# LA County CERF Governance Committee Meeting Notes (7/5)

<u>General Notes</u>

**Overview of Proposed Shared Governance Structure**

The goal is to develop a structure that is less hierarchical. But rather a set of concentric circles that allows continues feedback and passage of information.

North Star: The foundation of CERF is **economic development**:

- how do we bring people up
- how to we identify industries that have a future within our region while achieving environmental/equity goal
- how do we make sure that disadvantaged groups can be brought into that.

**Community / Business Tables:** Pre-established tables (may or may not be formed just for CERF HRTC) - Summarizing ideas/concepts to share with Table Leads.

**Table Leads:** Responsible for engaging on all of the topics that are CERF related - Summarizing ideas/concepts that are shared by Steering Committee.

**Steering Committee:** Subset of Table Leads - Summarizing ideas/concepts that are shared by Table Leads ➔ Voting on Major Decisions

**Stewardship (Central) Committee:** Comprised of the Convenor, Fiscal Agent, and Community Resident Leads - Summarizing and present ideas/concepts that are shared by steering committee → Implementation of major decisions.

**Creation of Tables (Internal Questions)**

How does this group identify Regional Leads? Should they be based on:

- 9 Service Planning Areas (SPAs), given that data is often collected at this level? - <u>Visual Breakdown</u> – South LA to be split in two
- 7 Workforce Development Boards in terms of service area
- 5 Supervisorial districts allow the group to be better aligned with LA County's elected officials – *How do we ensure that they are engaged?*

<u>Other considerations</u>

- Should the model replicate the Outreach and Engagement Committee's strategy
- How do we ensure that subregions are not left out if the regional size is too big?
- Where do we put our state partners in the model?

**Steering Committee Comments**

How does this group ensure that resident voice is weaved throughout the different levels across the entire process so that every region/subset has resident representation? → Look to leverage mechanisms that already exist

The group should avoid simply "cutting things up" → the HRTC should strive to target the populations that are hardest to serve and most disadvantaged. If not, the resources may end up skipping over their intended audience while everyone else continues to improve.

If there is a limitation on the amount of people on the steering committee, one possible model is having a steering committee where 80% of those on the committee represent disinvested communities.

Possible Coordination with the local and state reparations committees would be helpful + Identify communities that were most impacted by COVID-19.

**Next Steps** – Provide additional comments to the questions below:

- How do we handle tables that are already established v. those that do not yet exist
- How do we determine county-wide affinity topic leads (what are the indicators)
- Who should be on the subcommittee (percentage, etc.?)