

## CERF L.A. HRTC

### Governance Subcommittee Meeting

### Summary Notes and Transcription

November 30<sup>th</sup>, 2022

#### Meeting Summary Notes:

- The committee meeting discussed the governance structure for the CERF program. They discussed the different levels of tables and committees, including Table A's, Steering Committee, Stewardship Committee, and hub leads. The recommendation is to have 31 seats on the Steering Committee with representation from grassroots and community-based organizations. They also discuss the importance of using data to make selections for representation within the governance structure. There are some outstanding questions regarding finalizing the steering committee and waiting for additional guidance before moving forward.
- During the meeting, there was discussion about the RFP process for data and research, and the challenge of balancing representation with good data. The length of time that the Steering Committee should sit was also discussed. There was a question about compensation for participants, which would be up to Hub leads to decide. Funding is only currently available for Phase One, and sustainability in Phase Two will require additional funding. The potential risks of missing deadlines were also discussed. Recommendations were made regarding how tables are set up and who sits on them, as well as whether there should be term limits for committee members. Finally, there was a question about the roles of tables and hub leads compared to committees.
- The third part of the transcript discusses the responsibilities of the Table B hub leads, which include collecting and summarizing data from Table A tables to share with the Steering and Stewardship committees. The discussion also includes considerations for resident participation and whether members can take their seats on the committee if they leave their organization. The group debates who should be responsible for selecting new members for the steering committee and suggests creating a visual representation of the governance structure along with a calendar outlining important dates. Plans are made to design an application process, establish selection criteria, and solicit feedback from non-hub lead applicants in order to select members for the steering committee.
- The group welcomes future participation in developing their body of work, especially with the LAEDC once the contract is signed. The meeting will have limited updates due to where they are with the state, but community engagement outreach will briefly discuss recent developments for about 10 minutes. The group does not need to present as they reviewed the same information on Friday and only added a few notes. They will share a synopsis with new members. Emails were sent out for updates from current partners and onboarding new partners, and 24 responses have already been received. Weekly updates will be given, and a stakeholder analysis provided soon for partner engagement progress.
- The meeting is to go over items from the last weekly call with the entire group.
- There are still outstanding questions that need feedback.
- The group is waiting for additional guidance to see if language changes.
- The twelve anchor organizations will hold contracts and be fiduciarily responsible for soliciting ideas.
- Characteristics for the table leads will be identified by the Stewardship Committee.

- The group needs to complete a stakeholder analysis.
- There are templates for RFPs and hub leads that need to be reviewed.
- The group may have to do their best understanding at this point and have flexibility within the structure.
- The recommendations are how each of the tables will be set and characteristics of those set at those tables.
- Resident participation might need to be different in terms of timeline.
- LAEDC needs to tell the group whether there is such a thing as an outreach lead, a data lead, or a governance lead.
- Once the baseline infrastructure of the governance committee is figured out, the criteria for selection and rubric for waiting those applications must be laid out.
- The group will put together a synopsis of what transpired to share with new members.

### **Meeting Transcription:**

00:00

Speaker 1

Thank you for joining us.

00:02

Speaker 2

Thank you for joining us today, Maria. Thank you for being here as well. I know Kelly will be joining us as soon as she can for today's session. I think there are a number of people who are probably on this call that weren't on our last committee meeting. What we can probably do is really go over a number of the items that went over the last time, some of which were presented at our weekly call. The last time we had a 09:00, a.m. Call with the entire group. We can dig into there's a couple of still outstanding questions where we can certainly get some feedback. Never think that it's not open for discussion, so we can use the time to do that. Are there, Maria, anything you want to add? I'm sorry, there no you're good?

00:58

Speaker 3

I'm good.

00:59

Speaker 2

Thank you.

01:00

Speaker 3

Tanua I know Kelly is going to be signing on as well.

01:05

Speaker 2

Yes. There anyone else who had anything else that they thought we should or were expecting us to go over for today's call? Feel free to let me know. Now anyone had any questions?

01:25

Speaker 4

Hi, everyone. Sarah Anderson. So I did send a question over. I don't know if you had a chance to take a look at it. It was earlier this afternoon. Okay. Yeah, no, it was a couple of hours ago, so that makes sense. Just in regards to and like you said, the topic might have been gone over in a previous meeting and I might have missed it, but essentially just wanting to have a strong continuity or link between the data that we're collecting and from the economic disparity data and how we're using that to make selections for representation within the governance structure. Just so the process for aligning the data results with the number of people on the steering committee, et cetera.

02:26

Speaker 2

I don't know that we're going to have to decide the order of things. I don't know that if we wait to get data before we seat the governance structure, how will we know what data we should be going after? It's quite a circular strategy, as you can see. One of them has to get set first. The assumption I had been working under is that the governance structure would get set first or as quickly as possible, and then what data and what the data says and how to interpret the data, the governance structure can help with that. The governance structure should live throughout phase one and phase two, which would then be using the results of the data. I'm not sure if we wait, how will we decide what data one of them has to go first.

03:45

Speaker 4

Yeah, I guess my concerns with that, I think there's preliminary data that we could take a look at just based off of the CERF objectives in terms of demographic specific groups that have been disproportionately impacted. I think we could take a look at that data just to make sure that not necessarily the structure, but the requirements or how we're determining the selection criteria. Qualification, whatnot for people that are going to be representing the different communities on the board is so important that I think it might be more work up front or even push out some of the milestones. I think it's going to be really crucial to have those voices at the table. If we don't have the data, if we're not looking at the data unintentionally, we could overrepresent a demographic or underrepresent a demographic that we need to have a strong presence.

04:55

Speaker 2

Kelly, go ahead. Thank you.

04:57

Speaker 5

And sorry I'm late, everybody. I was just coming out of an event. I have a question based on the conversation I just walked into, but also sully your comment in the chat around the 60 day window to solidify the governance structure as part of the planning period. Do we have clarity on whether that means

we have to have all of the tables set in terms of because we're talking about how to structure the selection criteria and obviously we want to build those applications and get that particular committee set. But what is it truly? Do we have a sense of what it really means to have the governance structure fully done in 60 days? Because I'm just thinking about some of these conversations about the upfront work.

05:48

Speaker 6

Yeah, sorry, Kelly, this is Jermaine, by the way. I didn't chance to change the name truly. Actually couldn't be on here today, unfortunately. Nonetheless, what we're reading, because right now we're still going by the SFP, things are a little murky, to be quite honest. I mean, were expecting to be contracted right by now, and we're not. The way that it reads is that within the first 60 days, we have to submit that planning phase plan. Really within that first two months and part of that is a finalized, it actually reads verbatim finalized governance structure. That being said, we're waiting for additional guidance to see if that language changes. The other piece is it 60 days from when were announced as our fiscal agent was announced and us as the regional convener and this HRTC was confirmed, is it 60 days from that or is it 60 days from contract?

06:45

Speaker 6

These are all things that we're waiting on additional guidance from. It looks like, based upon when went to Bakersfield for the economic summit, my understanding and what I'm taking away from those conversations is that there's two regions that are still working through a mediation process and it appears as though they want to contract all 13 regions together for various reasons. That being said, that is what the hold up is. Hopefully we'll get some additional guidance soon. I can also share that we're in the final round of interviews, which I also just shared with the Outreach and Engagement Committee, and we have some excellent leaders that are going to help us move forward with this initiative for the HRTC in all positions. We're queued up and we're ready to move forward, but we're just really kind of just waiting for additional guidance so that we're moving correctly.

07:43

Speaker 6

Then, to answer your question, really have the proper information in, can we adjust the governance structure, essentially, so can we propose a governance structure and then essentially, if there's something that changes, can we just update that in the monthly reports that are due, et cetera? So that's kind of where we are. I don't know how much it answers your question, but doing best I can.

08:05

Speaker 5

No, thank you. I appreciate that. Based on our conversation that the last governance committee and the presentation to this the broader group on the Friday call, there we put forth the recommendations here around the various tables and how we would approach selection for them. Obviously we still need to do some work with LADC and this group to figure out what the exact selection criteria looks like, which obviously would benefit from lots of research whether or not we can get to that perfect point of full information by the time we have to do it. Maybe not, but I think one of the things that's still an

outstanding question is like the finalized steering committee, like sign off. I don't know if that Tanua or Maria, what are some things that coming out of that conversation that we still need to nail down with this group?

09:14

Speaker 2

What we haven't had an opportunity to do today was actually present, and some people, I think, haven't necessarily seen what was presented at the last meeting or what was presented on the call on that Friday. Before we answer that question, I do think we need to present so we can all level set. So we have that.

09:40

Speaker 3

No, I think that's absolutely right. I think we need a level set because we've had different audiences as we've moved this along. If we're going to be able to do that definition, that next step, I think we all need to be at the same page first.

09:57

Speaker 2

Luis, do you still want to ask your question before we start?

10:04

Speaker 7

I was just curious. I thought we have we ever put together, like, just what's it called chart, like here's, what tables or what committees or boards exist and how they all tie together, how many people are on each one?

10:19

Speaker 2

Yes.

10:22

Speaker 7

Can we share that out so people can see it? I don't know if it's put into the chat.

10:30

Speaker 2

So that's what we can do now. Let's just walk through the governance structure that we created together. So we have four different levels. They are to some extent a series of concentric circles. There was what we called the A tables, or Table A's, which included any community, business sector or industry cluster that currently exists or would like to exist as a result of the surf program. We had what we call the Steering Committee level and that is the committee that holds the major decisions. We had a Stewardship Committee and that committee is made up of the convener and the fiscal agent. This is all information that we've shared previously, starting to move into who is at those tables and how they are seated. These

are recommendations that are based on our collective conversations. Table A, how they're seated and who they are, is any individual small business, community, industry group that has an interest in participating in the surf process, in providing feedback on data on ideas regarding the surf process.

12:38

Speaker 2

This is multiple numbers of tables and they are cross region, sector, affinity again, could exist already, or may exist as a result of the surf process. We also then talked about having table leads, so that all of those tables, that the many multitudes of tables that are out there having at least twelve anchor organizations leading those tables. You'll recall there was a Friday morning discussion where we showed the topics related to those twelve areas, or there's twelve topics and then there's also regions that could another way to think about the twelve anchor organizations it's topics and or it could be regions. The idea is that these twelve anchor organizations would actually hold contracts, potentially contract with some of the smaller tables at the A level, and would be fiduciarily responsible for soliciting ideas, hosting tables across a variety of languages, regions, modalities accordingly. How those leads get set will be based on the Stewardship Committee identifying a series of characteristics.

14:24

Speaker 2

Now we can make recommendations on what those characteristics might look like. There are some concepts that are already here regarding identifying hub leads, who are inclusive, who have experience with convening, who show an adaptability in being able to convene across language, across region, various things like that. The recommendation from this committee is that the Stewardship Committee would design an application, a timeline, those characteristics, and look at a selection process for those twelve entities. The Steering Committee is the committee where again the voting decisions take place. Our recommendation here was that it be made up of 31 seats. 24 of those seats would be selected based on leadership and representation from grassroots and community based organizations. We further refined that more. We also made some recommendations around business, industry, labor, municipal partners and education partners as part of the 31 how the Steering Committee gets set again, the recommendation was that the Stewardship Committee would create an application, a timeline, and set together a set of characteristics.

16:11

Speaker 2

There are some initial recommendations that we have here regarding what some of those characteristics might be. In order to increase transparency, we had suggested that the Stewardship Committee share back out what their selection process will be, invite feedback, share the application and the timeline and invite feedback and potentially invite non hub leads and non Steering Committee applicants to participate in the selection process. And then there is the Stewardship committee. Stewardship Committee is made up of the Convener and the Fiscal agent. Those two entities will determine what and who else would be on this committee as an implementer. Our recommendation was that there would be I don't know if this could either be staff or consultant to support training and capacity building among the steering committee members to ensure that everybody who was on the steering committee, community members, had an opportunity to fully engage. If the convener and fiscal agent thought that they might need it, Any other consultants that could support surf wide outreach data or governance?

17:50

Speaker 2

Again, from an implementation standpoint? And that may be field by staff. So, as you can see, the only level at which there is a finite number is the Steering Committee. The tables are unlimited. The hub leads is twelve, so that's another set number. The steering committee. The recommendation is 31. The Stewardship Committee, it's at minimum two. If there are any others that will be based on the Convener determining or the Fiscal agent determining that there's a few more on that at that table, the items that were in red were the most recent items that were recommendations. This is also what was presented at the most recent Friday morning meeting. So I'll stop there. That's it.

19:02

Speaker 4

Yeah.

19:22

Speaker 8

I was going to say, I think that the data question is critical. I think we're talking about that in the community engagement side too, initially was brought up earlier. How do you make alignments, how do you prioritize? I know what was mentioned was that there is an RFP process that's being developed for the data and research. I think the sooner and faster we move that process along, the quicker we'll have information that we could look at. I think the challenge will be, as you were saying, to know is like, how do we balance setting the table with representation without having data that might be there might be an issue of concern about alignment, right? Making sure we have good representation, especially from marginalized parts of the county. I think that'll be the challenge we have to figure out.

20:11

Speaker 2

One of the things that is a question that we had was how long should the Steering Committee sit? Because if there is an opportunity to cycle out after a year or two, then the data information can be used to then make decisions about what it looks like going forward.

20:47

Speaker 6

For those wondering, like the encumbrance deadline, what's in the SFP is 2026? Just putting that out there, that's some additional guidance that could change though as well.

21:00

Speaker 2

What is that referring to, Jamaic?

21:03

Speaker 6

That's when implementation funds need to be spent by essentially or distributed, not spent, encumbered.

21:14

Speaker 2

So that's phase two.

21:18

Speaker 6

Correct.

21:19

Speaker 2

And we are in phase one.

21:22

Speaker 6

Yes.

21:23

Speaker 2

Well, as soon as it starts.

21:27

Speaker 6

Right.

21:29

Speaker 9

I have a question. This is Dion from USC. People participating on the tables are going to be compensated correct.

21:41

Speaker 2

For their time, the only area. If so there so the hub leads will have resources now they can compensate people, they can compensate organizations that will be up to the Hub lead and what their strategy is.

22:11

Speaker 9

Okay. That funding is for phase one only.

22:16

Speaker 2  
Phase one.

22:17

Speaker 9  
If we're talking a longer term, that would mean we'd have to apply for and receive funding out of the implementation money to keep this going at a funded level.

22:28

Speaker 2  
Right. That was also contemplated in the proposal.

22:34

Speaker 9  
But that's competitive.

22:36

Speaker 2  
There is no more state funds to go after. I also wanted to answer your question and suggest that there was plan for participant compensation as well at the steering committee level.

22:53

Speaker 9  
Steering committee. Okay. The reason I'm asking is if we're talking about term, I think we need.

23:04

Speaker 2  
To be clear.

23:08

Speaker 9  
When the funding ends that it would be unfunded terms after that for those who would be funded in the initial phase.

23:19

Speaker 2  
That's very possible. Yes.

23:24

Speaker 9

On the sustainability side, it takes another kind of thinking. Like if it was one year term, then the first year term is the easy term because you have resources. After that, you may have to be part of the group who figures out how to get resources in order to maintain the effort.

23:53

Speaker 2

Yes, I see Zahira has her hand up.

23:59

Speaker 1

Thank you. Thank you for going through the structure and the answers to the various questions. I know that part of what was discussed at the beginning and then we talked about again was that level setting of kind of those past discussions. Have we done that or is there additional summarizing of past conversations to have to do the level setting? In this meeting.

24:30

Speaker 2

What I presented was what were referring to as level setting. Great. Thank you. The other thing that is just as a reminder when we talk about Phase One, Phase Two. While the HRTC should live on during the entire implementation of both Phase One and Phase Two, the heart of the work is getting to a point where we have as a region a document that shows the kinds of projects we want to see funded by Phase Two resources. That's the big push in phase one. Once we get to phase two, then groups have the opportunity, communities, groups have the opportunity to go after resources. Those projects that are likely to be most successful are those projects that are responsive to the results of the phase one activities.

26:02

Speaker 4

Your hand is up again.

26:08

Speaker 1

Sorry, I was just still up from before.

26:10

Speaker 2

Okay.

26:14

Speaker 4

I think maybe Sarah James center I think maybe it's a good idea, and I don't know where we would note it, but to indicate in some planning document that for phase two. We're hoping in phase one to get the governance structure as needing the least amount of resources possible. For phase two, considering it may

not be funded. An objective for phase one would be establishing a sustainable, low resource required governance structure for phase two. I don't know where that would go in terms of planning, but hopefully I don't know who's putting everything together in terms of documentation and things like that.

27:12

Speaker 2

Sir. Convener.

27:14

Speaker 4

Okay.

27:17

Speaker 8

Yeah.

27:17

Speaker 6

So, Sarah, to kind of help you out what we're really waiting for right now is that additional guidance from the state so that we can properly guide the HRTC with the next two steps, which would be planning phase of this whole piece. Some things may change from what's in SFP. The other piece is what's in SFP isn't necessarily thorough enough to guide these efforts as it stands right now. We kind of need that additional guidance to really help us move forward appropriately.

27:50

Speaker 4

Do you think that we could, instead of maybe relying on their guidance, kind of make recommendations based off of our experience and understanding of community needs and the Serve program? I think that might be something that we can kind of start chart our own path in some ways. We just don't have the resources to do that.

28:15

Speaker 6

Yeah, absolutely. I think a lot of it right now, I mean, full transparency, everything is really on everyone's behalf is in kind at the moment. Part of that contracting process is bringing on the team that is really going to take all of the information from the tables and hubs and craft all that information into that regional plan that we need to present. As we kind of work through those processes and begin those spa meetings and those town hall conversations and engaging community members, it kind of takes a tremendous effort. Part of that is we want to make sure before we don't put the cart before the horse and start doing multiple items that we don't necessarily have full guidance on what some of this is. A lot of it speaks to some of the things that Ben was saying earlier and we talked about in community on the outreach call as well, which is we have a stakeholder analysis we need to complete.

29:16

Speaker 6

In addition to that, those research RFPs that need to hit the street along with those hub lead RFPs that need to be solicited. We can't put any of that out to really get back information that we need to really set the roadmap forward until we're contracted. That holds up a lot of this process because we need those analyses to really move forward, really, to your point. That's kind of why we're in this weird holding pattern, which is troublesome. Hopefully we can hear something here soon.

29:51

Speaker 4

Go ahead.

29:52

Speaker 2

No, please. Can finish.

29:54

Speaker 4

I was just trying to understand what is the real risk or impact if we don't. They laid out these specific dates, 60 days, things like that, and it's not realistic from a funding perspective for us to meet those deadlines. What's the actual impact from us? If you're selected as the HRTC, we miss a deadline. Probably different for different deadlines, but what's at stake? Do we know.

30:32

Speaker 6

On our end if we miss a debt? Right now, I don't think we're in danger of missing any deadlines simply because we're not contracted. If we receive any information. I know CCF hasn't as well. They're our fiscal agent. Unless we hear differently right now, we're kind of queued up and ready to move forward, to be quite honest. The moment we're contracted, we've got templates for RFPs that are set up for research. We have templates for the hub leads as well that need to be reviewed by the HRTC, and then we'll be able to start really moving a lot of these initiatives forward. If we get additional guidance that speaks differently, we'll immediately share that. That's kind of where we are, unfortunately. I know. Definitely not what I want to hear, and I'm sure it's not what you want to hear either, but that's kind.

31:26

Speaker 4

Of what the situation is.

31:28

Speaker 2

Thank you.

31:28

Speaker 1

Jermaine.

31:29

Speaker 2

Sarah? We run up against the fact that other regions are not missing the deadlines. It comes time to being eligible for phase two, they could be in front of us in terms of having had all of their various activities done, approved by the state and ready to go and able to then move forward with phase two activities. That's really the risk, is that we've got to keep in mind that there's a finite pot of money for phase two, and we want to be fully in a position to go for it and eligible when the time comes.

32:09

Speaker 4

Yeah, I guess this is the last comment I'll add, but the whole point of the questioning, the series of questions, was to get at if we postponed seating, the 31 seats at the steering committee or the community representation table to get the data that we need, and we could jeopardize potentially a deadline as a result. What's the trade off? The benefit of getting the data would increase our success, but we would miss this deadline and potentially what's I guess just trying to see the big picture. Yeah. Okay.

32:58

Speaker 2

Zahira, you had your hand up.

33:01

Speaker 1

Yes. Thank you. I appreciate this conversation and the piece around the data and the timing for it. I just wonder in terms of the question about an ideal scenario in terms of where we have all the data that we need versus time. Even if we were able to start kind of getting pulling the data together tomorrow, how do we have the evaluation, what's the analysis is there back and forth with people in terms of what we're finding. I don't know if that can be necessarily what stops us from moving forward. I just wonder if we have to use our best understanding at this point and then have flexibility within the structure to make some shifts based on what we are able to find out from the data. My other question is for this meeting, like understanding where we are in the process and understanding what we have available to us, what questions are we working to answer in this meeting so that as we're working on continuing the progress forward all right, great.

34:11

Speaker 2

Thank you for that. What was presented today are a series of recommendations as to how each of the tables get set and then some of the characteristics of those who are set at those tables, what some of those characteristics might be. I think that the question there is that recommendation one that is consistent with the consensus that we have as a committee and that recommendation should stand. If not, feel free to

share where you think we might have more discussion. The other area to have maybe more robust conversation is whether does the steering committee are there term limits? Are there terms once you're set, should it be a year or two years? So that's the question. How long is the committee set for? That's the second question.

35:39

Speaker 8

I have.

35:44

Speaker 7

This is Luis Pertill. I'll chime in on that. I would say if we can just relook at them every year or so, not necessarily mean they have to come off, but see if other people are interested in wanting to sit on them. I would think there's nothing wrong with seeing one. I think it allows us to see one. Has there been any members of the committees who have not been attending just because it doesn't permit they thought they would be able to, but they didn't. It allows us to replace them. Two, sometimes when people leave their jobs, leave positions, I wanted to be clear that these are not inherited. If I were to be on this committee and I leave, this position doesn't belong to the partnership. It belongs to that person. That if that person then leaves, their organization doesn't get that slot, that becomes opened up to a broader discussion as to anybody else would be interested and we can look at all those criteria as to who would best fit for that.

36:34

Speaker 7

That'd be my thought.

36:36

Speaker 4

Great.

36:36

Speaker 2

Thank you. That's really good feedback. I see. Mimi, hi. I just had a quick question. I get a good understanding of the steering committee and the stewardship committee, but what's the role for the tables and the hub leads and I'm trying to get an understanding the difference between those and the committees. Let me show you that. So let's go. Okay, so this is the table leads. The table leads are the entities that they'll have contracts. They will be entities that, as you can see here, will be responding to the data analysis. They'll be sharing that information with Table A table. They'll be collecting that information directly from the Steering and or Stewardship committee. They'll be summarizing concepts and ideas that they hear from table A's and sharing that with the Steering and Stewardship committees. This particular table, this B table or this group of hub leads will have a lot of responsibility in terms of both collecting data, sharing it out with the community, and doing that in a way that gets mass audience participation.

38:26

Speaker 2

They will also be responsible for gathering up information and then sharing that information with the steering committee as well. Okay, thank you so much. Benjamin.

38:42

Speaker 8

Yeah. Real quick, two things. One is in terms of the resident participation might need to be a little different in terms of timeline. It takes a while to kind of build capacity sometimes and make sure that folks are actively engaged in a proper way, not just to be rubber stamping pieces. Maybe their tenure might be a little longer, or we could stagger it just so there's continuity in terms of resident participation. Two, to the point that was made about somebody leaving, if they leave to another job, do they stay on board? I mean, conversely to the issue of it's not a slot for the organization, it's the representation of the participant who's been involved or the person who's participating. If they leave and they go to another organization that does similar work, does that mean that they take their seat with them? It's just something to put out there.

39:28

Speaker 2

What did you say at the end there, Vinny?

39:30

Speaker 8

Oh, do they take their position with them to the new organization? Like if they're assigned, if they're sitting at one of the tables as a member of the committee, do they then take that with to their new organization? If the organization is also aligned with this kind of work, or does it just an open seat to elect another person?

39:53

Speaker 2

You want to make a recommendation?

39:57

Speaker 8

Yeah, I think it would just open up an opportunity. In other words, as I said earlier, the seat doesn't belong to the organization. It belongs to the member who's purchasing the process. If that member leaves to go to another organization, I think we have to open the seat up just because there is a relationship between the members time involved in this process and the organization that they work for. I just would think it'd be of a weird situation if the person leaves and then without having an opportunity to change that, replace that position.

40:36

Speaker 2

Because I heard the. Way Louise said it earlier is once you leave that organization, then that whole seat becomes up for refilling.

40:48

Speaker 8

Yeah, I just want to conversely, too, the organization doesn't own the seat, but if the individual leaves and goes to another nonprofit to do work and they're also aligned with this kind of work, do they hold on to that seat? If they still involve with surf? My comment would be that we should just open that seat up to be replaced, just to make it clear and easier.

41:11

Speaker 2

Okay.

41:11

Speaker 1

Yeah.

41:12

Speaker 3

I think a lot of those things were the same kind of questions were having as were going through it. I think that's why we posed it there. Right, but I think that it would definitely weren't looking at it. I think what you guys have shared were things that were toying around it with as well.

41:41

Speaker 2

Okay, I'm taking some notes. We have those. Any other hands up. Let's see, it was the questions that we kind of had were term limits, term length, staggered terms. Once the steering committee is set, should the steering committee be responsible for selecting new members and no longer the stewardship committee? Any thoughts there's?

42:30

Speaker 7

I think my understanding has been that the stewardship committee recommends to the full board the People Full organization right. Who should be appointed to the steering committee. Is that correct?

42:41

Speaker 2

It's not a recommendation. They will decide. Our recommendation is that they will decide.

42:55

Speaker 7

Why would we leave it up to them?

42:59

Speaker 2

That's been a question on the table and that's been the recommendation. We are open to how else do you think it should be decided?

43:09

Speaker 7

Yeah, I would say they can still make the recommendation, but it should go to the full group. When we have those meetings where everybody is invited.

43:18

Speaker 2

We don't think that's a tenable way to make a decision about a group of individuals to sit on the steering committee. So let's go back over the recommendation. And Zahira, I see your hand up.

43:39

Speaker 1

Yeah. I appreciate what's being raised in terms of who does what, but in terms of this is the stewardship committee almost like a governance committee of a board that's then making the recommendations for who sits on that steering committee. I don't think the steering committee should be recommend, like saying for itself who sits on the steering committee. I don't think we're going to get enough differentiation of thought that way.

44:12

Speaker 2

Okay, so that's a different question, but I got your feedback there. Let's go to so this is slide 15 is the one that goes over how the steering committee gets set. The recommendation has been is that the stewardship committee will design an application, they'll design a timeline, they'll identify what the characteristics are for the steering committee members to outline all of the requirements for being a steering committee member. The stewardship committee will select in order to increase transparency and to try and share some power. We recommend that the stewardship committee, when they outline the selection process, invite feedback from the governance committee. When they share the criteria for how they're going to select in the application, they share that with the governance committee. The stewardship committee can also invite non hub leads and non steering committee applicants to participate in the selection process. That it is a manageable number of people who are making the decision about who sits on the steering committee.

45:43

Speaker 7

Who'S on the stewardship committee.

45:45

Speaker 2

The stewardship committee, as you, is made up of the convener and the fiscal agent.

45:55

Speaker 7

LAEDC and the California Foundation decide who's on the steering committee yes.

46:03

Speaker 5

Utilizing the application and like, boring rubric and the structure that's set forth by the broader collaborative.

46:14

Speaker 2

Right.

46:17

Speaker 5

And hi, everyone. It's Kelly. I'm back. Thanks to Noah.

46:20

Speaker 1

I forget.

46:22

Speaker 2

Thanks Jermaine.

46:33

Speaker 1

Is it just those two organizations? I thought in the last slide that the stewardship committee also includes the various leads.

46:40

Speaker 2

So those are to be determined. I know that they're listed there training and capacity building lead. I know those words are written there, but LAEDC has to tell us whether there is such a thing as an outreach lead, a data lead, or a governance lead. The way we had conceived of this is that those might be consultant roles, but I don't know that those are going to exist because LAEDC plans to hire staff. That would really

kind of roll under the convener role. The only two entities that we know for sure at the stewardship committee level are the convener and the fiscal agent.

47:24

Speaker 5

Okay, thank you.

47:26

Speaker 6

To kind of just add to that for some clarity, the decision making body is that steering committee, not the stewardship group. We're essentially just implementing what the HRTC wants to plan, essentially and pushing that forward to the state.

47:52

Speaker 2

Tova, I see your hand is raised.

47:56

Speaker 9

Hi, Tanoa. Good to see you all again. It seems to me the stewardship committee is more focused on operations and moving process forward and meeting state deliverables on this planning grant. Couldn't there be another mechanism for input that could lead to this being done quickly? Like whether there's the ability.

48:26

Speaker 2

During some.

48:27

Speaker 9

Of the feedback but during some of these larger meetings? I'm trying to think of how to solve this right. A lot of input needed to do it fast.

48:38

Speaker 2

Okay.

48:39

Speaker 9

Because of volume. Wouldn't there be the ability that instead of bringing it up as a step by step individual.

48:47

Speaker 2

Agenda item that's.

48:49

Speaker 9

Going to take a bunch of time? These meetings are already rather unwieldy sometimes that there would be the process of adding new members and there could just be a poll and everyone just clicks during the meetings. They can run it and say, yes, we approve, yes, we approve. Yes, we approve, ideally rather quickly so that there could be large consensus without pulling a bunch of time because I think that's really what we're struggling with.

49:14

Speaker 2

Right? I don't think so. I'm not sure what your comment is solving for. There are places for what you just described within the structure and that's the table a's and really what the hub leads will help do so there is plenty of room in the structure that allows for that.

49:39

Speaker 9

The question at hand is who's going to go approve new members?

49:43

Speaker 2

No, that wasn't quite the question. What were discussing is the steering committee and the selection of the steering committee the first time that it's set.

50:03

Speaker 5

Right.

50:04

Speaker 9

Just to clarify, the issue here is who is going to decide who's going to be on the steering committee?

50:10

Speaker 2

I don't know that it's an issue. We do already have a recommendation and the recommendation is that it's the stewardship committee who will lead that process.

50:25

Speaker 9

Okay, well, perhaps I maybe was confused on some of the debate that was happening here about how the steering committee is going to get fully appointed. The conversation was, is the stewardship committee going to work on selecting the steering committee? Or the other comment was that there would be more input from other members outside of what is only identified right now as a couple of people on the stewardship committee making those recommendations.

50:55

Speaker 2

Right. That second matter was a completely different matter.

51:02

Speaker 5

Okay, well, yeah, I think to clarify too, that's like round two once there's a recommendation on the table for the stewardship committee to use the agreed upon application and process for selection for the first time as there is no selected body yet. The open question definitely is, like, as people start to transition off based on the guidelines that we set and then just natural turnover, how do we reallocate individuals to the steering committee? Does that still hold with the original recommendation of the stewardship committee? Or does that transfer to the steering committee's responsibility or some other body?

51:46

Speaker 2

Far, unless there's any other comment, it would go back to the steering to the stewardship committee to select.

52:08

Speaker 7

One thing. I'm not sure, maybe I'm not there you are. Sorry. Hopefully I might be the only one having this problem, but I do better. Maybe I'm just used to it kind of working with organizational chart structure this committee is feeding today and things like that. It possible put it to something together, it's more visually so we can see who's this committee is, this here's, how many slots are on there and this oversees this and this like that. I'd be more than happy to help with that. I think I don't know if anybody else would find that help. I think for me and also kind of just say I know that some of the time frames are still fluid, but I think something that kind of says, hey, we'd like to build in from the time we announce openings for these committees, for the steering committee, we want to give people three weeks to submit applications, things like that.

52:52

Speaker 7

Some a calendar of like here's when things need to be happening, when I think all that might be really helpful. Again, I'd be more than happy to help with that, but if I'm the only one having that issue, then let me know, please.

53:07

Speaker 2

I think we're premature for a calendar. There is no calendar just yet and we have done our best as co chairs to present the consensus. Based on our discussions that we've had, I'm not sure if we reached our skill sets. At some point, I'm sure I know Steven had mentioned that LADC might have some resources to take what has been presented, to modify it accordingly for visual purposes. We'll take that feedback back and look to get clarity on when we could get that done.

53:58

Speaker 6

Yes, that's correct.

54:06

Speaker 5

I think in addition with that calendar, because I agree it's like a next step. Once we figure out the baseline infrastructure of the governance committee, we will need to lay out secondarily, what is the criteria for selection, what is the rubric for waiting those applications? What's the actual process to solicit review and select members? I do agree that's like a body of work that still needs to be fleshed out. I think we do welcome this group's future participation in that development, especially with the LADC once the contract signed and also just folks to start thinking about those things as well. That will be a significant lift.

55:10

Speaker 2

So we are just at time.

55:13

Speaker 6

Yeah, I was going to just say real quick to know. Thank you, everyone. We are having our meeting on Friday to provide an update. We'll have limited updates, obviously, because of where we are with the state, but nonetheless, does this group or speaking to the chairs now as well? I know community engagement outreach is going to just kind of briefly talk because there have been some things that have transpired and so they're going to bring those up for about ten minutes. Do you all want ten minutes to present as well or do you want to bypass that?

55:49

Speaker 2

I don't think we need ten minutes.

55:52

Speaker 6

Five minutes, however much time you may need, do you want to present?

55:56

Speaker 3

The question is, what would we present? Right. Because what we reviewed here is what we reviewed the Friday before.

56:05

Speaker 6

Exactly.

56:07

Speaker 2

Yeah. We added a few notes, but they're not substantial, but there's definitely notes.

56:15

Speaker 6

Okay. We'll put a synopsis together of what transpired and we'll share that with folks that are kind of new to the group because we may have some new members. So no worries. Just wanted to ask to make sure and that's kind of where we are. I do know from that OE meeting, we have sent out emails for those updates from current partners that have already previously signed on to the HRTC. We've also sent out information for those that are going to be new and need to be onboarded in totality. So that information is out. We're getting information back. We've already gotten 24 responses, so we're well on our way from both folks that are updating information and those that are onboarding new. What we'll do is kind of give weekly updates and then hopefully be providing a stakeholder analysis here soon that Community engagement outreach will then utilize to figure out where we are in terms of partner engagement.

57:14

Speaker 6

Just wanted to share that and thank you all.

57:18

Speaker 2

Have a good night. Thank you.