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Executive Summary

In November of 2020, the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors voted to implement a care-first approach to youth justice. This historic move is intended to help address decades of strict youth sentencing laws and gang enhancements that became the gold standard for criminal justice policies enacted in the early 1990s. This new framework aims to be less punitive in nature and seeks to provide developmental and diversion opportunities for youth who come into contact with law enforcement, aligning with evidence-based practices across multiple disciplines. Studies have demonstrated that youth diversion is worthwhile, not only for its potential to produce positive outcomes for young people, but also for the communities they inhabit. This report reaffirms the need for youth diversion and sets forth a list of policy recommendations that are intended to make the contracting process more efficient and equitable for potential community-based youth diversion providers.

Using a mixed-methods approach, our team analyzed government contracting practices between community-based organizations (CBO) and Los Angeles County government. Coupled with an expansive literature review of best practices in public-private partnerships, document analysis of relevant County contracting guidelines and templates, as well as survey analysis and in-depth interviews with stakeholders, we reveal common themes that have negatively impacted the contracting relationship between local government and community-based service providers within Los Angeles County.

Our research has indicated several themes that speak to the common barriers in the county contracting process. The current contracting process is overly complex and inundated with insufficient advertisement of work solicitations. This has caused the process to be unnecessarily lengthy and cumbersome, an issue our client has affirmed and highlighted. YDD has requested a list of recommendations to address these inadequacies.

We have developed a list of evidence-based policy options meant to curtail negative and unproductive contracting experiences felt by CBOs currently contracted with Los Angeles County, as well as some who were seeking future partnerships. These options are guided by a tailored criteria matrix and weighted decision matrix rating system that allows us to assess the quality of our options in relation to their utility, political feasibility, and administrative feasibility, while also reflecting specific values expressed to us by our client, YDD.
Our list of policy recommendations address the imbalances and barriers identified in our findings, and can be implemented as stand-alone programs, and/or in combination. We strongly recommend our most highly ranked short and long-term options, Restructure Work Solicitation Templates and developing Capacity Building Workshops. Implementing these recommendations will lower procurement barriers, and ensure organizational health and sustainability for Community-Based Organizations (CBOs), expanding access to County funding and promoting scalability for YDD.

We also found that providing technical assistance throughout the application process, utilizing consistent contracting language, providing payment for indirect costs, and streamlining an electronic repository service could also lead to very profound efficiency that would significantly improve CBOs access to funding. It is our fervent hope that YDD will adapt these recommendations into their contracting standards as they transition to the Department of Youth Development (DYD).
Introduction

"Meaningful change takes time. Decades of evolving problems cannot be solved overnight."

Background

History
Los Angeles County, California is home to the largest juvenile justice system in the nation, with approximately 500 youth incarcerated in the County’s two juvenile halls and six probation camps, and 3,500 youth on probation supervision.[1] These numbers reflect a roughly 40% decrease in youth incarceration since the onset of COVID-19, which has accelerated the release of young people held in County facilities. The County’s heavy reliance on incarceration and supervision of youth costs taxpayers roughly $550 million annually.[2] According to a 2018 California Health Report, the recidivism rate for youth who go through the County’s juvenile justice system without the offer of diversion is between 30 and 60 percent.[3] Research shows that a single arrest nearly doubles the likelihood of a young person dropping out of high school, exacerbating their likelihood to offend or reoffend.[4] These statistics are worse for Black and brown youth and reflect the ongoing inequities that plague the youth justice system. For instance, Black youth are six times more likely to be arrested and 25 times more likely to be incarcerated than their white peers.[5] Due to the ineffectiveness and inequitable outcomes of the current system, there is a need for an alternate response to youth crime. Diversion serves as an alternative, helping to keep youth from cycling through the County’s harmful and punitive youth justice system.

Since its creation in 1903, the Los Angeles County Department of Probation has been responsible for detaining and monitoring youth who are involved in the justice system. In 2017, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors (BoS) voted to establish the Probation Reform and Implementation Team (PRIT), a workgroup tasked with identifying needed reforms, creating recommendations, and developing an implementation plan to hold the Probation Department more publicly accountable in its operation of youth and adult facilities. The PRIT held 14 public meetings where they received testimony regarding challenges with the current youth detention system. Their findings led them to urge the Board to move youth out of the Probation Department’s jurisdiction and into a separate health or youth development agency, while moving away from youth incarceration as a whole. The PRIT’s 2019 report also specifically recommended the formation of a work group to draft an implementation plan and address the statutory, legal, and budgetary challenges of any new agency.

In August 2019, the Board passed a motion directing the Office of Diversion and Reentry’s (ODR’s) division of Youth Diversion and Development (YDD) to co-convene a Youth Justice Work Group (YJWG), tasked with developing a new framework for youth justice in the County. Between the August 2019 Board motion and the Fall of 2020, the YJWG developed a report, Youth Justice Reimagined, which recommended the County create an entirely new department to oversee youth in conflict with the law, the Department of Youth Development (DYD). On November 24th, 2020, the Board unanimously voted to implement the YJWG’s recommendation. This new County department will become responsible for many of the current duties of the Probation Department, essentially supplanting the existing youth division within the department.

---

9 Ridley-Thomas and Kuehl, “Restructuring the Juvenile Justice System: Building a Health-Focused Model.”
10 “Care First, Jails Last: Health and Racial Justice Strategies for Healthy Communities.”
11 Ridley-Thomas and Kuehl, “Restructuring the Juvenile Justice System: Building a Health-Focused Model.”
12 Ibid.
Additionally, this department will build upon, and eventually replace the Youth Diversion and Development (YDD) division within ODR.\textsuperscript{13}

DYD will be responsible for implementing a care-first approach to youth justice, heavily relying on diversion in an effort to provide young people with a developmentally appropriate response to community harm and ensure accountability.\textsuperscript{14} To achieve this goal, the DYD will need to establish several new partnerships with CBOs throughout the County to carry out diversion service-provision. CBOs are a critical and central component to the Youth Justice Reimagined Model, and its success will heavily rely on DYD’s ability to provide needed funding and support to organizations working directly with the County’s youth.

Overall, the Youth Justice Reimagined framework is less punitive in nature and seeks to provide developmental and diversion opportunities for youth who come into contact with law enforcement. The model aligns with best practices outlined by research across many disciplines, and incorporates innovative youth justice reforms taking place both at the state level and nationally.\textsuperscript{15} This shift comes on the heels of years of demonstrated failures on behalf of the Probation Department, including: complaints of excessive use of force, high recidivism rates, pervasive racism, and financial mismanagement which has intensified the existing trauma disproportionately felt by this population.\textsuperscript{16} The Board’s recent efforts to transition to a development-focused model of youth justice demonstrate acknowledgement that the previous youth justice system was ineffective.\textsuperscript{17}

\textit{Contracting in Los Angeles County}

The Board of Supervisors are responsible for establishing policy to guide the administrative functions of all Los Angeles County departments\textsuperscript{18}, including those for the Department of Health Services (DHS). DHS supports the second largest municipal health system in the nation, including providing health care to youth in the juvenile justice system and inmates in the County’s jails. DHS’ People Services division, houses the Office of Diversion and Reentry (ODR), where our client’s division (YDD) resides.\textsuperscript{19} The BoS has adopted Section 5.065 of their Policy Manual to reflect the requirements nonprofit contractors must meet in order to do business with the County’s Departments.\textsuperscript{20} Some of these requirements have been reported to us as tedious and cumbersome throughout the course of our interviews with CBO leadership. Among them, Nonprofit contractors are required to complete and submit documentation identifying their level of liability insurance, as well as financial documents verifying that all charitable contributions

\textsuperscript{13} W. Hayward Burns Institute, “Los Angeles County Youth Justice Reimagined: Recommendations of the Los Angeles County Youth Justice Workgroup.”

\textsuperscript{14} See Appendix II for The Los Angeles County Model

\textsuperscript{15} W. Hayward Burns Institute, "Los Angeles County Youth Justice Reimagined: Recommendations of the Los Angeles County Youth Justice Workgroup."

\textsuperscript{16} Alexander Sanchez et al., \textit{Summary Report of the Los Angeles County Probation Systemic Reform Plan}, (Los Angeles County Probation Reform and Implementation Team, 2019), \url{https://prit.lacounty.gov/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=8mWgSiQvaVO%3D&portalid=37}.

\textsuperscript{17} See Appendix I for Noteworthy LA Youth Justice Reforms

\textsuperscript{18} Los Angeles County - Board of Supervisors Policy Manual - Municode Library, (Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, n.d), \url{https://library.municode.com/ca/la_county__bos/codes/board_policy?nodeId=LOS_ANGELES_COBOSUPOMA}

\textsuperscript{19} “People Services,” Los Angeles Department of Health Services, last modified February 25, 2021, \url{https://dhs.lacounty.gov/people-services/}.

\textsuperscript{20} Los Angeles County - Board of Supervisors Policy Manual - Municode Library, Chapter 5 - Contracting and Purchasing, (Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, n.d), \url{https://library.municode.com/ca/la_county__bos/codes/board_policy?nodeId=CHSCOPU}.
received comply with California law. In their Policy manual, the County declares these requirements are made in an effort to protect the County and its taxpayers, but does not explicitly outline from what. As a result of this complexification, several nonprofit leaders we spoke with reported feelings of mistrust and historical under investment in their relationship between the various County Departments they have worked with in the past.

Los Angeles County adopted a formal contracting management accountability process in September of 2000. As part of its response to a large and untimely budget request by the Sheriff’s department that year, the County’s BoS instructed the Chief Administrator to develop a specific protocol that includes an advanced deadline for bringing contracts forward to them for approval ahead of their expiration date. The County formally adopted its processes that year and revised them once later in 2004 to reflect the implementation of a new online contract monitoring system; Countywide Contract Monitoring System (CCMS). The County’s processes had not been significantly updated again until July 2020, when the BoS voted to incorporate formalized procedures regarding retroactive contract approvals and a revision of language used for consistency purposes.

Our client, YDD, established in 2017, has had to comply with the Board’s requirements as it relates to contracting with nonprofit organizations for their youth diversion and development programs. Although YDD initially had considerable discretion in establishing a framework for which nonprofit contractors could be implemented into their system, it has been expressed to us that it is not sufficient for scaling in its current form.

Similarly, YDD must also comply with monitoring and reporting requirements from its main source of funding- the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act. Funds accrued through the implementation of this Act are dispersed locally by the County in collaboration with Los Angeles’ Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC), a group composed of 14 County and City official representatives, 5 CBO representatives, 1 community-based drug and alcohol service provider, and 5 community representatives. While the JJCC has overseen the development of the County’s multi-agency juvenile justice plan, historically, the Probation Department has played the primary role of coordinating and administering JJCPA funds at the local level in the County. Some of our interviews with YDD leadership have indicated that this step of acquiring Probation’s approval for programmatic funding decisions has impeded the Division’s (YDD’s) ability to effectively provide quality support and implementation monies to organizations that have demonstrated need and worthiness.

21 Los Angeles County - Board of Supervisors Policy Manual - Municode Library. Chapter 5 - Contracting and Purchasing
22 Ibid.
23 David E. Janssen, Minutes of the Board of Supervisors County of Los Angeles - County Policies/Procedures - Timely Submission of Contracts for Board Approval adopted, (Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, 2000), http://file.lacounty.gov/SDSInter/bos/supdocs/091900_70.pdf.
25 Approval of Revised Board Policy Number 5.015 - Timely Submission Of Contracts For Board Approval, (County of Los Angeles Internal Services Department, n.d), http://file.lacounty.gov/SDSInter/bos/supdocs/146762.pdf.
Policy Question

How can the contracting of youth diversion service providers in Los Angeles County be made more accessible and efficient in order to meet the increased demand of the restructured youth-justice system?
The Los Angeles County Youth Diversion & Development (YDD) division is a subdivision of the Los Angeles County Office of Diversion & Reentry (ODR), which is housed within the Department of Health Services (DHS). YDD is a relatively new division in the County, and was established by the Board in 2017.[28] YDD is going through a period of transition, as it will soon become the Department of Youth Development. (See Figure 2).

Currently YDD is contracted with eight community-based service providers. Within the first two years, DYD intends to contract with 120 CBOs, in four cohorts of 30.[29] To meet DYD’s critical need for youth diversion service providers, it is important to understand past mistakes which have resulted in delays and missed opportunities, repurpose resources needed to effectively support service providers, and re-examine the challenges faced by those who have held county contracts to provide diversion services in the past.

**Importance & Scope**

The client has described the current contracting process as overly complex and inaccessible for CBOs of varying sizes, with burdensome reporting requirements, fee charges for service structures, and single-year funding awards. Due to this onerous process, many smaller, albeit effective CBOs, are often prevented from accessing public funds due to a lack of developmental and administrative resources to procure them. Further, a 2018 study of the Los Angeles County Probation Department found that staff and CBOs had a strained relationship and doubt a shared commitment to high quality, client-focused services.\(^{30}\)

In order to receive financial support from Los Angeles County, CBOs must currently be contracted via the Master Services Agreement. All contracts and payment disbursements for YDD service providers are managed through DHS.\(^{31}\) While YDD has tried to be flexible with their contracting process in the past, they are still obligated to abide by many of the disbursement standards that the county has set.\(^{32}\) One such model is a hybrid fee-for-service model. Currently, YDD uses this model for funding, which is linked to the case management structure. CBOs receive $9,000 per case manager, and a case manager is intended to serve up to 30 youth. Organizations are guaranteed a one-time payment of $2,000 for initial costs, followed by a monthly payment of $9,000, for up to 30 referrals; if referrals supersede 30, they may be allotted additional funding to hire another case manager. The hybrid fee for service model was designed to partially pay upfront costs while still holding CBOs accountable to fulfill the contract before being paid in full. However, as noted further in our research, despite the intention of this method to be more equitable for smaller CBOs this method of funding can be unpredictable for CBOs, preventing them from planning for the fiscal year.

YDD is seeking innovative solutions to instate contracts that are more accessible and have the ability to hold both parties accountable.\(^{33}\) Consistent and reliable government funding by way of accessible contracts and grants will enable CBOs to implement the *Youth Justice Reimagined* model and divert youth from the criminal justice system. Successful implementation of the YJWG’s recommended model heavily relies on YDD/DYD’s ability to significantly increase CBO contracting for diversion services. Due to the County’s established sense of urgency, demonstrated interest in youth justice reform, and potential available funding from the Probation department, YDD did not identify any budgetary constraints to adhere to.\(^{34}\)

---


\(^{31}\) *Summary of Contracting Processes: Los Angeles County Department of Health Services Division of Youth Diversion and Development Intensive Case Management Services (Y-ICMS)*, (Division of Youth Diversion and Development, 2017).

\(^{32}\) *Summary of Contracting Processes: Los Angeles County Department of Health Services Division of Youth Diversion and Development Intensive Case Management Services (Y-ICMS)*

\(^{33}\) See Appendix J for Significance and History of Public-Private Partnerships

\(^{34}\) See Appendix R for more on Financial Feasibility
**Defining a Community Based Organization**

CBOs are commonly defined as 501(c)3 nonprofit organizations with a mission to improve the circumstances of a local community. YDD ask that CBOs seeking funding demonstrate their ability to:

1. Conduct strengths-based intake assessment for youth who are referred to diversion in lieu of arrest or citation by a local law enforcement agency.
2. Provide or link youth to partners who can provide services that meet the core components of the Los Angeles County Department of Health Services Division of Youth Diversion and Development Intensive Case Management Services (Y-ICMS) model, including but not limited to:
   - Mentorship and peer support,
   - Community leadership and civic engagement,
   - Academic engagement and remediation,
   - College preparation and workforce development,
   - Integrated arts education,
   - Linkages to trauma-responsive physical and behavioral health services,
   - Restorative and transformative justice practices, and
   - Housing and legal support

**Centering Community Based Organizations**

Our analysis seeks to acknowledge the pivotal role CBOs play in the prevention and diversion process for at-risk youth in Los Angeles County. This premise underlies the mission of the Justice System Reimagined model and thus, will require more access to government grants than the current system permits.

Currently, Los Angeles County defines diversion as a crime-response program in which law enforcement refers eligible youth to CBOs for alternative programming, rather than relying on arrest and citation.\(^{35}\) Programming may consist of, but is not limited to, youth development and enrichment activities, case management, trauma responsive preventative services, and treatment for physical and mental health. CBOs develop an individualized case plan for each youth referral received. Upon program completion, youth have no arrest or criminal record.\(^{36}\)

YDD is responsible for countywide coordination and contracting for youth diversion services. In order to effectively scale up the contracting and grantmaking structures, the client is seeking a set of recommendations for YDD’s use (short-term), as well as a set of recommendations for DYD’s use (long-term). This report will be integral in YDD’s effort to develop a more streamlined contracting process that will encourage greater CBO participation.

---


\(^{36}\) Taylor Schooley, *Youth Diversion in Los Angeles County: Advancing Evidence-Informed Policy to Improve Youth Outcomes*. 
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Our team used a mixed-methods approach for our analysis of CBO and government contracting practices in Los Angeles County. Our project relies heavily on qualitative data, and employs a multi-pronged approach to qualitative analysis. This includes an expansive literature review of best practices in public-private partnerships, document analysis of relevant county contracting guidelines and templates, as well as survey analysis and in depth interviews with stakeholders. Our quantitative approach consisted of a spatial analysis of government contract procurement, spatial analysis of resources distribution, and funding patterns in the county.
Qualitative Methods

➢ Document Analysis
In an effort to gain a better understanding of Los Angeles County municipal contracting, we reviewed several public documents outlining the operations and contracting procedures of various departments within Los Angeles County’s departmental infrastructure. We also reviewed several motions passed by the BoS between 2016-2020 which demonstrate their willingness to invest and allocate resources towards transforming the youth justice system. This analysis informed our understanding of the guidelines, limitations, and bureaucracy that govern how CBOs have partnered with the County in the past. Furthermore, this analysis helped to identify areas for improvement, while also highlighting which aspects of the County’s contracting process cannot be changed.

- Highlighted Documents:
  ■ Approved YDD contract templates
  ■ Los Angeles County Charter
  ■ Los Angeles Municipal Code
  ■ Policy Manual for BoS
  ■ Relevant Board Motions

➢ Literature Review
We began our literature review with an examination of reports from the nationwide nonprofit sector, documenting common contracting issues in public-private partnerships between CBOs and government agencies. These reports documented barriers faced by CBOs in government contracting, as well as the shortcomings of government agencies in upholding their contractual obligations. We then focused our review on public reports regarding the County’s youth justice restructuring plan, with an emphasis on what steps may already be underway to support the transition to a care-first model. Specifically, we reviewed available reports regarding the Probation Department’s performance as it relates to youth. We expand on existing literature by offering a more robust analysis of Los Angeles County contracting as it relates to youth diversion, a unique case study of public-private partnership expansion.

- Highlighted Documents:
  ■ A Culture of Care for All: Envisioning the LA Model (2016)
  ■ Los Angeles County Probation Work Group (2017)
  ■ LA Probation Governance Study (2018)
  ■ A Roadmap for Advancing Youth Diversion in Los Angeles County (2018)
  ■ Youth Justice Reimagined (2020)
Community Based Organization Contracting Experience Survey

Our team gathered survey data to better understand the experiences of CBOs who have engaged, or will engage, in the County’s contracting process. Survey question types were mixed and included multiple choice (yes/no) questions, open ended questions, and one Likert scale. The survey questioned respondents on whether they have sought or procured a County contract, whether they have been successful or received denials, their perceptions of accessibility, ease of the contracting process, and the barriers they may have faced. Survey data was analyzed for patterns and common themes, allowing us to draw conclusions about the experience of CBOs who seek out government funding, and guiding our recommendations as to how to make funding more accessible.

Survey Sampling

○ Convenience Sampling
The survey was circulated to roughly 200 youth serving CBOs in Los Angeles County, and received 34 responses.

Respondents were identified through convenience sampling, and surveys were circulated to two existing lists of Los Angeles County youth-serving CBOs.

We elected to include youth organizations outside of YDD’s existing network in our sample to gain a better understanding of their experiences contracting with the County more broadly. Due to the time constraints of this project, physical limitations imposed by COVID-19, and an anticipated low-response rate due to stretched CBO capacity, we felt convenience sampling would yield the best results and largest sample.

Stakeholder Interviews

Our team conducted semi-structured interviews with several stakeholders involved with the contracting process in Los Angeles county, including YDD staff and leadership from CBOs currently contracted with YDD, and CBOs from the broader youth-justice CBO network in Los Angeles County. This approach provided an in-depth understanding of the effectiveness and accessibility of current contracting practices from both perspectives, the County and the service provider. We felt it was important to capture both perceptions, as the County and the community often have a different understanding of contracting success and procurement ease. This allowed us to compare responses from both pools of CBOs with responses from County contracting administrators, capturing areas of needed alignment. Additionally, we conducted interviews with third party experts, including capacity building specialists and philanthropic organizations with expertise in County contracting.

See Appendix III for survey questions and responses.
Table 2: Interview Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Perspective</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>10 Interviews</td>
<td>Gain information and historical context regarding YDD-specific contracting processes, program models, and challenges with implementation. Interviewees were also invited to describe successful past experiences establishing partnerships with the nonprofit community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Youth Diversion &amp; Development -Chief Executive Office, Alternatives to Incarceration Initiative -Internal Services Department -Workforce Development, Aging and Community Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Providers</td>
<td>24 Interviews</td>
<td>Identify needs of the population, challenges CBOs face when securing funding, navigating regulations set forth by the county.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth serving CBOs contracted with YDD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth serving CBOs not currently contracted with YDD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third party experts</td>
<td>3 Interviews</td>
<td>Inform our understanding of alternate funding models, capacity building partnerships and initiatives, and outline possible solutions for CBO support and accessibility within existing County limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity building specialists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philanthropic organizations that serve as intermediaries in county contracting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Interview Sampling*

○ **Purposive sampling**
Our team used purposive sampling for our interviews with County officials, third party experts, and CBO leadership and staff currently contracted with YDD. Overall, we conducted 10 semi-structured interviews with County officials, 3 with third party experts, and 5 with YDD contracted CBOs. For these interviews, it was important that we were intentional in speaking with people who hold specific knowledge about the contracting process, so we sought out individuals with expertise in the areas outlined in the table above.

○ **Convenience Sampling**
For CBOs in the broader youth development and youth justice network (outside of YDD), we relied on convenience sampling to gather interview data. We
conducted 24 semi-structured interviews. Participants were identified through responses from the Community Based Organization Contracting Experience Survey mentioned above. The survey asked CBO respondents whether they would like to speak with us further, and if they answered yes to this question, we conducted an in-depth interview.

**Quantitative Methods**

Our team conducted a spatial analysis to identify geographically where youth are most likely to enter the justice system. This helped us shape our overall understanding of the needs of the community. This data may help encourage the County to partner with CBOs in high-needs locations. The intention with this data is to help YDD in how they best utilize their resources for future capacity building efforts and contracting decisions.

➢ *Geospatial Needs-Based Tracking*

The geospatial analysis is used to identify what communities could most benefit from additional County investment into CBO services. This is done by using arrest data, identifying hot beds, then overlapping it with geo-coded locations of CBOs currently contracted with YDD and median household income. Therefore, we can identify priority service areas to address the needs of the local population and determine where resources and funds should be streamlined to meet the needs of CBOs.
Related Literature
Existing literature on public-private partnerships (PPPs) highlights several reemerging barriers that persist throughout the different stages of the contracting process: procurement, implementation, and reporting.

➢ Complexification - Lack of Clear Guidelines and Stratified Processes

YDD’s current contracting process is labor intensive and requires taxing efforts from both CBOs and County departments. Presently, there is no uniform standard of documentation or format for work solicitations that is adhered to countywide. This lack of cohesion amongst the various County Departments that offer funding to nonprofit providers further exacerbates an already time-consuming application process. Our research has identified perplexing contract language and ambiguous guidelines as one of the greatest barriers CBOs face in the contracting process.

Existing literature acknowledges insufficient collaborative efforts amongst government agencies that have failed to standardize county contract processes in the past. “According to the Urban Institute’s 2013 survey, an astounding 72 percent of nonprofits reported a problem with the complexity of, or time required by, government applications processes for contracts and grants. Importantly, those are not complaints that applications were long or detailed – but that the processes were so burdensome in terms of complexity or time that they created a problem.”

Current practices are burdensome for CBOs and can make procurement inaccessible for smaller CBOs, as this process takes a significant amount of time and staff.

➢ Capacity

Smaller CBOs are often limited in their capacity to implement government contracts, despite having strong and effective programming. When smaller CBOs—often without a development team or administrative staff—enter into PPPs, the rigorous requirements of a contract can take away from their programmatic or fundraising staff. Small to medium sized CBOs can greatly benefit from additional resources and capacity building to further improve their ability to seek and manage more funds.

➢ Reporting

Measuring and collecting performance data is a necessary aspect of contracting. Reporting is used to determine if contracts are being fulfilled, create transparency in the use of taxpayer dollars, and ensure adequate allocation of resources towards programs and services. Recent

---


41 Van Slyke, "The Public Management Challenges of Contracting With Nonprofits For Social Services."
research indicates that the depth and frequency of required reporting has increased, creating an unnecessary burden for CBOs. If the quality of the reporting is improved, the frequency needed for check ins can be reduced.\textsuperscript{42} This course of action also releases some of the burden on CBOs and minimizes administrative management.\textsuperscript{43} Benchmarks should be made understanding the unique limitations of CBO procurement, and reflect appropriate contract requirements with feasible goals for programs and services.\textsuperscript{44}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{Indirect Costs}
\end{itemize}

One of the most common issues that CBOs face when entering PPPs is acquiring funding for indirect costs. Indirect costs, which are also referred to as overhead costs or administrative costs, include things such as administrative fees, rent, utilities and staff.\textsuperscript{45} Funding indirect costs allows organizations to be more financially sustainable and conduct programs without losing money on the front end.\textsuperscript{46} A national survey conducted by the Urban Institute reports that 54\% of participants experience issues with government agencies refusing to pay the full costs for services.\textsuperscript{47} Government expectations for the true costs of programs are often unrealistically low, and include arbitrary caps on reimbursement for overhead.\textsuperscript{48} This disconnect is problematic, as research indicates that “the most effective and efficient organizations are those with higher rather than lower overhead rates.”\textsuperscript{49} Failing to pay true program costs reduces CBOs’ effectiveness and limits their ability to fulfill their contract.\textsuperscript{50}

\textbf{Cultivating Responsive & Communicative Public-Private Partnerships}

The literature also highlighted the need for responsive and communicative public-private partnerships. In order to cultivate an impactful and responsive system, governments must work on establishing and building relationships with communities and the CBOs that can best serve them. Developing a system of trust is imperative. Government agencies must disclose information and be transparent about what money is spent on, what is required in the contracting process, what fees are required, who is eligible for county contracts, measurements of contracting performance, and the reason why or why not a CBO was awarded the RFP. Providing CBOs and other contractors with a baseline of information that can be used as a reference would be conducive to understanding the contracting process and whether CBOs have the feasibility to undertake a County contract.

\textsuperscript{43} See Appendix M for more on Standardized Reporting
\textsuperscript{44} Davis and Walker, "Trust-Based Relationships in Local Government Contracting."
\textsuperscript{45} "Toward Common Sense Contracting: What Taxpayers Deserve."
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{49} "Toward Common Sense Contracting: What Taxpayers Deserve."
\textsuperscript{50} See Appendix O for more on Indirect Costs
Not only does transparency and building trust positively impact CBOs but it can also encourage government agencies to improve their own operations, benefitting CBOs and the public good. Having publicly available information in regard to government operation costs, performance measures of government agencies and departments, and what government agency is responsible for specific initiatives, ensures the public can hold the government accountable. When the contracting process is sufficient and seen as fair, the public can see that the management of public services is done effectively with an equity lens. This becomes the foundation of a trusting relationship built upon the public knowing that the government aims to spend money responsibly.
Findings
Our analysis has yielded several themes highlighting the barriers facing CBOs seeking to partner with Los Angeles County. Primary themes that emerged include:

- **Complexification**
  - Complex Language
  - Unclear Criteria & Insufficient Feedback
  - Lengthy Process

- **Insufficient Marketing**

- **Systemic Issues → Ambiguous County Contracting Parameters**

**Complexification**

Complexification can be described as needless red tape in the contracting and bidding process, imposing avoidable inefficiencies and burdens on CBOs as they seek public funding. In Los Angeles County, this has appeared in the past in the form of complex work solicitation language, unclear selection criteria, and excessively lengthy applications. These issues are exacerbated by the size of the County, which has led to extremely disparate processes across departments. A majority (70-90%) of California nonprofits have reported that complexification is a hurdle in their pursuit of government contracts.

Our survey respondents and interviewees reported many barriers that fall into the category of complexification. For example, 19% of survey respondents who have successfully procured contracts in Los Angeles County (n=27) reported to us that the County’s process is inaccessible, while 15% reported that it is accessible with caveats, such as having specialized staff, or that it varies based on the County department one is working with. Further, nearly 60% rated the process 6 or higher on a Likert scale measuring the difficulty of the procurement process, with 1 being “easy, the process was extremely clear” and 10 being “difficult, there were no clear instructions.”

A survey participant describes complexification in Los Angeles County below:

> Reading instructions that exceed 300 pages and having to identify inconsistencies between the RFP and the Statement of Work, all within one week of receiving the RFP so that all questions can be shared at the bidders' conference is untenable. Having to submit 8 hard copies of each application, with tabs, with specific page numbering conventions,

---
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with a table of contents, along with multiple copies on CDs (or occasionally we are fortunate enough to be required to submit the electronic copies on a flash drive) means that an overly zealous amount of time has to be spent on the administrative portion of the application before and after the writing portion has been completed. Further, when RFPs state that the lowest cost bid will be accepted, or will be used as a baseline for eligibility against all other applications, that naturally sets the environment where program components and service to participants matters much less than helping the county to spend as little money as possible to fulfill these mandatory programs.

**Complex Language**
A prevalent way Los Angeles CBOs encounter complexification is through work solicitation and contract language. A report from the Council for Nonprofits found that 75% of CBOs nationwide identified complex and time-consuming application processes as a problem.55 Our interview data supports this. Of the 24 interviews conducted with CBO staff and leadership, 16 people reported that the language used is overly complex, requiring high levels of expertise and staff time to adequately complete. Language is described as confusing and overly prescriptive, with narrow questions that make it difficult for CBOs to convey their strengths while remaining within the guidelines. One Interviewee described the process as, “so prescriptive it's crazy.” Another described feeling like they needed a legal expert to understand the contract: “It's not just written in [a way that], you know, a lay person who is not like a legal expert or something can read and understand the contract.” This level of complexity in language can cause lower resourced CBOs to be excluded from funding resources simply due to their legal fluency rather than on the strengths or weaknesses of their programs. Several organizations expressed to us that they believed this is why they were not chosen to receive a contract in the past. For example, an interviewee who had demonstrated success in implementing County-contracted programs was passed over for funding due to their inability to navigate complex work-solicitation language. Previously, this organization had a staff member familiar with County language; after this staff left, the organization applied for a renewal and was not funded, despite the fact that the program was the same and they had met all measures of success in their previous contract.

**Unclear Criteria & Insufficient Feedback**
Another Los Angeles County contracting issue identified by our interviewees was unclear selection criteria with insufficient feedback. This issue is heightened by the complex language described above and has the ability to leave CBO applicants feeling unsure of what the County is seeking or why they were rejected. For example, some rejected applicants in the past were left wondering how they could improve their applications for the next round of funding. Consequently, smaller organizations with strong programs and long-standing community ties are
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left to choose between allocating their valuable resources towards direct service provision or administrative tasks and fund development. Describing their programs in a way that aligns with the County’s current contracting structure is complicated and requires significant expertise and staff time. The director of a CBO with a 20 year-track-record of successful youth gang intervention programming expressed the following:

As far as like, the County looks for certain words, like in the box, you know, and people that are from the community and working in the community and not professional grant writers, we don't know what they're looking for. [...] So, it just is, it's just frustrating, because they need us.

The director of another CBO expressed frustration around the County’s inability to provide meaningful feedback after a rejection and the lack of clarity on how applicants were rated. This organization was declined after applying for a contract renewal with a County department, despite their successful implementation of the previous contract.

We asked for a meeting and then it was pretty hostile. I felt it wasn't very inviting. Well, we can't tell you who got it, but we can tell you that you didn't score as many points as even the runner up. And we're like, why not? You know? So they say, well, let's go through, you know, where they are. Very, um, I don't know what the word is. It's like they, only work within a box. Right. So, if you didn't check this box, then you don't get any points, you know? [...] You know, so that it's like, there's no give. And then just going down the list, you know, and having them say, well, the other company [CBO] had, you know, a higher score on this, or, you know, it's like, we felt dejected rather than uplifted for one thing.

And it was so frustrating because of all the points we lost and the Director actually was crying afterwards after we left. And she said, we put in, I don't know how many hours, you know, we, we answered everything we thought, but there's no wiggle room. There's no explanation, you know?

County experts validated the confusion around unclear rating criteria, stating that:

Its general practice here to give out 10,000 point evaluation matrices. That’s because when you break it down, the winners and losers end up further apart [...] which creates less transparency and less protest, maybe, I don’t know. So if you’re a nonprofit you’re like why is there 10,000 points on this nonprofit contract [...] It’s very intimidating.
And we're giving them, we're making it so hard for them, not just to get the contract and compete for those contracts, but also to get paid on the backend of that. Like we have to figure this out.

Experiences of the CBOs we spoke to and confirmation from County experts both highlight the need for the County to develop more transparency in its selection criteria and responsiveness in its dealings with nonprofit providers. Existing research indicates that for successful partnerships, both parties need to be responsive to one another and willing to engage in feedback.56

**Lengthy Process (Solicitation Length and Turn-around Time)**

Another issue expressed by LA County CBO interviewees was the length of work solicitations and the turn-around time on behalf of the County for different parts of the process. Additionally, the different aspects of the lengthy applications are complex and specific, such as including extensive documentation packaged in a highly prescriptive manner, redundant questions, different submission portals for different application components, or even requiring multiple application hard copies. Fulfilling these aspects of the application takes extensive staff time, and CBOs are often left wondering about funding decisions for several months. Several CBOs staff and leaders describe this issue below:

> I mean, seriously, we have RFPs that we turn in that are 300 pages--of which, probably 260 of those pages are backup items, like three years' worth of financial audits and bylaws, and articles of incorporation and, you know, Certificate of Good Standing with the state...I mean all this stuff.

> Why can't they make it so it's an easier process? Like why do you have to have a book for the grant, make it simple and keep it brief

> First of all, to apply, oh, it took months. [...] So, it took so much time to answer all the questions. Right. And then you fit it in, and whatever. So, by the time we did it, and then so many copies, and it has to be this page, you have to have an index. And it was like, oh my gosh. They made little disclaimers, you know, if you didn't follow it exactly, you won't be [chosen]. You know, so it's like, you know, going back to grade school or something. It was really, really sad that we had to do this.

> From the time we applied to the time we heard, it was like almost a year, I felt like it was a year later. [...] I can't wait a year. You know, I applied, you know, a year ago, what, what
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are you doing? I'm like paying all my MSWs and everything. I mean, what am I doing? I need to reach the youth. You know, we can't wait the year.

This issue speaks to the inaccessibility of public funding within the County. Many interviewees expressed that the requirements were experienced as incredibly burdensome for small and midsize organizations.

It just... it can't be done by a small shop. They [contracts] are a beast.

Nonprofits and grassroots organizations--either by design or not by design—they [the County] make it difficult to attain and disagreeable to receive. In other words, they put you through so many stages to qualify, that by the time you're qualified, you almost don't want it anymore.

County experts on the contracting process agree that the current practice in most departments is lengthy and overly complex. One County expert described the average work solicitations as a "100-page document. 75 pages which are legally required provisions that they should be reading, but does not necessarily need to be repeated....then you have to hunt for scope and evaluations.” They went on to suggest that this could be restructured, putting more pertinent information upfront, stated clearly, with required legal language at the end.

**Insufficient Marketing**

Both organizations with and without County contracts reported difficulty in locating work solicitations and expressed fear that they would miss funding opportunities for this reason.

I would think the biggest concern for us is ensuring that we see the opportunities come through.... Because I’m there, the fear is always that the RFP is released, but we don’t see it. So, I think that we've done a better job of trying to get on specific list serves. However, those are seeming to be a little bit disjointed. [...] It’s just always fearing that there's potentially grant opportunities that we miss.

This particular issue seems to be specific to Los Angeles County, as it did not come up in the literature review but arose often in interviews and in the survey data. The nature of the County’s many departments complicates the issue of marketing for work solicitations.

---
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Interviewees also expressed confusion around getting on the correct County mailing list, and frustration that some lists they were already on, often notified them of solicitations that were not relevant to their scope of work.

I mean at one point somebody at the County said, you know there's a list that you can be on you know where you can get referred, and I was like, how do you get into this list, and nobody could answer that.

So, [now] I'm on the vendor's list. I've been there for years now. [...] You know, they always send me solicitations that have nothing to do with what I'm doing.

There is a clear need for a streamlined application process which encompasses the release and marketing of work solicitations.

**Ambiguous County Contracting Authority**

Interviews with several County stakeholders revealed a lack of clarity around the County’s contracting processes, particularly as they pertain to contract template creation and guiding policies. Due to the County’s fragmented departmental structure, there is a general misconception amongst department leaders that contracting structures are fixed and beholden to strict policies. In reality, contracting templates are governed by unique Departmental guidelines, rather than concrete legislation, and departments often have greater flexibility to create innovative contracting templates than they are aware.

One County stakeholder expressed:

One of the problems that I've seen is there doesn't seem to be any actual concrete rules around a lot of this. [...] Folks end up making policy within departments [...]. This is how it's done. These are the steps, these are the requirements. Those essentially become seen as like County policy and things that can't be changed and things that you can't do differently when in reality, it feels like the majority of it can be completely shifted if we just decide to do so.

The true flexibility of department to create their own contracting templates was reflected again through a County stakeholder with expertise in the contracting process. He stated that:

There are templates, and people use them to some degree or another, but there is no limited restriction on the use of the templates. [...] And so, we're always refining them. And whoever wants to create a template [can do so], that's fine. Yeah. There's, nothing that prevents a department from creating a template.

Our findings indicate that the lack of visibility and accessibility are additional barriers in the contracting process. This can be witnessed in the feedback gathered from interviews, which
depict a difficult process littered with conflicting information, ambiguity in identifying contracts, perplexing contract language, and burdensome reporting. The current inequities have created an uneven culture that serves mid to large size CBOs that have the resources to enable their success. Considering YDD would like to significantly expand their pool of diversion providers, it is imperative to create more transparency, and clarity about the contracting process.

Geospatial Needs-Based Tracking

We focused our analysis on identifying locations in the County with the highest concentration of youth arrests. Our data is derived from LA City Mayor's Office, Census Data and LA Times neighborhood maps. Youth arrest data is collected by local Sheriff department precincts and submitted to the Mayor's Office to ensure transparency of data and information.58

Our analysis identified arrest data of youth under age 18. Findings indicate that arrests are largely clustered in South LA, however there are incidents of high youth arrests in parts of West LA County and in North LA County. Based on the data, we can see that arrests are surrounding the major freeway systems within Los Angeles.

Map 1: YDD Contracted CBOs, Arrest Data, & Median Household Income of LA County

White/Light Yellow areas reflect lower median household incomes, while Dark Blue areas reflect where highest median household incomes were clustered. Dark Gray/Black areas are missing

58 See Appendix IX for more on Data Sources
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data. The Blue Circle markers reflect youth arrest data. Orange Markers are CBOs that YDD currently contracts with.

The map above indicates a difference in dispersion of youth arrests between the northern and southern parts of the County, with arrests in the south more tightly clustered and arrests in the north more greatly dispersed. This indicates a need for creative solutions in developing CBO networks able to serve these diverse areas and address the needs of the youth residing in them. Additionally, we overlaid the arrest data with census data (2018) reflecting median household incomes throughout LA County to identify whether there is a relationship between youth arrests and neighborhood socioeconomic status. The socio-economic make-up of neighborhoods was mapped out using census data. From this data we can see a greater need for youth diversion services in the Southern parts of the County (specifically Inglewood & South Central), parts of West County (Venice) and the Valley (San Fernando).

Our analysis reveals that areas with greater incidences of youth arrests are primarily concentrated in the lower socio-economic neighborhoods of LA County, specifically in South LA County and the Valley, with the exception of Venice/Santa Monica. Through this map we can see that there is a lack of County contracted CBOs in specific areas that are in high need areas (where there is high youth arrests), such as the South LA, parts of West County (Venice) and the Valley. We recognize that these 8 service providers are part of an initial pilot program by YDD and recommend that as YDD expands into DYD that they further expand their contracting relationships with CBOs in these high need areas. To further meet the needs of these communities, we encourage DYD to further investigate how they can directly identify CBOs that are located within these areas so that resources are accessible. This data has comprehensively influenced our policy options.

---
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# Policy Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Restructure Work Solicitation Templates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create a new work solicitation template and structure it in a way that is less complex and less lengthy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Improve the Marketing of Work Solicitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advertising and providing community-based service providers with information about how to become a contracted vendor with Los Angeles County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Work Solicitation Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Host informational workshops to provide the CBO community with grant writing support, advice, and linkages to third-party support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Restructure Disbursement Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New funding structure that incorporates three main elements: Multi-year funding options, Increased CBO Budgetary Discretion, Full up front funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Capacity Building Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of an annual multi-day conference that equips contractors with longer-term capacity building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Create Community Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create a community advisory committee embedded within DYD’s structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Streamlined Submission Portal for Documents + Application Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish an online storage platform for CBOs to submit, track, and sign documents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DYD is on a fast track to expand its service provider network. Our client requested both long- and short-term recommendations that could be implemented as the County embraces its new approach to youth justice.

In Los Angeles County, all new partnership contracts must be approved by the Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors holds ‘executive’ authority in the County to award other County departments with delegated authority. Delegated authority occurs when one government entity who has authority for a particular function transfers said authority to a different independent agency. In this case, the Board holds the authority to make contracting decisions, which may be delegated to DYD. Based on our research about the potential size and scope of the new department, we strongly suggest DYD seek delegated authority from the Board to allow for more flexibility in their contracting and disbursement practices. Certain County departments, such as DHS where YDD currently resides, WDACS, Probation, have already received delegated authority to approve, change, and create new contracts with CBOs without needing the legal approval by the Board of Supervisors. Many of our policy recommendations have been designed with the expectation that DYD will be seeking delegated authority for designing new contracts and selecting service providers. It is in the best interest of the Board to approve delegated authority for DYD, as approving each individual DYD contract would place a significant administrative burden on the Board. This will enable DYD to rapidly upscale their contracted partnerships with CBOs to meet the increased demand of the Youth Justice Reimagined model.

**Immediate Options (9-12 months)**

We have divided our immediate policy options into two phases: procurement, and disbursement. Procurement refers to the initial stage of the contract application process, and includes identifying available funding, clarifying application materials, and supporting organizations during the application process. Disbursement occurs after an organization has secured the contract, and references funding models and practices used by YDD to grant money out to the selected diversion providers. Immediate options can be implemented by YDD and carried on to the new department.

---
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Due to the enormous and complex undertaking of establishing a new department within the County’s structure, our client has also chosen to secure a partnership with a third-party consulting firm, Urban Peace Institute (UPI). UPI will likely be concluding independent needs assessments for non-profit organizations seeking to contract with the County’s diversion initiative, at the time this report is released. We anticipate they will continue to provide support to organizations as YDD transitions to DYD, but there is a possibility that additional or different consultants may be brought on. The participation of a third-party capacity building consultant(s) will be integral to the implementation of the listed policy recommendations.

➢ **Procurement**

*Policy Option 1: Restructure Work Solicitation Templates*

This option requires YDD/DYD to create a new work solicitation template and structure it in a way that is less complex and less lengthy. Information most pertinent to the CBO, such as scope of work and funding amount, should be stated up-front, in clear, common language, avoiding legal jargon whenever possible. Work solicitations should be designed thoughtfully, avoiding duplicative requests, and should clearly define the criteria by which the client will rate applicants. Required legal language should be placed at the back of the solicitation and be confined to one section rather than dispersed throughout. Each RFP should be accompanied with a guide/glossary that provides context for specific terminology used in the contract. This will enable those who are new to the application process and make the technical aspect of applying more manageable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Benefits of implementation</th>
<th>Challenges of implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Benefits of implementation| • Makes work solicitations more accessible to lower-resourced CBOs by addressing issues of complexification and requiring less staff time.  
• Increases engagement for smaller, grassroots organizations, creating a more diverse pool of CBO applicants able to meet the needs of youth across the County.  
• A bigger applicant pool will allow YDD to scale, meeting the needs of the new growing department | • Additional work for YDD to develop new templates within County guidelines.  
• Creates additional County templates, which may add to confusion due to greater variance. |
| Status quo (if not implemented) | • Contracts remain inaccessible to small grassroots organizations.  
• Does not support YDD/DYD’s goals of expansion.  
• YDD staff resources can be utilized elsewhere.  
• Departments currently have the ability to create new templates, though power to do so is often underutilized. |
Policy Option 2: Improve the Marketing of Work Solicitations

A work solicitation is an announcement that provides details about a project that is available to be funded and solicits bids from service providers to perform the listed project. In the Los Angeles County context, work solicitations are also commonly referred to as a request for proposal (RFP). Under this option, YDD would expend significant resources towards advertising and providing community-based service providers with information about how to become a contracted vendor with Los Angeles County. The Department would also provide CBOs with a simple and jargon-free presentation of their specific funding application process, including deadlines and a list of needed documentation. An ongoing online and print marketing campaign would be used to notify the public and Countywide partners about each open RFP.

Table 4: Policy Option 2: Improve the Marketing of Work Solicitations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Benefits of implementation</th>
<th>Challenges of implementation</th>
<th>Status quo (if not implemented)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Expands the network of potential CBO partners through increased outreach.</td>
<td>• Additional administrative burden and cost will be placed onto the new department to implement presentations and refine marketing campaigns.</td>
<td>• Current work solicitation process requires significant time and information is cumbersome to locate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides opportunities for less resourced CBOs to learn about funding opportunities.</td>
<td>• Requires additional resources for marketing, such as staff time, website development, advertising, etc.</td>
<td>• Information largely only reaches CBOs with established success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Keeps the CBO community informed about opportunities to support youth who need services.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• No additional resources required from YDD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy Option 3: Work Solicitation Workshops

Utilizing similar resources and adaptable structures from the YDD 2018 Summit, DYD would work with other County departments and host informational workshops to provide the CBO community with grant writing support, advice, and linkages to third party support. These workshops would include information on the distinct elements of an attractive proposal, and how CBOs can successfully align their applications without competing on price, fees or rates. Rigorous processes, like obtaining a Master Agreement with the County, would also be reviewed and demystified with potential youth diversion providers via a workshop or online video series.
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Table 5: Policy Option 3: Work Solicitation Workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits of implementation</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Combats the confusion and difficulty associated with the application process.  
• Addresses the disparity in resources between smaller and large CBOs.  
• CBOs who have been unsuccessful in securing funding in the past, can learn how to strengthen their applications to meet the expanding needs of YDD.  
• Workshop spaces increase the likelihood of networking amongst existing CBOs. This course of action encourages community development amongst organizations doing similar work.  
• Lessens the burden on YDD program managers, they can address common concerns in a group format versus repetitive 1-1 sessions. | • Combats the confusion and difficulty associated with the application process.  
• Addresses the disparity in resources between smaller and large CBOs.  
• CBOs who have been unsuccessful in securing funding in the past, can learn how to strengthen their applications to meet the expanding needs of YDD.  
• Workshop spaces increase the likelihood of networking amongst existing CBOs. This course of action encourages community development amongst organizations doing similar work.  
• Lessens the burden on YDD program managers, they can address common concerns in a group format versus repetitive 1-1 sessions. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges of implementation</th>
<th>Status quo (if not implemented)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Requires additional resources for workshop planning, such as staff time, program development, advertising, etc.  
• Successful workshops depend on the collaboration of current stakeholders with fragmented interests. | • Common concerns still addressed by the Contracts and Grants team.  
• Lack of informational workshops has created more burden on YDD staff to answer individual work solicitation questions. |

➢ Disbursement

Policy Option 4: Restructure Disbursement Practices

Currently, YDD uses a hybrid fee-for-service model for funding, which is linked to a case management structure that allows for CBOs to be reimbursed for providing direct services. CBOs receive $9,000 per case manager, and a case manager is intended to serve up to 30 youth.67 While the CBO must invoice the County for services provided, 9,000 is guaranteed for reimbursement per case manager, per month. Organizations may also request a one-time $2,000 “start-up” payment for each new case manager. If referrals supersede 30, CBOs may need to allocate additional funding to hire another case manager.68

Our interviews have indicated that this method of funding is unpredictable for CBOs to manage, makes it extremely challenging to do year-long program planning and budgeting, and does not address organizations’ need to fund indirect program costs. We propose a funding structure that incorporates three main elements:

1. Multi-year funding options
2. Increased CBO Budgetary Discretion to address Indirect Cost
3. Full up-front funding, renewable every year

CBOs may have limited savings or assets to successfully manage public contracts which can often have long delays in project ramp-up, disruptions in activity and project benchmark schedules,

---
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and funding. Oftentimes the County grants money on a fee for service basis. Smaller CBOs with limited capacity struggle with this model because they do not have initial funds to carry out services. Organizations YDD finds suitable for awards should be provided with full upfront costs. Providing up front funding based on referral estimates, in annual or multi-year cycles, would allow CBOs to better plan for the future and be more sustainable. Other County initiatives utilize this practice and have found no issues with accountability. Instead, the practice has fostered trust between CBOs and the County and allowed CBOs to engage in future financial planning, contributing to their overall organizational health.69

It’s a common practice for local municipalities to set aside overhead rates greater than 20 percent or themselves, therefore it is justifiable to request they do the same for non-profits and CBOs. Limits on indirect costs and underfunding to pay for administrative costs can severely undermine an CBOs capacity to adequately implement a contract and invest in staff.

Table 6  
Policy Option 4: Restructure Disbursement Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Benefits of implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allows for a more stable funding stream, encouraging future planning, program iteration, and expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increases organizational sustainability by funding full costs of program implementation (e.g. less staff burnout, fair living wages, increased productivity).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allows organizations to run programs more effectively when their resources are not stretched so thin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• May foster more trust between CBO and County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges of implementation</td>
<td>May reduce accountability if an organization is not fulfilling their end of contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May inhibit new organizations and programs to be considered if budget constraints do not allow for expanded funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status quo (if not implemented)</td>
<td>County holds CBOs accountable to specific deliverables, while holding off payments until completion. County has expressed reluctance changing this strict payment model.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Long-Term Options

Long term resolutions are built off of prior implemented policies and reflect future goals expressed by the client.

➢  Capacity Building Infrastructure

Policy Option 5: Capacity Building Workshops

YDD has already expressed interest in supporting their Program Managers in their efforts to provide more training opportunities to contractors, as well as creating learning opportunities for CBOs who may wish to become contractors in the future. We recommend the development of an annual multi-day conference that equips contractors and other youth-serving CBOs with

longer-term capacity building skills such as identifying a communications strategy, fiscal management training, fund development, improving volunteer recruitment, updating a nonprofit’s technology, and improving how it measures its outcomes. Additionally, smaller scale virtual public workshops can be provided throughout the year covering similar topics.

In addition to this annual conference, under this option DYD would provide support to contracted CBOs throughout the implementation of the contract through more Check-In Calls, Learning Community Meetings, Partnership Meetings, and Contract Review.

It has been proven country wide that the implementation of supportive services can greatly influence the candidate pool and their level of preparedness. Resources such as: technical assistance, town halls, and RFP walk-throughs enable CBOs who feel intimidated by the application process to confidently tackle the procedure. The purpose of these multi-day workshops would be to build capacity for youth diversion programs regionally, fortify partnerships between providers that service the same or geographically close areas, strengthen the relationship between CBOs and law enforcement agencies. Service providers would have the chance to exchange information that is relevant to their specific needs, as well as liaise with one another. DYD would be able to highlight their success and growth in previous years and set goals with the community for consequent years.

**Table 7: Policy Option 5: Capacity Building Workshops**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Benefits of implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Capacity building fosters organizational health and sustainability leading to stronger programs and overall diversion success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Capacity building supports long-term growth and leads to more practical, suitable solutions and effective diversion services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lessens the burden on YDD program managers, they can address common concerns in a group format versus repetitive 1-1 sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strengthens the network of youth-serving CBOs in LA County, supporting the vision of Youth Justice Reimagined.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Challenges of implementation | • Time/Funds to create, organize and conduct workshops. |
|-------------------------------| • Course of action is heavily dependent upon collaborative efforts between organizations that may feel like they are competing for funds. |

| Status quo (if not implemented) | • Ongoing underinvestment doesn’t allocate resources to programs such as these. |
|--------------------------------| • Currently CBOs with demonstrated success receive funding, without a concurrent investment in strengthening smaller CBOs. |

**Community Involvement**

**Policy Option 6: Create Community Advisory Committee**

Because DYD’s design relies so heavily on CBO service provision, a well-developed partnership with the community will be important to the success of the department. A community advisory committee embedded within DYD’s structure has the potential to foster trust through shared decision making, ultimately strengthening this partnership and providing more transparency. Not

---

only does transparency and building trust positively impact CBOs, but it can also encourage government agencies to improve their own operations, benefitting CBOs and the public good.\textsuperscript{71}

Having publicly available information in regards to government operation costs, performance measures, and responsibility for specific initiatives, helps to ensure the public can hold the government accountable. When the contracting process is perceived by vendors and organizations as sufficient and fair, the public reaps benefits. The foundation of a trusting relationship is built upon the public knowing that the government aims to spend money responsibly.\textsuperscript{72}

Our literature review and interview data has highlighted a disconnect between funded services and needed services; a Community Advisory Committee could work to better align DYD’s decision making with the needs of the communities served. It is imperative that a significant majority of the members of this body represent lived and current experiences in the areas with the highest concentration of youth arrests as indicated with our geospatial needs-based tracking. In doing so, we expect the committee will uplift the needs of the most impacted communities.

We imagine the committee engaging in participatory grantmaking with DYD, holding sway on contracting decisions (should DYD receive delegated authority). The County should also explore utilizing philanthropic support for participation stipends to appropriately compensate CBOs and community member participants for their input. The structure of this body would need to be designed carefully to avoid conflicts of interest, but if done properly, could serve as a useful mechanism for community input. Bringing community to the table for decision making was identified as desirable by interviews with YDD leadership. Community advisory bodies can be found in other areas of the County and looked to for reference, such as the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council’s Community Advisory Committee, and the Measure J Advisory Subcommittees.\textsuperscript{73}

\textsuperscript{71}“Toward Common Sense Contracting: What Taxpayers Deserve.”
\textsuperscript{72} Davis and Walker, “Trust-Based Relationships in Local Government Contracting.”
\textsuperscript{73} “Community Engagement Planning Canvas,” Tamarack Institute, Accessed April 13, 2021, https://www.tamarackcommunity.ca/hubfs/Resources/Tools/TOOL%20%7C%20Community%20Engagement%20Planning%20Canvas%20Tool.pdf?hsCtaTracking=7f148bd3-43fa-4b3b-9892-71739f29289d%7C1f8207f3-7ac6-418f-900c-36ecaba54f89.
Table 8: Policy Option 6: Create Community Advisory Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Benefits of implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• This committee will advise DYD on the types of diversion services needed in the community, allowing DYD’s to make well-informed programmatic funding decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fosters trust between DYD, CBOs, and communities served.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Better aligns funding decisions with community needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assists DYD in developing best contracting (procurement &amp; implementation) practices and helps them better adapt to the changing needs of the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges of implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• County could demonstrate reluctance to share authority and oversight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential for conflict of interest for contracted CBOs and CBOs seeking funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additional administrative burden and cost will be placed onto the new department to facilitate community engagement and incorporate feedback/monitoring into the new framework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status quo (if not implemented)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Decision making power remains solely with the County with no buy-in from CBOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relationships between the County and CBOs remain strained due to existing power deferential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• County entities remain disconnected to growing and changing needs of impacted communities which leads to lack of responsiveness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

➤ Infrastructure for Contract Submission & Documentation

Policy Option 7: Streamlined Submission Portal for Documents & Application Materials

In Los Angeles County, a request for proposal (RFP) is a department announcement that provides details about a project, as well as solicits bids from contractors to fulfill the listed project. This option would require DYD to establish an online storage platform for CBOs to submit, track, and sign documents. This storage space should allow CBOs to track and save their application progress, as well as alert them immediately if attachments or information is missing.74

Table 9: Policy Option 7: Streamlined Submission Portal for Documents & Application Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Benefits of implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A DYD website &amp; portal can publicize specific services from CBOs to address potential gaps in future programming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CBOs have one place to track and submit documents for the County, thus enabling a streamlined approach to the grant renewal process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduces risk of staff + paperwork error.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• By providing CBOs with ease of access, it promotes their engagement in the application process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduces costs in the long-term for DYD in reviewing the application process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges of implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• CBO self-assessments require staff + resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Costly infrastructure to initiate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will require education and buy in from CBOs to embrace new forms of technology systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Forces CBOs to move into a form of technology they may not want to embrace.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status quo (if not implemented)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Current application process is weighted by inefficient tasks that are burdensome on all CBOs regardless of size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of a streamlined system creates a stratified process which is difficult to navigate for both County staff and CBO applicants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

74 See Appendix P for more on Document Vaults
Criteria & Evaluation
We designed a criteria matrix and rating system to evaluate policy options. This matrix allows us to assess the quality of our options in relation to their utility, political feasibility, and administrative feasibility. Our scoring reflects the goals and values expressed to us by our client, and initiatives stated in the Youth Justice Reimagined Report. The report highlighted specific remedies, as identified through analysis of County expert and CBO interviews, survey data, literature on best practices, and a review of County documents on the DYD transition. The intention of our criteria matrix is to help illuminate the efficacy of our policy recommendations, based on the evidence and research we have gathered.

**Table 10: Criteria Definitions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Feasibility</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Feasibility</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Decision Matrix**

To evaluate our policy proposals, we used a Decision Matrix to scale the feasibility of our policies. A *weighted decision matrix*\(^{76}\) is a tool used to compare alternatives with respect to multiple criteria of different levels of importance. It is used to rank all the policy options relative to a “fixed” reference and thus creating a partial order for the options.

We utilized weighted decision matrices to describe how the values of each of our stakeholders was determined. For example, we weighed County, YDD, and Consultant interviews more heavily to inform the political feasibility of our policy options. Based on their experiences working with Los Angeles County municipal code and the BoS, we were able to gain a sense for DYD’s potential new authority to implement these recommendations. The scores and ratings for each policy is further discussed below.\(^{77}\)

---

\(^{75}\) See Appendix Q for more on Political Feasibility


\(^{77}\) See Appendix S for more on Weighted Decision Matrix
Utility
This measure reflects the relative strength of a policy option in its ability to achieve effective partnership and contracts with the DYD. Policies are judged based on their projected ability to increase the accessibility for local CBOs to gain County funding and contracts. Effectiveness is measured by the likelihood of a policy being able to be scaled efficiently, increase accessibility, and reduce funding barriers countywide.

**Table 11: Utility & Impact Measurements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Rational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBOs Interviews</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>CBOs have direct knowledge and experience of County shortcomings and contracting inaccessibility. Their interviews were crucial in understanding persisting County barriers. CBOs stand to benefit the most from new practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Interviews</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Although the County stands to gain from improved processes, they are entrenched in the current system. The inaccessible nature of County contracting processes does not immediately hinder their ability to reach their performance benchmarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YDD Interviews</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>YDD has demonstrated interest in creating access for CBOs of all sizes to develop partnerships with their department and expressed the need to scale services rapidly, requiring an improved contracting process. As the client, their assigned weight reflects their desire to create equitable private-public partnerships going forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Interviews</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Consultants shared direct knowledge of best practices, capacity building, and needed resources for CBOs of varying types and sizes to become prepared enough to accept a contract with the County for services. Their interviews reflected common contracting barriers, and how they have been navigated in the past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit Review</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Literature revealed contracting best practices as well as how other jurisdictions have encountered and overcome common barriers in accessing public funds. Nationwide surveys provided solutions, strategies, and models as to how local jurisdictions can improve their processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Analysis</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Previous BoS motions and the Youth Justice Workgroup have identified the need for innovative contracting models to increase accessibility, scale services, and meet the growing youth diversion needs of the County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Decision Model - Utility</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Political Feasibility
Estimating political feasibility requires an understanding of the level of support that might be expected for a given option. DYD’s power to decide and provide payment to external providers, or receive delegated authority, currently depends on the LA County Board of Supervisors. The Board’s perception of the urgency and need for DYD’s services will be critical to determining the political feasibility of several funding motions that would need passage in order to continue establishing DYD as its own Department. Therefore, we measure political feasibility based on the perceived extent to which locally elected officials are likely to oppose or support a transition to
a care-first approach to youth justice. We attempt to anticipate certain policies passed by identifying how stakeholders in the past have voted and the recent shifts in the political or economic environment, which gives us an idea of the political feasibility.  

Table 12: Board of Supervisors Political Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Political Interest</th>
<th>Supports Diversion</th>
<th>Constituents Interest</th>
<th>Tough on Crime?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hilda Solis</td>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Mitchell</td>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Kuehl</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Hahn</td>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Barger</td>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changing Political Environment / The Policy Window

Over the past 6 years, the Board has passed several motions demonstrating their desire to transform the youth justice system within LA County. Sponsored primarily by Supervisors Solis, Kuehl, and Ridley-Thomas, they have ordered a slew of studies and subsequent reports be published to improve accountability within the Probation Department. These actions encapsulate the Board’s sense of urgency in transforming Los Angeles’ youth justice system and set forward a trend of reallocating public funding from punitive services to public services. Additionally, recent studies note a trend in the reduction of the youth crime rate (leading to the closure of detention facilities/camps), the less costly investment in diversion programs in comparison to incarceration, and effectiveness of sending youth to care-oriented diversion programs.

The Board’s recent actions indicate the presence of an open policy window, or a period that allows changemakers to implement new and innovative approaches. In 2020, all across the country, protests erupted to challenge how systematic racism influences how the criminal justice system is implemented. This led to a wave of demands from the constituents, holding their elected officials accountable and asking for reforms to the justice system. As a result, there was a change of tone from elected officials and an urgency to make systemic changes (including LA City Mayor Garcetti, Board of Supervisors, etc.). It has become the optimal time to reinvest money from Probation to a system that relies on community funding and rehabilitation practices.

---

79 See Appendix R for more on Financial Feasibility
81 See Appendix R for more on Financial Feasibility
Table 13: Political Feasibility Measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Rational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBOs Interviews</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Although CBOs have vested interest in the political framework of certain policy options, implementation knowledge is limited. However, we assigned this weight because these organizations represent constituent interest and need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Interviews</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>County officials have institutional knowledge about what is legally feasible and awareness of the priorities of current County leadership, including the Board of Supervisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YDD Interviews</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Current YDD staff has set forth a list of priorities integral to the department transition to a care-first approach. Their weight reflects demonstrated knowledge of Board politics, department initiatives, and the County’s overall willingness to adopt new and innovative contracting practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Interviews</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Consultants are often contracted by the County to implement innovative programs that help to facilitate public-private partnership. Although they have expertise in program development, they are external to the County’s political process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit Review</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>There is a gap in previous literature regarding contracting with Los Angeles County for provision of direct client services. This weight reflects a lack of available information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Analysis</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>This weight reflects official BoS motions and departmental reports that have indicated the County’s desire and history in adopting new, innovative contracting practices for the Youth Justice Reimagined Model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrative Feasibility

Administrative feasibility measures the likelihood that a department or agency has the capacity, ability, and budget to successfully implement the suggested policy.\(^8^2\) This determination takes into account an agency’s resources and technical capabilities, and the commitment and skills of its leadership.\(^8^3\) We assess the current regulations and guidelines, existing and additional resources, and administrative capacity necessary to carry out the critical components of the policy. In the context of our matrix, all of our proposals are financially feasible because we were not given any budgetary restrictions by YDD.\(^8^4\)

To determine administrative feasibility we consider the expansion of agency duties, use of new policy approaches or new technologies, and forecasted capacity building.\(^8^5\) Notably, YDD has identified the need to hire consultants to support expansion planning efforts. This will include an Operational Consultant and a Research and Design Consultant Team.\(^8^6\) Currently, YDD has

\(^8^3\)Kraft and Furlong, Public Policy: Politics, Analysis, and Alternatives
\(^8^4\)See Appendix R for more on Financial Feasibility
\(^8^5\)Kraft and Furlong, Public Policy: Politics, Analysis, and Alternatives
\(^8^6\)See Appendix R for more on Financial Feasibility
limited capacity to provide meaningful training and capacity-building support to community-based organizations, law enforcement, and other partners.\textsuperscript{87} They will need to significantly scale their staff to meet the needs of the new department, which we have considered in our analysis.\textsuperscript{88}

\begin{center}
\textit{Table 14: Administrative Feasibility Measurement}
\end{center}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Rational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBOs Interviews</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CBOs lack internal knowledge about the County’s resources and their ability to efficiently deliver support to agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Interviews</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>County leaders have direct knowledge of administrative and bureaucratic hurdles that may hinder efficiency during the implementation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YDD Interviews</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>YDD has expertise in developing community partnerships and is currently navigating the expansion of their agency as well as their existing relationships with service providers. This weight is informed by their assessment of existing administrative capacity, as well as anticipated capacity for the pending transition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Interviews</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Third party consultation will be critical in developing a new and fluid public-private partnership. Consultants have first hand knowledge on the intricacies of implementing new strategies and practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit Review</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>While not LA County specific, this weight reflects options that have been implemented and other best practices identified via research on successful private-public partnerships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Analysis</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>This weight is informed by existing YDD administrative and staffing capacity, as well as anticipated capacity for the upcoming department expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{87} Department of Health Services, "Youth Justice Reimagined: Phase 1 Proposed Plan & Initial Analysis," last modified 2021, \url{http://file.lacounty.gov/SDSInter/bos/supdocs/150836.pdf}.  
\textsuperscript{88} Ibid.
Policy Recommendations

- Restructure Work Solicitation Templates
- Work Solicitation Workshops
- Restructure Disbursement Practices Policy
- Improve the Marketing of Work Solicitations
- Capacity Building Workshops
- Streamlined Submission Portal for Documents & Application Materials
- Create Community Advisory Committee
After deriving utility and feasibility scores through our decision model, we then assigned weights to each measure to obtain an average score. Assigned weights are as follows: 40% for feasibility (20% political, 20% administrative), and 60% for utility. We chose to give utility greater weight, as highly feasibly policy options that do not achieve utility are not of use. Average scores for each policy option were then used to rank options. Rankings are divided into short and long term options, and ranked by their utility and feasibility scores. Results are as follows:

Table 15: Feasibility & Utility Scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 to 4.0</td>
<td>Strong Feasibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 to 3.0</td>
<td>Moderate Feasibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 to 2.0</td>
<td>Mild Feasibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 1.0</td>
<td>Infeasible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score = Rating*Weight

Table 16: Criteria Rating for Short Term Policy Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Option</th>
<th>Utility &amp; Impact</th>
<th>Political Feasibility</th>
<th>Administrative Feasibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Restructure Work Solicitation Templates</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Improve the Marketing of Work Solicitations</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Work Solicitation Workshops</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Restructure Disbursement Practices</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assigned weights are as follows: 40% for feasibility (20% political, 20% administrative), and 60% for utility.

Table 17: Criteria Rating for Short Term Policy Options

See Appendix S for Weighted Decision Matrix used to determine rankings
See Appendix T for Utility Ranked Weighted Decision Matrix
See Appendix T for Utility Ranked Weighted Decision Matrix used to determine rankings
### Criteria Rating- Long Term Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Option</th>
<th>Utility &amp; Impact</th>
<th>Political Feasibility</th>
<th>Administrative Feasibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - Capacity Building Workshops</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Create Community Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Streamlined Submission Portal for Documents &amp; Application Materials</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assigned weights are as follows: 40% for feasibility (20% political, 20% administrative), and 60% for utility.\(^92\)

The policies that we are recommending to YDD can be implemented as stand-alone programs, combined, and/or interwoven into a long-term policy strategy implementation plan.\(^93\) We identified *Restructure Work Solicitation Templates* as the highest-ranking short-term policy option. For long-term policy strategy we identified *Capacity Building Workshops* as the highest rated.

#### Rankings of Short-Term Policy Options

1) **Policy 1: Restructure Work Solicitation Templates**
2) **Policy 3: Work Solicitation Workshops**
3) **Policy 4: Restructure Disbursement Practices**
4) **Policy 2: Improve the Marketing of Work Solicitations**

#### Rankings of Long-Term Policy Options

1) **Policy 5: Capacity Building Workshops**
2) **Policy 7: Streamlined Submission Portal for Documents & Application Materials**
3) **Policy 6: Create Community Advisory Committee**

#### Short-Term

**Policy 1: Restructure Work Solicitation Templates** was rated the highest because based on our criteria it would provide the highest utility to CBOs, especially in lowering barriers for smaller-scale CBOs who have trouble accessing County resources. Further, it has high utility for our client, as restructured work solicitation templates will increase accessibility in the contracting process,

---

\(^92\) Ibid
\(^93\) See Appendix H and I for relevant Short- and Long-Term policy options that did not make recommendation list
allowing more organizations to enter contracts and help YDD to scale as they transition to DYD. In combination, this policy option scored highest in our two other feasibility scores, political and administrative feasibility, which indicates a strong likelihood of DYDs’ willingness and ability to implement it.

**Policy 3: Work Solicitation Workshops** is our second highest rated option. Both County and YDD interviews reflect a willingness to implement such a measure. Though the intent was clearly conveyed both County and YDD feedback, it was weighted with a 3 scoring. Ultimately, developing and operating consistent workshops adds more responsibility to YDD. Our consultant interviews, literature, and document analysis all support this measure as a common and beneficial measure with substantial benefits. An overwhelming amount of our CBO interviews indicate that this type of support is greatly needed.

**Policy 4: Restructure Disbursement Practices** was rated third for short term options, as it has a high utility and moderate administrative and political feasibility. It achieves high utility for CBOs by lowering the financial burden of contracting with YDD for service provision. It does so through providing up-front funding and allowing CBOs more flexibility in billing for indirect costs.\(^9^4\) It increases accessibility for the client, encouraging them to scale contracting to a broader pool of CBOs. Administrative was ranked moderately, as it will require significant administrative capacity. The political will to develop, implement, and track accountability for a new structure that would provide upfront costs may be difficult to achieve because this model is not often practiced by County departments and is considered a risk to the County.

**Policy 2: Improve the Marketing of Work Solicitations** is a beneficial policy option that requires the County to restructure how they advertise contracts. Both public and private parties have expressed the desire for more accessibility and less cumbersome language in the contracts. This measure may require the County to add more staff to help implement new marketing strategies. Due to the possible legal and administrative constraints that this measure requires, political feasibility is ranked right below a 3. Considering YDD’s goal to substantially scale the number of CBOs they work with; utility was ranked fairly high.

**Long-Term**

**Policy 5: Capacity Building Workshops** was ranked as our highest long-term goal amongst our other large-scale options. This option ranked highly on both feasibility measures, largely due to the overarching enthusiasm from interviews that workshops have proven to be successful in the past when implemented by other County departments. Utility scoring indicates this option would also achieve the highest benefit for CBOs, serving as an opportunity to strengthen their organizations and become county-contract ready. Utility for the client is strong as well, as

---

capacity building workshops will help strengthen the network of diversion providers in the County, creating a larger pool of eligible service providers.

**Policy 7: Streamlined Submission Portal for Documents & Application Materials**

Streamlining an electronic repository across different government agencies for contracting documents can help with lowering the burdensome aspects of applying for a contract. This reduces the additional work a smaller, grassroots CBO must go through to try to learn how to navigate the system. By creating a streamlined submission portal, DYD would increase utility for CBOs by mitigating needless confusion and reduce redundancy about RFPs. This policy action administratively reduces time and costs associated with the application process. However there is a lower political feasibility and administrative feasibility rating because of the costly infrastructure to initiate.

**Policy 6: Create Community Advisory Committee** This option ranked last for long-term options. While this option ranked highly in terms of utility, political and administrative feasibility ranked moderately. Utility is achieved here through providing a vehicle for community involvement, which will foster responsiveness and accessibility, contributing to the department’s ability to scale in a way that meets the needs of communities served. This option ranked moderately on political and administrative feasibility, as it required significant administrative management and political buy-in.

---
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Conclusion
“Research shows that young people who have violated the law — even in serious and harmful ways — can become productive adults if they have guidance and a support network that connects them to education and job skills, along with the chance to repair the harm they have caused to others.”

Diversion programs work best when led by local community-based organizations. Having the ability to access services in the communities in which youth live can substantially reduce their recidivism rates. Government entities have the ability to uplift diversion programs by making their contracting processes more efficient for organizations of all sizes and types.

YDD is currently contracted with eight community-based service providers and would like to expand to 50 CBOs within the next year. Understanding the limitations of the current process was integral to providing a list of short- and long-term policy options and recommendations to rectify existing inequities.

Using a mixed-methods approach, we analyzed government contracting practices between community-based organizations (CBO) and Los Angeles County government. Our research has illuminated several barriers to entry that have made the existing contracting process cumbersome, strenuous, and unnecessarily time consuming. Our team posed the questions: How can the contracting of youth diversion service providers in Los Angeles County be made more accessible and efficient in order to meet the increased demand of the restructured youth-justice system? How can we ensure service providers are reflective of communities served and that the scaled contracting process is equitable?

Based on our analysis of interviews with CBO Executives, County leaders, YDD staff, and third-party capacity building consultants, coupled with a review of available literature of pertaining to local government contracting and Los Angeles County’s specific practices, we have developed a list of evidence-based policy options meant to address the inaccessibility and injudicious nature of current County contracting practices. These options are guided by a tailored criteria matrix and rating system that allows us to assess the quality of our options in relation to their utility, political feasibility, and administrative feasibility, while also reflecting specific values expressed to us by our client, YDD.

Our criteria matrix was designed to help illuminate the efficacy of our policy recommendations, based on the evidence and research we have gathered. Therefore, we decided to use a weighted decision matrix to compare alternatives with respect to multiple criteria of different levels of importance. These weighted methods valued utility over political and administrative feasibility intentionally to leverage the interest of CBOs and YDD’s expressed initiatives.

97 Schlesinger, “Decriminalizing Racialized Youth. 59-82.
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One of our strongest policy recommendations is developing capacity building programs. In addition, we found that providing technical assistance to CBOs, standardizing contracting language and reporting requirements, paying for CBO indirect costs and codifying common documents and services into a streamlined electronic repository\textsuperscript{100}; are all profound improvements that can be made to bolster the capabilities of CBOs and provide greater access to funding. It is our strong hope that YDD will adapt these recommendations into their contracting standards as they transition to the Department of Youth Development.
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## I. Noteworthy LA County Juvenile Justice Reforms 2015-2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reform</th>
<th>Task or Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>BoS passes motion to review Juvenile Probation Outcomes study</td>
<td>Instructs the Probation Dept. to review the Juv. Probation Outcomes Study and establish an interagency workgroup to develop best practices and articulate a countywide strategy for juvenile justice.(^1) (Eventually led to the development of the LA Model)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>BoS passes motion, <em>Probation Oversight Mechanism- Feasibility</em></td>
<td>Created a work group to evaluate the feasibility of creating a permanent Probation Oversight Commission, and calls for evaluation of whether adult and juvenile probation operations should be analyzed together or separately. (To report back in 90 days)(^2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2017 | BoS passes motion, *Exploring Best Practices in Probation* | Calls for evaluation of best practices and consideration of moving youth out of adult operations within Probation department\(^3\)  
Probation Workgroup submits report to BoS  
Report proposes Countywide Juvenile Justice Strategic Plan, signifying cultural shift. Plan calls for centering developmental stage of youth, trauma informed care, and family and community centered services.\(^4\) |
| 2017 | BoS passes motion, *Advancing Countywide Approach to Youth Diversion* | A petition to advance a comprehensive, coordinated and expanded approach to youth diversion across the County, with a goal of minimizing youth contact with the juvenile or criminal justice system, which eventually led to the formation of YDD. |

---

1. Board Motion: Review Probation Outcomes Study- Sept. 15, 2015
| 2018 | Campus Kilpatrick opens (L.A. Model Pilot) | The model for this facility was co-designed amongst Probation, LACOE, community partners, and other County departments. It is a small-group treatment model that is youth-centered and embodies a culture of care rather than a culture of control, demonstrating a significant culture shift. This represents a significant culture shift in the County’s approach to secure placement.5 |
| Camp Consolidation Plan proposed to BoS | A plan is proposed to close several juvenile camps and halls, reflecting a drop in the population and an attempt to align County facilities with the new L.A. Model.6 |
| BoS passes motion, Developing a Path for Instituting a Probation Oversight Commission | Created Probation Reform and Implementation Team (P.R.I.T.) to serve as the first phase of a permanent probation oversight mechanism.7 |

| 2019 | P.R.I.T submits report to BoS | Report calls for removal of Juvenile Services Division from the jurisdiction of the probation department and urges the board to establish a work group to explore alternate options for youth who come into contact with the law. Report also calls for the board to authorize as many youth as possible be diverted to community-based diversion programs8 |

| 2020 | BoS passes motion, Restructuring the Juvenile Justice System: Building a Health-Focused Model | Created the Youth Justice Workgroup (YJWG) to explore the best place in the County for the responsibility of youth probationers |

---

6 Los Angeles County Probation: Calendar Year 2017 and Q1 2018 Updates- Letter to the Board
7 Board Motion: Developing a Path for Instituting a Probation Oversight Commission, May 1, 2018
| YJWG submits *Youth Justice Reimagined* report to BoS | Report calls for removing youth from the jurisdiction of the Probation Department, ramping of diversion services, and the creation of a new department level agency, the Department of Youth Development, to oversee these duties.\(^9\) |
| BoS passes motion, *Youth Justice Reimagined: A New Model for Youth Justice in Los Angeles County* | Formally creates DYD and established transition planning teams to implement Youth Justice Reimagined Model\(^10\) |

---


\(^10\) Board Motion: Youth Justice Reimagined: A New Model for Youth Justice in Los Angeles County, Nov. 24, 2020.
II. YDD’s Role in Public & Private Partnership Program

III. CBO Contracting Experience Survey Responses
A. Has your organization ever held a contract with Los Angeles County (All respondents)

B. Do you feel that contracts offered through Los Angeles County have aligned with what your organization has to offer? (All respondents)

C. Does your organization have the capacity to apply for and implement contracts with Los Angeles County (All respondents)
D. Are you interested in contracting with the county to become a diversion provider?

E. Did you find the application process for funding to be accessible? (Respondents who have held county contracts)
F. How would you categorize the contract procurement process with Los Angeles County in terms of ease? (*Respondents who have held County contracts*)

G. To the best of your knowledge, what has prevented your organization from securing a contract with Los Angeles County to provide services? (*Respondents who have not held county contracts*)
IV. Policy Options

H. Short-Term Policy Options

Policy Option X - Unbundle Contracts
Divide up large contracts into smaller contracts to attract smaller CBOs to apply for specifically defined portions of the RFP, allowing the contract to be a collaborative work effort between many CBOs. Revising eligibility requirements and developing a tier system that would allow start-up CBOs and smaller CBOs that may be eligible to compete for lower-risk subawards up to $75,000. Creating a restricted or limited tier of eligibility, would expand the pool of CBOs to include start-up CBOs so that they can compete for lower-risk subawards. In the long run, this would enable disadvantaged communities to have access to funding, without needing to meet the burdensome funding requirements that are prominent in larger contracts.

Policy Option XY- Bidding Preferences
Set aside 25% of contracts to be bid on for CBOs located in targeted zip codes that have been identified as the highest needs community for youth diversion based off of GIS - Gap Analysis. Specifically areas with greater incidences of youth arrests that are primarily concentrated in the lower socio-economic neighborhoods of LA County, such as in South LA County, Venice/Santa Monica, and San Fernando Valley. Allowing CBOs who may be smaller to be chosen as a preferred contracted worker which would increase the probability that more organizations qualify and are able to apply for and receive contracting opportunities, especially organizations

To the best of your knowledge, what has prevented your organization from securing a contract with Los Angeles County to provide services?
7 responses

- 57.1%
- 14.3%
- 28.6%

I have applied in the past, but have been denied
I don’t know where to find or apply for government contracts
I am not interested in contracting with the County and have never applied
It can be hard to find the opportunities to know what will be available, and when RFPs are released and we do hear about it there often isn't enough lead ti...
that have not been able to in the past and that are historically disadvantaged. Further research is recommended.

I. Long-Term County Policy Options

Policy Option Y: Public RFP Portal for all County Departments (specifically for services)
In Los Angeles County, a request for proposal (RFP) is a department announcement that provides details about a project, as well as solicits bids from contractors to fulfil the listed project. An RFP for a specific program may require the petitioner to assess their own feasibility, financial health, and the bidder’s ability to do what is proposed. This course of action would be most effective if paired with application workshops (See Policy Option C) to aid smaller CBOs in the procurement process.

Policy Option YY: YDD Active Role in Facilitating Referrals from Law Enforcement to Diversion
Long term goal of YDD’s designing a better referral system between Law Enforcement Agency & CBOs. Systemic barrier for referral process, in which law enforcement is required to provide referrals. This option would require YDD to hire staff that are well versed and have potentially worked with the Law Enforcement agency, in order to develop a bridge for the referral process. Outside of the scope of the project.

V. Literature

J. Significance and History of Public-Private Partnerships
Federal, state, and local governments have been entering into agreements with nonprofit organizations to deliver services with increasing frequency since the 1960s, known as public-private partnerships (PPPs). Social service privatization originates from 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act which, “allowed purchase-of-service contracting with nonprofit organizations for the first time”.12 PPPs are intended to be mutually beneficial, providing CBOs

---

with a reliable funding stream and allowing government entities to tap into community infrastructure and expand service provision.

While it is ultimately the duty of the government to meet the needs of its constituents, the government often does not have the capacity to do so as populations grow and diversify. Public agencies are limited in their capacity for service provision, and CBOs have emerged as ideal partners in their ability to implement wide-spread systemic change. Further, CBOs are more efficient and effective in program implementation, as they are typically embedded in communities in ways the government is not. Additionally, arguments highlighted by note that funding CBOs to implement service provision results in “reduced costs, improved service, increased management flexibility, specialized expertise, and decreased public monopoly inefficiencies.

K. Resolutions to Addressing Barriers

➢ **L. Standardized Language for Contracts and Grants**

In an effort to reduce initial contracting barriers, county wide agencies should outline and practice consistent definition use of common contracting elements such as, administrative costs, indirect costs, overhead. Each RFP should be accompanied with a guide/glossary that provides context for specific terminology used in the contract. This will enable those who are new to the application process, and make the technical aspect of applying more manageable.

➢ **M. Standardized Reporting**

Research supports the need for standardized reporting requirements that can be implemented while still adhering to federal guidelines. For instance, Standardized Program Evaluation Protocols have been used to determine how closely programs being implemented in the field align with best practices and the overall mission and vision of participating agencies. YDD, as a governing entity, can use systems like a contract monitoring system that focuses not only on

---


18 Toward Common Sense Contracting What Taxpayers Deserve. 2014.
compliance, but also on ensuring that providers are implementing programs with fidelity to their models.

If instituted, government officials should reduce redundant monitoring by standardizing and integrating reporting procedures across multiple government agencies. In particular, governments should standardize administrative requirements, consolidate and standardize forms and reporting processes, and use common language, and apply them consistently across services and agencies, with particular emphasis placed on fiscal and general administration documents\textsuperscript{19}.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{N. Supportive Services}
\end{itemize}

It has been proven country wide that the implementation of supporting services can greatly influence the candidate pool and their level of preparedness. Resources such as: technical assistance, town halls, and RFP walk-throughs enable CBOs who feel intimidated by the application process to confidently tackle the procedure. Florida is one prime example of the government providing technical assistance; “the Office of Program Accountability monitors contracted providers using real-time data uploaded into its Juvenile Justice Information System, which shows whether a program is being implemented with fidelity to its model.\textsuperscript{20} DJJ also provides technical assistance for providers to support training on evidence-based program models.” Technical assistance can be provided in numerous ways; having a service provider from other CBOs, using an intermediary consultancy agency, and government provided evidence based models that can help give direction to CBOs entering the process.\textsuperscript{21}

In Georgia, “the state provides its own training and technical assistance through a contract with the Center for Family Research at the University of Georgia.”\textsuperscript{22} Georgia’s contracts require that CBOs utilize technical assistance, specifically encouraging them to work with an organization or a consultant to support them fulfilling their contract\textsuperscript{23}. Having the availability of supporting services, like technical assistance programs, has proven to reduce barriers to procurement, by guiding smaller CBOs through the process and giving them tools to be able to navigate the system.

\begin{footnotes}
\item \textsuperscript{22} How to Use Evidence in the Contracting Process. 2016
\item \textsuperscript{23} Ibid
\end{footnotes}
➢ **O. Indirect Costs**

In an effort to create fair and equitable contracts, governments at all levels must be willing to provide adequate funds for indirect costs on behalf of CBOs. Placing arbitrary restrictions on reimbursement rates and caps on funding for indirect costs, has stifled CBOs ability to effectively render services.\(^\text{24}\) This barrier can be overcome if governments repeal arbitrary caps, as well as match and pay for CBOs indirect costs. Additionally, governments must be willing to reimburse for incurred indirect costs during the time of the contract, to alleviate the burden of CBOs if and when they encounter unforeseen costs whilst fulfilling contract guidelines.

This is a feasible course of action and can be easily adapted to the current price model considering there is a growing effort exhibited by the federal government to make a standard negotiated indirect cost rate.\(^\text{25}\) These rates are between 18% to 35% of overall costs. These rates set a baseline for nonprofits and CBOs to hold local and state governments accountable to federal standards. The Federal Department of Labor requires the local governments to provide a minimum of indirect cost rate of 10%, but this is not an advisable guideline.\(^\text{26}\) It’s a common practice for local municipalities to set aside overhead rates greater than 20 percent or themselves, therefore it is justifiable to request they do the same for non-profits and CBOs.\(^\text{27}\) Limits on indirect costs and underfunding to pay for administrative costs can severely undermine an CBOs capacity to adequately implement a contract and invest in staff\(^\text{28}\). To encourage more transparency in the process, local governments should publicly disclose indirect costs reimbursement rates, policies and practices.\(^\text{29}\)

➢ **P. Document Vaults**

A common recommendation seen in the majority of our literature reviews was the need for local governments to develop sponsored document vaults. Document vaults are electronic repositories that hold all required documents that pertain to government contracts. The document vault would be accessible by all contracting agencies. Streamlining an electronic


\(^{26}\) Indirect Costs of Nonprofit Contracts with Government, 2021.


repository across different government agencies for contracting documents can help with reducing redundancy in the application process. This course of action would further reduce time and costs associated with the application process, and mitigate needless confusion once an RFP is released. Developing a system that meets the specific needs of the local government and minimizes the redundancy of the application process, can save money for both CBOs/nonprofits and government agencies.30

VI. Criteria

Q. Political Feasibility

The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors

Hilda Solis -

Ideologically Solis is considered liberal/progressive democrat on the political spectrum.31 Supervisor Solis has been the biggest champion of criminal justice reform. She consistently has voted for rehabilitation efforts32; Citizens United for Rehabilitation of Errants 2005-200633, National Criminal Justice Association 2005. She has sponsored juvenile justice reformation: H.R. 6934 (110th): Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2008.

On her website, Solis has made it a point of commitment to focus her efforts on passing and supporting legislation that is aimed at transforming the justice system, shifting the focus from punishment and incarceration to care and diversion. She has led the Board to embrace the “care first, jail last” approach, and she continues to seek “to advance the will of the voters in reimagining our criminal justice system.” Since Solis has taken office, “I have made sure that County resources were invested in the First District— and constantly pushing for an equitable, not just equal, distribution of resources. “As of 2018, I have ensured that more than $20 million was put into my district in the form of: Funding for the Sheriff’s Department’s Community Partnerships (COPS) Bureau, Civic Center, Equestrian and Bike Patrol, and Parks Security and Funding for gang intervention and prevention programming and strategies to address violence in our communities.”

30 Toward Common Sense Contracting What Taxpayers Deserve. 2014.
Holly Mitchell -

Newly elected: Holly Mitchell does not have a long track record of her voting history. However she is deemed on the political spectrum as a progressive liberal. She does not support capital punishment for certain crimes. She believes in prison realignment programs. She is supportive of alternatives to incarceration for certain non-violent offenders, such as mandatory counseling or substance abuse treatment. She believes in decriminalizing the possession of small amounts of marijuana. She does not support a minor accused of a violent crime being prosecuted as an adult.34

Sheila Kuehl -

Supervisor Kuehl has actively emphasized and supported “second chance” and anti-recidivism programs, including the opening of Campus Kilpatrick, a state-of-the-art juvenile justice facility that emphasizes rehabilitation and preparation for a constructive future. Sheila Kuehl helped create a Sheriff’s Oversight Commission, and the oversight committee of the Probation Department.35 She supports increasing state funding for community centers and other social agencies in areas with at-risk youth.36 She is also against charging minors as adults for violent crimes.37

Janice Hahn

Ideologically Supervisor Hahn comes out to be a moderate democrat who has had a stance of ‘tough on crime’. However, back in 2016 Supervisors Ridley-Thomas and Hahn drafted a motion that was later adopted in 2017 by the Board, which proposed recommendations and strategies contained in the report entitled “A Roadmap for Advancing Youth Diversion in Los Angeles County” which led to the establishment of YDD. She has demonstrated a vested interest in YDD’s formation and continues to be in support of their initiatives38. In spite, her campaign focus does not have as much backing for criminal/justice reform but she has been a part of efforts to innovate crime fighting strategies, by fostering policies that are community focused; bringing the community and police together to curb gang and gun violence by advancing an anti-gang strategy. She has supported early intervention, job training and after-school programs for populations at risk.39 Supervisor Hahn has sponsored evidence-based & proven

prevention for street gangs (Mar 2013).\textsuperscript{40} She was rated 85% by the NAPO, indicating a tough-on-crime stance (Dec 2014).\textsuperscript{41}

\textit{Kathryn Barger -}

Ideologically Supervisor Barger is a republican. She is considered a pragmatic moderate republican who has had a tough-on-crime political stance. She historically has defended and supported the sheriff’s department. She has criticized specific reforms such as AB 109 (reassigning responsibility for categorized offenders from state prisons to county) and Proposition 47 (deeming drug possession & theft from felonies to misdemeanors)\textsuperscript{42}. However she has advocated for criminal justice reform and has been a supporter of California’s shift from the lock-'em-all-up stance of her predecessor to more care-focused policies that “emphasize reducing recidivism, diverting the mentally ill from jail to treatment when feasible and responding to crime with prevention and rehabilitation rather than strictly punishment.”\textsuperscript{43}

\section*{R. Financial Feasibility}

In November 2020, the Board of Supervisors committed to restructuring how youth diversion is implemented within Los Angeles County. The board adopted the core values of the Youth Justice Work Group’s report, which pushed forward a care-first model outlined in the report by 2025. Additionally there is a pressing need created by the District Attorney’s Office’s new policy for presumptive youth diversion to allocate funds and resources quickly towards this initiative. The Board has issued that YDD & CEO present a fiscal analysis to the board within 60 days of the report, and from there the Board has the authority to allocate funds to the transformation of YDD.

Within the “Youth Justice Reimagined Phase 1 Proposed Plan & Initial Analysis”, YDD states that it will need an “immediate initial allocation of $1.8M to begin.” Specifically to meet the preliminary goals outline in Phase 1 of Youth Justice Re-imagined, YDD is requesting funding to hire staff to expand youth diversion and development services countywide. “Reflecting an updated assessment of the budget implications outlined in the Youth Justice Reimagined report, an additional $55.6M will be needed in FY 2020-21 to fund expanded youth diversion and development services; support ongoing consultant costs; and ensure sufficient leadership for capacity-building, housing and reentry, and youth development.”

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\end{thebibliography}
“In order to effectively and equitably serve the estimated 6,500 youth who could be diverted or connected with community-based youth development services in 2021, YDD will need to expand accordingly to approximately 5 times its current size and will need an initial allocation of 1 Program Implementation Manager and $1.9M to bring on 7 additional Senior Staff Analyst equivalent and 22.5 Staff Analyst equivalent contract positions. At the beginning of FY 2021-22, YDD will need an additional $5.5M to support new staff for the year; $5M for consultant costs, capacity-building, and evaluation; and $45.1M to support the full countywide expansion of youth diversion services, reaching approximately 6,500 youth per year.”

The financial feasibility is truly reliant on the belief that the overall cost and benefits are justified to change the system to serve youth better. This is because politics have shifted towards allocating resources from probation to this new department, making all proposals tangible despite the wide-range of costs. The relative virtues of government intervention is being defined by a progressive Board of Supervisors whose main goal is to promote social welfare. Financially all of our proposals are financially feasible because at this moment the inefficiencies of the system in which youth diversion is handled by probation are costly and are not using tax-payer dollars effectively. Policy proposals that are designed to improve the efficacy of the department are deemed as more fiscally responsible use of funds. These policy proposals encourage equal opportunities to community based organization and the well-being of youth.44

VII. Evaluation

S. Weighted Decision Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example Weighted Policy Decision Matrix</th>
<th>Improved RFP Language</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision Model</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 to 3</td>
<td>Strongly Feasible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>3 to 2</td>
<td>Feasible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOs Interviews</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>2 to 1</td>
<td>Mildly Feasible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Interviews</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>1 to 0</td>
<td>Infeasible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YDD Interviews</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Model</th>
<th>Political Feasibility</th>
<th>Administrative Feasibility</th>
<th>Utility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weight</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rating</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOs Interviews</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Interviews</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YDD Interviews</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Interviews</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit Review</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Analysis</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Model</th>
<th>Political Feasibility</th>
<th>Administrative Feasibility</th>
<th>Utility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weight</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rating</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOs Interviews</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Interviews</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YDD Interviews</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Interviews</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit Review</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Analysis</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Model</th>
<th>Political Feasibility</th>
<th>Administrative Feasibility</th>
<th>Utility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weight</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rating</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOs Interviews</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Interviews</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YDD Interviews</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Interviews</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit Review</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Analysis</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Model</th>
<th>Political Feasibility</th>
<th>Administrative Feasibility</th>
<th>Utility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOs Interviews</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Interviews</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YDD Interviews</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Interviews</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit Review</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Analysis</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Model</th>
<th>Political Feasibility</th>
<th>Administrative Feasibility</th>
<th>Utility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOs Interviews</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Interviews</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YDD Interviews</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Interviews</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit Review</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Analysis</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Model</th>
<th>Political Feasibility</th>
<th>Administrative Feasibility</th>
<th>Utility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOs Interviews</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Interviews</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YDD Interviews</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Interviews</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit Review</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Analysis</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
T. Utility Ranked Weighted Decision Matrix:

Assigned weights to each measure to obtain an average score. Assigned weights are as follows: 40% for feasibility (20% political, 20% administrative), and 60% for utility. We chose to give utility greater weight, as highly feasibly policy options that do not achieve utility are not of use. Average scores for each policy option were then used to rank options. Rankings are divided into short and long term options, and ranked by their utility and feasibility scores.

### Ranking Short Term Policy Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Policy 1: Restructure Work Solicitation Templates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Policy Option 1 Feasibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Feasibility</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Feasibility</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Policy 3: Work Solicitation Workshops</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy 3 Feasibility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Political Feasibility</th>
<th>Administrative Feasibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th><strong>Policy 4: Restructure Disbursement Practices</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Policy Option 4 Feasibility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Political Feasibility</th>
<th>Administrative Feasibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th><strong>Policy 2: Improve the Marketing of Work Solicitations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Total: 3.52**
### Policy Option 2 Feasibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Political Feasibility</th>
<th>Administrative Feasibility</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility</strong></td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Feasibility</strong></td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Feasibility</strong></td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 3.15

### Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ranking</strong></th>
<th><strong>Long Term Policy Options</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Policy 5: Capacity Building Workshops</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Policy 5 Feasibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Political Feasibility</th>
<th>Administrative Feasibility</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility</strong></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Feasibility</strong></td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Feasibility</strong></td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 7: Streamlined Submission Portal for Documents + Application Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Policy 5 Feasibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Feasibility</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Feasibility</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.35</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Policy 6: Create Community Advisory Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Policy 4 Feasibility</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Feasibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Feasibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IX. Data Sources:

- [https://dev.socrata.com/foundry/data.lacity.org/amvf-fr72](https://dev.socrata.com/foundry/data.lacity.org/amvf-fr72)
- Census Reporter: ACS 2018 5 year: Table B01003: Total Population in Los Angeles: Census Block Groups