First 5 Commissions: Mr. Rodriguez had noted that at the previous meeting of the Commission he had provided an update on the Medi-Cal Managed Care Plan MOU, and will now present the MOU template that was released by the California Department of Healthcare Services. He noted that this MOU template is similar to that which a number of agencies have used to engage with local Managed Care Plans, though it is particular to First 5s. Commissioner Vargas noted that the Public Health Department currently has an MOU with these plans and is familiar with it. Mr. Rodriguez acknowledged that, and presented the MOU that represents how the Commission will engage with the Managed Care Plan, and noted that he wanted to ensure that it was meaningful in that the Commission only has four staff members, two office staff and two program staff, and would have to ensure that this MOU is something that would not only benefit families served but that would be realizable given the staff available to work on it. He noted that there has already been some contact with Kaiser Permanente, and that now it is a matter of identifying the responsible person and the liaison for First 5 Imperial that would be working on the MOU. He noted the responsibilities that are being allocated to the Commission which has to do with coordinating services. In addition he provided a summary of the Managed Care Plan's responsibilities, and

identified the term of the MOU. He noted that perhaps a referral in the Commission's general grant would be a good way to engage with local Managed Care Plans. He noted that he would now move to negotiate the MOU. Commissioner Llanas asked if any Commissioners have been expressing challenges with the MOUs. Mr. Rodriguez noted that First 5s have just received the final template, though, that he knows of, there are no MOUs that have been ratified. He did note that some First 5s were looking at leveraging funds through the Managed Care Plan through the MOU, though this is another process. He noted that he would work to get back with information with respect to any challenges that may rise up. After discussion on the possible challenges and ideas for working with local Managed Care Plans, Mr. Rodriguez indicated that we would follow up on the process.

8. First 5 Imperial Updates: Mr. Rodriguez indicated that he had several updates related for First 5 Imperial, and proceeded to present an update on the status of the Community Development Mini-Grant awarded by the Commission to the UC Desert Research and Extension Center, of which he noted that the Commission had funded the Fall Festival event that would be scheduled around February 2025 with the center, which would be a one-day event that targets up to 700 children 0-5 years of age and their families. He noted that the Director, Jairo Diaz, of the center had notified him that he was experiencing challenges with staff retention, and as a result of that, the center would not be able to host the Fall Festival this year and would therefore have to decline the award. He noted that because of this problem the center does not have the capacity to host the event properly. Mr. Rodriguez indicated that the Fall Festival was a good project and that he had indicated to Mr. Diaz that the Commission would wait until December 1st to hold the contract, though Mr. Diaz had later suggested that the Center would not be able to provide the services this year. Mr. Rodriguez noted that the contract was not signed by the UC Desert Research and Extension Center, and therefore there really were no contractual issues that needed to be dealt with, though felt that the Commission would benefit from this update.

Mr. Rodriguez then provided an update of the internal programs operated under the Special Programs units, and indicated that these programs were not part of the RFP process. He noted that the First 5 IMPACT Program, funded by First 5 California, through a regional grant held by First 5 Riverside, was currently serving 58 family childcare providers and a number of alternative sites and other early care and education settings. He noted that IMPACT Programs are currently in the second year of funding, and are tentatively approved of for an additional two years, in addition, carry-over funds that were identified from the previous year. Once we have those funds we will ask the Commission to approve changes to the overall budget, which is approximately \$32,000. One of the items that the Commission was looking at is working to provide funds to provide a train-a-trainer in the county that is Certified in CLASS, which is an assessment tool on adult-child interactions. He provided an update on the coaching that is offered, and funds used from the PACES Program for professional development, which also leads to the development of a quality improvement plan. He also provided an update on the Home Visitation Program, and Dr. Galindo highlighted the 24/7 Dad component, which is a male involvement home visitation program.

Next, Mr. Rodriguez noted the recent decline in Proposition 10 revenues as a result of the Tobacco Flavors Ban, which is Proposition 31. The First 5 Association will be working to address this matter and identify ways for Commissions to enhance their revenue in general, by creating a stronger presence in Sacramento by representing the 58 County Commissions there. He noted that because of the general increase in services at this level, the First 5 Association will

significantly increase membership dues addressing these additional tasks. Commissioner. Kelley noted that this would include hiring a lobbyist to work with the Association. Mr. Rodriguez noted that these increases would be used for other purposes as well, though definitely increasing the Association's presence at the State Level. Commissioner. Kelley noted that it would be a challenge right now. Commissioner. Sigmond thanked Mr. Rodriguez for the update and all of the work the Commission is undertaking.

VII. Commissioner Comments

Commissioner Sigmond took the time to thank Commissioner Kelley for all of his work and dedication, not only at the First 5 level, but his work throughout the County over the past 53 years. She thanked him for this long service, his compassion, and particularly noted his integrity in working with local agencies and the Community, which is something that she really admires about him. Commissioner. Kelley thanked her and noted that he would not change any of it, and that his decisions have always been made based on the benefits of the community, not for other reasons. And he thanked Commissioner Sigmond for her comments. Mr. Rodriguez also thanked Commissioner Kelley, and noted that in his role as County Supervisor, he had served on the Commission multiple times and clearly showed a desire to help young children in our County, and definitely a strong child advocate. Commissioner Kelley noted the important work the Commission does for young children and how the end result of these programs benefits everyone, and wished there were something like that for high schoolers.

Commissioner Llanas noted that her office has recently seen an increase in referrals for children with behavioral issues and have juvenile justice involved in this. The department is partnering with the Probation Department and other juvenile support programs to develop a program for prevention for children that may be eventually involved in the juvenile justice system, as a prevention measure. She noted that she would forward the information to Commission members, and would be promoting the program in the county.

VIII. Adjournment

Having no further business to discuss, Commissioner Green motioned to adjourn, and the motion was seconded by Commissioner Vargas. The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 pm. With all in favor.