

Community Economic Resilience Fund

L.A. HRTC

Governance Subcommittee Meeting Summary Notes and Transcription May 12th, 2023

Meeting Recording

Passcode: trn+0wh#

Summary Meeting Notes:

A governance committee meeting was held to discuss the governance structure and election process of the steering committee. The SPA based CBOS, table partner leads, affinity hub leads will be responsible for gathering information from their communities and sharing it with others in the governance structure (Steering and Stewardship). The stewardship committee will be responsible for implementing work cerfaced by other groups in the governance structure. Details on grants have not been finalized yet, but they will tie into the overall communication and synthesis of information across all levels of the governance structure before being presented to the Steering Committee for review.

The CERF's Steering Committee's responsibilities include budget allocation, data goals and outcomes, outreach and engagement strategy, and adoption of the regional Phase One strategy. The committee also needs diverse representation from various industries or entities. A Jam board was created for feedback on the governance structure. There is a need for a broad range of organizations to be represented on the steering committee to ensure diversity. The process of finalizing the governance structure has taken over a year and there is a need to move forward with implementing plans soon. A vote will be taken at the next Partners meeting on May 19th, to finalize the Governance Structure of the CERF LA HRTC program.

The meeting discusses the progress of LAEDC in moving forward with seating the steering committee. The values and goals of the governance structure are discussed, including ensuring equitable representation across sectors, communities, and geographies. The timeline for the nomination process and voting roadmap for the steering committee is presented. Concerns about equitable representation among SPAs are raised during a Q&A session at the end.

The HRTC voting process is discussed, including the need for candidates to identify how they represent equity environmental justice and organizations and individuals to be fully onboarded partners in order to qualify to run for a seat. The possibility of using an alternative method instead of a raw vote for seating the steering committee is also mentioned. There is a poll conducted to gain feedback on the nomination structure, with 37% preferring a 150-word candidacy statement only without photo or video. Feedback can be provided offline through email or calls. The meeting is closed with gratitude towards Tanua, Kelly, and all committee members present.

Meeting Outline:

Here's an outline with chapters based on the transcript and their corresponding timestamps:

1. Introduction and Agenda Overview

06:54-08:35: Introductions and overview of the agenda for the meeting

08:40-09:51: Explanation of the main focus of the meeting

2. Governance Structure Discussion

09:58-11:12: Explanation of the visual representation of the governance structure

11:16-12:01: Clarification on the slide presentation

12:35-14:15: Discussion of specific areas associated with required participation in the CERF application

14:15-15:34: Explanation of how information will be presented to the steering committee

3. Steering Committee Discussion

16:05-21:53: Explanation of the steering committee structure and how they will review and make decisions

22:51-25:46: Discussion of the responsibilities of the steering committee

31:36-39:12: Discussion of representation and process for future meetings

42:02-44:35: Overview of steering committee voting roadmap and timeline

44:54-49:35: Discussion of steering committee ballots and feedback on governance structure

50:04-57:34: Discussion of content for steering committee ballots and review of written feedback

58:20-1:03:40: Additional questions and discussion of ballot content

1:03:40-1:07:15: Poll results and end of meeting.

Transcription:

08:48

Speaker 1

Yeah, of course. So today's governance committee meeting. The goal today is to kind of do a brief overview since we did do an overview of the governance structure at our previous governance committee meeting, SUNUA had gone through the evolution of the steering committee, but today's focus would be getting all the feedback that we can on the governance structure and the steering committee structure. We'll also be going over the steering committee election process and inquiring about feedback that you all might have regarding our election nomination structure. So, again, just for the sake of informing everyone as best as we can before we move forward with our voting on the final steering committee structure next Friday, we want to just do a brief overview of all of our hub structure, our steering committee and our stewardship committee structure and all of the governance structure. I'll go ahead and move forward to the next slide.

09:47

Speaker 4

Thank you for that, Alan.

09:49

Speaker 1

Yeah, of course.

09:51

Speaker 4

What I'll do is kick off by going through and discussing the governance structure. This will be an opportunity to recap what went over last governance meeting, along with our discussion that we had at our partner meetings on a couple of Fridays ago. I'm very sorry if my background is loud. I am traveling, but wanted to make sure we kept our cerf business moving forward. The document that you see in front of you is a beautiful visual that was put together by the LAEDC team, but really represents the elements of an overall governance structure that this group, along

with others who may not be here, help put together. When we start at the top, the idea is that everything you see on this sheet represents the governance structure and it has various elements in it. The CBO, spa based micro grantees, they don't necessarily have to be called grantees, but basically community development or community based organizations and a variety of topics are listed here as really the part of the governance structure where ideas are generated, needs are generated and assessed.

11:12

Speaker 3

Sorry to interrupt.

11:13

Speaker 7

Can you make the slide bigger? It's hard to see.

11:16

Speaker 4

What we're looking at is a visual that shows the next slide. If there's any way to put it in presentation mode, I think that will help people be able to see the overall slide.

11:30

Speaker 1

I'm sorry, are you guys seeing the black and the gray?

11:33

Speaker 4

Yes.

11:34

Speaker 1

Oh, man, nobody told me. Okay, sorry about that. I think you must be sharing from my second monitor. Let me go ahead and reshare.

11:41

Speaker 4

I'll also share the graphic he's displaying in the chat box. Thank you for that, Scarlet. As a reminder, this information is also available on the LAEDC website where we have our Cerf information.

11:57

Speaker 1

Are you all able to see that now? Is it full screen?

12:00

Speaker 4

It's full screen now.

12:01

Speaker 1
Perfect.

12:03

Speaker 4

All of the areas that are listed under the CBO area are connected to requirements around Cerf, as well as some identified areas that the Outreach and Engagement Team have identified in terms of making sure that we have a variety of voices from across the county that have a chance to participate in this process. The next layer is our table leads. These are still listed as TBD. Part of what we discussed last time is that there may be some specific areas that, as an overall HRTC, we determine. We want to make sure that there are resources for specific communities that may not be represented somehow in some of these other areas. Again, those organizations will be involved in collecting information, sharing information with the community. We get to the Affinity Hub leads at this level. Again, these particular topics are very much associated with the required level of participation in the Cerf application.

13:16

Speaker 4

Affinity Hub leads will also have the responsibility of not only taking information, synthesizing information that is gathered from the CBO and Table Lead organizations, they'll be sharing information that comes from data, from the analysis and research that takes place. They'll be sharing that information out in community. Hub Leads really have the responsibility of doing a lot of synthesis of information going in both directions. The information that is synthesized from there will also be shared. With the steering committee moving us into the steering committee the hope is that between the CBOs, the partner leads the affinity, hub leads. We really start to create a regional consensus around what's important for community participation, engagement and projects. The direction of those projects really gets baked. Hopefully as much as possible with that wide consensus of conversation among community that information will then be presented to the steering committee.

14:24

Speaker 4

The steering Committee is the body under which if there is a need for any kind of voting or decision making is where that would take place. It's currently anticipated that this committee, for example, from a value standpoint will have a supermajority of community based community partner organization participation with participation from other key sectors in the region. 33 seats and this will make up the steering Committee. The Stewardship committee is made up going back stewardship committee is then made up of the fiscal agent as well as the convener those entities are responsible for implementing the work as surfaced by CBOs partner leads hubs and validated by the Steering Committee they're responsible for implementing that work. We can now move along. This was just a reminder as to what some of the thinking was behind moving from 21 seats to 31 seats to 33 seats. This is in response to series of conversations much like the ones that we're having right now, where there was an interest increasing the number of seats or adding, for example, municipal or educational partners.

15:45

Speaker 4

In doing that in order to maintain our values around having a supermajority of community based organizations and partners at the table, it was determined that we would then need to, just from a math standpoint, additional community based seats so that we could keep that supermajority.

16:05

Speaker 3

Hey Tanoa, this is Charles, the program director. I see where there's a hand up from Luis. I don't want you to go so far ahead that you may have to rewind to something that you're referring to. Luis, please.

16:19

Speaker 7

Yeah, can you go back to the previous slide? I still don't quite understand how all these tie together. I see there's the spa based micro grantee so I'm assuming, what does that mean? I'm in I think service area six, let's say for the San Gabriel Valley. There's going to be one 2312 of these organizations within the San Gabriel Valley.

16:43

Speaker 4

So that has not been determined. The way you want to think about these is that these are organizations that are some, once they're selected equitably distributed throughout the county from a variety of expertise on various topics and the term grantee shows up there because it is the understanding that each of those organizations, or at least 90 organizations will receive a grant. Their goal as part of that grant would be to engage their constituencies, communities, sharing with them. What the current research is that LAEDC is in the process of convening right now that research will say things like these are the industries, these are the types of opportunities in those industries. This is what the skill set looks like for residents of La County by demographic, by location. Really those groups are to assist with gathering information from the community regarding feedback on what the barriers are and what opportunities should exist for community as we move towards a high road transition again.

18:06

Speaker 7

You're saying there's 90 grantees nine spa areas and there's twelve categories. Theoretically every spa area should get at least twelve grants, is that correct?

18:19

Speaker 4

I'm not able today because that hasn't been determined. I cannot specifically say that a spa will get a specific number. What I can say is the goal here is for every spa to be well represented.

18:40

Speaker 7

Okay, but just pointing out, if you did get every spa, maybe I'm doing my math wrong. An equal number of grants, that would be 108 grants, not 90.

18:52

Speaker 4

When we talk about equity, it's not always about an equal number of something happening within each district, right? There are going to be spas where there are going to be needs that might be different from other spas. It's not just about the number of grants that are within each spa. It's really looking at and understanding what's happening in each spa, what are the needs and how do we make sure that the most vulnerable in those spas have representation and coverage. That may mean that some spas will access more grants. That doesn't mean other groups can't participate. It just may mean that there might be more grants in particular area because that might be what's needed in that spa.

19:40

Speaker 7

Have we outlined what the grants are for?

19:43

Speaker 4

Again, this is getting into detail under Stewardship Committee activity from a governance perspective. We have not gotten into the detail on who's going to get a grant, how many grants.

19:57

Speaker 7

No, I'm just saying have we what the grants are for?

20:03

Speaker 4

There is some of that's been done, but I can't say that all of that work has been done yet.

20:10

Speaker 7

I don't want to hog up those time because I know there's other people who probably have questions, but so then once these people get the grants, how does their work tie into every tie into the affinity hub leads, to the Table partner leads, and to the steering committee.

20:23

Speaker 4

Again, the details on what each grantee will do is still information that's being worked out. In terms of how it all ties together, the CBA spa based grants as well as the Table leads, for example, are really communicators. They're communicating research information, they're communicating up feedback from the community. They're engaging and trying to make sure that everybody knows that the cerf process is taking place and the cerf process is prioritizing the most vulnerable in the county. We need feedback on what is it going to take to reach the most vulnerable in being able to access opportunity. The CBOs and partner leads are really focused on gathering that information. The hub leads, the hub leads have more responsibility in the sense that they are doing a lot of the synthesis of that information. They are taking in both sides and really providing some understanding as to what kind of consensus has come forth from community in relation to any research or other information that's out there.

21:51

Speaker 7

How does that tie into the steering?

21:53

Speaker 4

That is the information that the Steering Committee will then review. They'll know that so many youth organizations, CBOs hosted X number of youth meetings and X number of languages across X number of regions. The results of those activities will be synthesized by maybe an affinity hub lead and shared with the Steering Committee. They have an idea of what has that outreach netted in terms of understanding as to what either youth or youth serving organizations think needs to happen.

22:30

Speaker 2

There a bucket offer that maybe you go ahead and finish your presentation and we come back to the questions?

22:38

Speaker 4

I think that would be great. Now, Luis, I have gone through and answered your question regarding how it all comes together and then Scarlett has also set in. I think in the chat already we have descriptions that also can be read that go through what I have described here verbally but also in writing. That way maybe that can also help with connecting, making the connection. We honestly are actually living out our process in a lot of ways. By the way, we have managed the HRTC process so far, meaning, you see, LAEDC is implementing to some extent between the affinity hubs, I would say is what the co chairs have really served as. A lot of this has come from community based organizations and individuals such as yourselves in terms of how the overall process or feedback on the overall process. Actually the good news is that I feel like we're getting a lot of practice in living out this process.

23:47

Speaker 4

I will go on because I think we don't have too much more to go. This one in particular is really just about the values and the number of seats which I went over. I think we can go to the next slide. This is just an up close view of the Cerf Steering Committee, who's on it and who would need to be seated on this particular body within the overall governance structure. It also notes what the responsibilities are here, including determining budget allocation, the goals and outcomes of the data, outreach and engagement strategy, helping to adopt the regional Phase One strategy which will create a roadmap for what projects get prioritized in Phase Two.

24:47

Speaker 1

And Tanua. I can hop in here. We do have a Jamboard that we had sent out in a newsletter previously. Unfortunately, we did not receive any feedback on a Jam board thus far and we're hoping to have that feedback to discuss it here today at this meeting. Scarlett or anyone from our team will drop the link to the Jamboard and everyone feel free to go ahead and add feedback regarding the governance structure. What I'm going to do is I'm just going to really quickly stop sharing this and then I'll go ahead and open the jamboard so you can all see how it looks if you're not opening it on your end.

25:28

Speaker 4

Thank you, Alan.

25:38

Speaker 1

I see Scarlett has dropped in the chat, so that's perfect.

25:46

Speaker 4

Everyone's familiar with jamboard, feel free to click on the link, and in the link there, Alan's going to share it. You'll notice that there's my info right there.

26:08

Speaker 1

Go ahead and try to mute this. Someone on the team can mute that.

26:19

Speaker 2

Coach Ron, you need to mute yourself. Coach Ron.

26:24

Speaker 1

Okay, can you all see the jamboard on the screen?

26:29

Speaker 4

Yes.

26:29

Speaker 1

Perfect. So, yeah, just to go over this jamboard, essentially, you can leave sticky notes. Feel free to grab a sticky note here and it'll populate whatever you type in there. You could stick it anywhere on the surface here. We included a couple of other pages for the general governance structure as well. Feel free to put questions, feedback, comments on this jamboard because we definitely want to discuss that during this meeting before next Friday. Does anyone have any questions regarding the jamboard?

27:05

Speaker 2

I have a question before we get to the jamboard. If you go back to the slide, it shows all the different categories. You have the businesses listed there.

27:22

Speaker 1

Was it this one?

27:24

Speaker 2

So, business and industry. Before I ask my question, can you just give me an idea of what that looks like? I don't understand that.

27:35

Speaker 1

Just to clarify, these are the different seats for the steering committee. Within these seats, we designated a number of seats to different industries or entities. So, for example, the business and industry seats would likely be held by, for example, like, an employer and something that might be related to cerf. For example, one of the goals of cerf would be that transition to a carbon neutral economy. An example of someone who may take a seat in the business and industry is, let's say it's a carport company that manufactures the charging stations. Does that kind of clarify what that is?

28:20

Speaker 2

I want to offer a suggestion because, particularly since we're doing environmental issues, I think we may need to

expand the number of seats for business and maybe attempt to target some companies that are part of the billion dollar roundtable, where there's a natural affinity to reach out to small businesses and mid sized businesses. Take, for example, Johnson Controls, who's deep in that space for energy efficiency and so forth, and all of the accruals that come with that and then learn from the industry perspective more broadly than narrow casting is just an individual service offering.

29:03

Speaker 4

Let's go back and I'm zahira, I see your hand, Alan. Let's go back to respond to Robert, the back. What you've described. Robert, we've discussed at the governance level, and there are opportunities at the affinity hub level, as well as what would be doesn't have to be a micro grantee because the plan was not necessarily to give out a grant, but community based or table lead partners. There is absolutely an opportunity and expectation. Kelly, you can step in here because I know we had this discussion that we would have various industries, we'd want to hear from them as well and have their input. That input is absolutely available to be held at any of these other levels. The concept of them going on a steering committee, there will be representation. The goal, again, from a value standpoint, we're trying to balance ensuring that community voice was the largest is it here?

30:24

Speaker 2

Yeah. Before Zara responds I just wanted to suggest the reason I'm suggesting this is because oftentimes community may not have as broad of a lens of the landscape of say for example, the energy efficiency green space is so broad that we really need a big thinker organization, if you would, that then could feed down into the other elements as we move forward, and that would then inform directions that we need to go. It would also open up opportunity for the smaller companies to be part of their recruitment for dei initiatives within their corporations.

31:01

Speaker 4

Absolutely. This is also part of the research that's happening as well now.

31:07

Speaker 3

Okay, thank you. Thank you. This is Charles Johnson. I just want to jump in real fast. Robert, you're making a great point, and it's a point that's been brought up by many HRTC members. Keep in mind that in those affinity hubs and maybe even the partner table partner leads, there will be representation from those different organizations there as well. It's not like everything is feeding down and waiting for expertise to come. It'll be there along the way. There'll be representation throughout the entire process. I know it seems like it's kind of lopsided when there's 20 seats for the CBOs and five seats for resident workers and two for everyone else. The truth of the matter is there's going to be representation throughout this entire process.

31:54

Speaker 2

Right.

31:55

Speaker 4

Okay, Zahira, thank you.

31:59

Speaker 5

I'm actually happy to have Louise go first. Thank you.

32:02

Speaker 7

Okay, Louise, for the two questions, is there any requirement that the people who are on the steering committee also be holding some kind of role in either the micro grantees, the affinity hub leads, essentially that they be one of those as well?

32:22

Speaker 4

It's quite possible that they could be. I know that's a discussion that we're open I think LADC is open to feedback on as the convener. There has been some discussion that is very possible that you work for an organization that is an affinity hub or a CBO based Michael grantee and you sit on the steering committee, but we're open to feedback on that.

32:53

Speaker 7

I would recommend something like that just because I worry that if the people sitting on the steering committee are not involved in some of the other stuff and we're hoping that those individuals are sharing up the information, that there is going to inherently create a gap between what the work that's being done one level and the other one. I want to make sure there isn't this kind of group that's kind of just out there and kind of doing their own thing but not really involved with some of the work that's going on the local level. The second one would be is and I don't know if this already has it, but if we haven't, I would like for us to go through and specify in more detail what those seats should be. For example, we have 20 seats for community based organizations. I would like for us to go through in more detail and kind of say at least one of these has to be an environmental justice group.

33:40

Speaker 7

At least one of these has to be LGBTQ. At least one of these has to be disadvantaged kind of going through for residential, for five seats, for resident workers and community partners. We have to say one has to be for resident, one has to be for workers, one has to be for community partners. For business and industry, one can be a large business employer, one can be a small business employer. For labor, one could be public employees, one could be a private sector employee union, municipal partners, a contract city versus a non contract city and kind of have us specify as much as possible because my concern is that you have one type of organization dominating this. If we have like nine environmental justice organizations in the 20 community based organizations, that isn't a really accurate representation. I'd rather have us err on the side of caution and say these are the types of organizations we want to make sure we at least have one of on this steering committee.

34:32

Speaker 7

I think that the bill specifically called for us to have certain groups on there. I want to make sure that those groups that the bill called for us to have are specifically outlined to be taking up one of those seats.

34:43

Speaker 4

Keep in mind, Luis, that the entire governance structure is compliant with the bill because it is an entire governance structure. Steering committee is one element of that. Second, you bring up a very good point and there was a document early on that very much specified the exact number of seats for each of the categories, but there was not

broad consensus on those exact numbers. We instead determined as a community that what you're describing is the direction that we'd want to go, which is to have as much diverse city as possible among all of the 33 seats. The specification of one seat for this one seat for that was too narrow for the overall group. We could not get to a level of consensus on that. But I think everybody agrees. The hope is that we won't have all environmental justice or one type of group, that we will have a variety.

35:56

Speaker 4

That's more or less where we ended up. We will note that you are calling for just a amount.

36:05

Speaker 7

A final comment for me on that. Just and I'll be quiet after this. I think on that one, it was made more specifically related to the ethnic makeup or the racial makeup of people. Folks, I think on this one, I would like to maybe if we can set up a process where we say, here is the ideal. Again, everybody lists their organizations, people nominate, what type of organizations we should be have taking up these. If there's more groups listed than there are seats, then we can kind of go through a process of cutting these down to kind of get as much representation as possible. I just want to make sure that we have a very diverse group of people, whether it's homeless, whether it's people with mental health, whether it's people with physical disabilities, whether it's other types of groups that we want to make sure are represented.

36:50

Speaker 7

I'd rather err on the side of caution of we have now the overarching tables of what we have, what type of organizations we want, how many seats. Let's go and try to make sure that we can make that representation as broadly as possible.

37:04

Speaker 1

Thank you.

37:04

Speaker 4

Kindly put that in the notes. That would be great to have on the Chamboard, Luis, where you kind of highlight that out. Sure. Thank you. Kelly, you may have wanted to respond, but I know Sahira has been waiting patiently.

37:20

Speaker 6

Sahira, go ahead. I'll follow.

37:22

Speaker 5

Okay, thank you. Well, thank you for this and really appreciate seeing the full structure. Again, my question is one just around process. I was kind of reflecting back in terms of how long we've been kind of going through the structure and having these discussions. It's been over a year. We've had a framework for a while, and we've been talking back and forth, and there were some things that were able to make it in and some things that weren't. I mean, I know that for my organization, we actually wanted to see more representation from CBOs and residents, and we lost of that percentage. We do think that we're landing in pretty much like a good place. I know at this point we

won't see drastic changes because that would kind of nullify the past year plus of work that we've all been collectively doing. This might be like the next part of the agenda.

38:21

Speaker 5

What is our process so that when we come together again as a governance committee, we're kind of talking about a different portion of this. Attending these meetings, I tend to see that we're kind of looking at the same issues. We're responding to the same questions again, which I very much appreciate the patience and the feedback and the engagement so fully of everyone. We have a lot of work to do. How do we kind of start getting to the point where we roll up our sleeves and start doing whatever is like that next stage of work?

38:54

Speaker 4

So thank you for that. Thank you to you and others who I know have surgery through this process over the last year. I think we're there. This was an opportunity from the last meeting to get any major jamboard notes in. As you can see, no major ones came in. We've got some conversation happening today, but it's all very much in line with the values of the overall governance structure and can be things that we kind of drill down into. My understanding now in LAEDC is that they're moving forward with seating the steering committee, and we'll talk about that process, which we want to get to now. That would mean that when we get together on the 19th, we understand that this is our governance structure and this is how we're going to be operating. That is the goal from this foundation. Kelly, thank you.

39:55

Speaker 6

Tanua yeah, I mean, I echo a lot of what's been said already. I think one of my points was the steering committee has had a lot of discussion and I both co sign the idea that we want as much representation as possible. This is like where we landed with the consensus of the group over the past year. I think, like tinua has said it a couple of times, it's like the values of making sure that we have this really robust and expansive information gathering convening process across sector, across communities, across geographies. That at the end, when we're looking at strategy and implementation of projects, the community is the last to weigh in here, but that everyone has a place in this process and in a very important place. You can see it's intentional that this isn't like a typical hierarchy. This visual, right? Like the visual is actually meant to demonstrate that everyone has a place in a role.

41:08

Speaker 6

So I just wanted to echo that. The other point I wanted to make because there was the comment around folks on the steering committee and folks on other parts of the governance structure, whether it's a table leader and affinity hub. I think the only comment that we had I'll lift up here is that say you're on the steering committee but also serve in an organization that's an affinity hub or participating in the governance structure and like promoting a project in the future for implementation. I think we will have to think about together, like where. Folks recuse themselves right from the steering committee because our first tack together is develop a countywide strategy that promotes equitable opportunity. There's the opportunity for us to put forth projects that get funded in the region, which is really exciting.

42:02

Speaker 1

Perfect. Thank you, Kelly, and thank you to Noah. And thank you for everyone's questions, feedback. Please make sure to put it on the jamboard just so we have everything in writing for your very useful suggestions. So it looks like we're at 138. We have about 20 minutes left. We're just going to go ahead and move forward. So moving towards

the steering committee election. Our team has been working very diligently on kind of hashing this election process out. I just wanted to give a brief overview on a steering committee voting roadmap and the timeline that we're looking at right now. This upcoming May 19 date, which is next Friday, we'll be voting on the final steering committee structure, which is why we are having this meeting today to get all the feedback. I'm sorry, what was that?

42:52

Speaker 4

We should be voting on the overall governance structure, not just the steering committee structure.

42:59

Speaker 1

Thank you.

42:59

Speaker 4

I didn't have a chance to provide that feedback. I think the document should reflect that.

43:05

Speaker 1

Awesome. Thank you for that clarification. Yes, the governance structure, because every role plays an equal role. There's no hierarchy. The May 22 date, our nomination window will open, so candidates will be able to submit a nomination form, which we'll talk about later. The nomination window will end June 5. Our governance structure and process is due to the state on June 6, and June 19, will open the election voting and close it on July 3 and announce it July 4. Once we hit July 6, our steering committee seating is due to the state.

43:44

Speaker 3

Allen, before you go too far, I just want to let you guys know I'm going to probably put in a request to the state to try to extend that deadline. They may say yes, they may say no. With July 4, my fear is that people are going to go out of town and may not have enough time to devote and see results and all that. I'm going to see if I can get an extension on that July 6 date of having everyone seated, but it is a possibility that the request is declined.

44:17

Speaker 1

Perfect. Thank you, Charles. Charles, I'm actually transitioning it to you now. Do you want to share the electrical mechanism mockup? Awesome. Let me go ahead and wait a minute.

44:28

Speaker 3

I guess it will probably help if I actually hit the Share Screen button.

44:35

Speaker 1

Okay. Oh, my.

44:38

Speaker 3

Where is my Share screen button? That's not good. All right. Are you guys seeing a PowerPoint?

44:57

Speaker 4

It's coming.

45:03

Speaker 3

Are you guys seeing a PowerPoint?

45:05

Speaker 1

Yeah, we could see it.

45:06

Speaker 3

Okay, we can.

45:07

Speaker 1

Full screen it now.

45:08

Speaker 3

Okay, so obviously everyone's curious how this election is going to go. We've been working with a company here in Los Angeles who donated their time so far, putting together a demonstration of how the election could go. And with no payment, by the way. They had a working demo ready for us, but they're actually moving forward to build it out. I had to build a PowerPoint just to kind of walk you guys through it because that link is not working right now. However, we're going to try to make this as simple as possible for you guys. And we'll have a home page. Do you guys see my mouse moving? Okay, so we're going to have just a home page that kind of outlines everything and giving directions on how you should start. Okay, perfect. The six categories for the steering committee that everyone's going to be voting on, there's 20 seats for the CBOs, five for the resident workers, and two for the remaining four.

46:32

Speaker 3

So it'll go something like this. The community based organizations will have some type of description of the purpose of these and then they have the opportunity to scroll down and see what.

46:52

Speaker 4

The.

46:53

Speaker 3

Candidates, what they look like and as well as whatever their message is. Now, here's the issue. Right here, we have the opportunity to have a video where you can the candidates can take a video from their phone and upload it. Essentially, it's like a commercial. You have your own personal commercial to go right here. Or if that's too cumbersome for majority of the people on this, call the candidates. We can just have a picture or no picture at all. It's completely your choice. We have to agree to videos or photos. We can't have a mixture of both. Unfortunately, it just won't be enough time for the developer to build it out. Regardless, let's say it's a picture only underneath is where there'll be a full description of their organization, the type of organization, Luis, you were concerned with that. Here's a perfect opportunity for every voter to see which type of organization is running for those seats, as well as the message that they want to convey.

48:14

Speaker 3

Again, it'll be either whether they're writing text or they're using video in this spot right here. The reason were given that opportunity to have video is because we understand right now that you guys have been text heavy with everything. Pretty much every piece of documentation you guys have been getting has been something that you have to read. It feels like that you guys are just reading books all the time. Visuals really do help quite a bit. There's an opportunity if you decline it, that's completely fine. The developer can just make sure that it's a photo or no photo, and you can just rely on the written message. Regardless, you just scroll down to see each candidate and in this case, it'll be 20 candidates. The top 20 candidates will be elected, and then everyone else will be voted out for each section. Resident workers will be five candidates for there.

49:18

Speaker 3

Scroll down is kind of the exact same process going all the way through. So, Allen, I can turn it back to you because we're getting tight on time anyway.

49:29

Speaker 1

Thank you, Charles, and let me go ahead and reshare my screen. I see a couple of questions and thank you for your patience. I think we want to kind of move forward through the rest of the presentation first to make sure we get your feedback and comments at the end, if that's okay. Let me go ahead and share my screen. Are you able to see the PowerPoint or what? I think I see it on the other window.

50:09

Speaker 3

You had it right, actually. You just needed to put it in presentation mode.

50:13

Speaker 1

There we go. Thank you for the presentation of the mockup, and Charles did go over this . The nomination process will be a two week period, and we'll be creating a Google form created for the candidates of the steering committee to submit their nomination information. We're looking to ask the following information. The name, the seat, the nominee is running for their title organization. I know that there are seats for residents, community partners, and worker seats who may not be affiliated with or representing a specific organization. We can potentially just make that field optional. To make sure we're being inclusive of our individual residents and community stakeholders, we're asking their area of specialty, associated service, planning area, and, of course, a candidacy statement with 150

word max. In the case that we do move forward with a photo or video, we would be providing a link to a cloud based drive that will be provided so nominees can submit their photo and video to us that can be uploaded to the website.

51:18

Speaker 1

What we're going to do now is we're going to go ahead and conduct the poll. The question of this poll is, what should the steering committee ballots include? This is referencing to should we include picture video or only text? Only a text description.

51:35

Speaker 4

Before we start the poll, I think there's some questions that probably should be answered prior to that.

51:43

Speaker 1

Can you please call out the names? I'm not able to see it on my screen due to me sharing.

51:48

Speaker 3

Sharon, you're muted. Sharon, hi.

51:55

Speaker 8

Thank you. Two things. A few of us looked over the document and recommendations and submitted written comments. How are those being factored into the structure of the ballot?

52:12

Speaker 3

I'm sorry, can you ask the question again?

52:16

Speaker 8

Some of us got together and reviewed the proposed governance structure as requested from the previous meeting and provided written documents and comments with regard to items. We're asking, how are those written feedback and comments in terms of the revenue structure and concerns being factored into the structure and design of the ballot.

52:44

Speaker 3

Scarlett, I think this is probably because I don't believe I was on that meeting.

52:49

Speaker 1

If I can hop in really quickly, sharon, this is a document that you had shared with us.

52:55

Speaker 8

Yeah, and they went out, there was a group meeting, and we did share the document. There were some concerns, like the restriction that there are community based, that the 20 is only community based organizations, where the proposal says it's community based leaders and community organizations. We're looking at how is that content going to be structured, how is that feedback going to be factored in before a ballot is designed? One of the issues is that every spa should have to have representation, equitable representation on the steering committee that's in our proposal, 33 people divided by nine does not add up. Those are discussions that were questions that need to be brought forward, especially when it comes to how you design the ballot. If you take the top 20, you could take ten people from one spot.

53:50

Speaker 3

Well, I think I can't speak for the entire HRTC. However, the thought process behind having an election like this where the candidates are being transparent and which spa that they serve, which type of organization they are, that will give everyone who is voting the opportunity to vote for whomever they want. If there's another way that you guys see it, then I think that should.

54:25

Speaker 7

Be.

54:27

Speaker 3

Discussed and solidified quickly.

54:34

Speaker 8

I agree. Again, were just asked to provide feedback and comments, and so, unfortunately, I was sitting in the waiting room and couldn't get in, and I don't know if that stuff got discussed. Again, I definitely from this just question in terms of what the steering committee should include. It should include a statement, a question that asked the candidate to identify how they represent equity environmental justice, because there's a prerequisite in the proposal that priority is given to organizations that represent equity economic justice. Something else, I think each candidate has to speak to that so that they can determine what they're representing and nobody can determine that for them.

55:28

Speaker 3

I agree. I think that's where the opportunity for what can happen on the ballot is certainly for us to make sure that the candidates are listing what type of organization they are, which body work, where they're based. There can be other prerequisites, so to speak, just so the entire HRTC voting body can understand what they're quote unquote voting for, who they're voting for, and then they make the decisions from there. Essentially, outside of that, it's their own campaign. It's just like any candidate, at some point, they have to convince the voter that they should vote for them over someone else. Hopefully they'll have a compelling message in order to do that, including being equitable. However, if there's another way that the Hrtcs fit, then let's have that discussion. We're getting tight on time. I'm not exactly sure Sharon, I'm not sure if you muted, but Luis, you have another question.

56:45

Speaker 3

We're going to have to make it quick.

56:47

Speaker 7

Yeah, I was sure. A couple of things. One, who can be nominated to serve on the steering committee? Do they have to be an organization that's signed that agreement with the LADC kind of said, hey, you have to.

56:59

Speaker 3

Be a fully onboarded partner. Yes.

57:01

Speaker 7

You have to be a fully onboarded partner, but as long as you're a member of that organization. Meaning if it's not me, it could be somebody who just happens to be a part of the partnership.

57:12

Speaker 3

If they're within your organization, they represent your organization. You're all one vote anyway.

57:17

Speaker 7

Okay, so how do we verify who's voting and who can vote?

57:22

Speaker 1

I could clarify on that, Luis. We did discuss in our last meeting who exactly will be voting from each organization, and that would be the primary point of contact indicated in the partnership agreement letter. Let's say it's you, Luis, or let's say it's another person from your organization. You would have to email us directly at cerf@laedc.org to let us know that you will be changing your voter status to someone else in your organization. I hope that clarifies. Does that make sense?

57:54

Speaker 7

Yeah, that's fine.

57:55

Speaker 1

Okay.

57:55

Speaker 7

The final recommendation I would make is one, if we could avoid having two things, actually. One for the since Luis, I'm sorry.

58:06

Speaker 3

Buddy, I'm going to have to cut you off because we have someone else with a question and we're really tight on time. We have to be respectful of everyone else's time. If you need something else, I dropped my email in the chat. Let's have a chat offline, and I.

58:18

Speaker 7

Said, let's do it.

58:19

Speaker 3

Okay.

58:20

Speaker 1

Thank you.

58:20

Speaker 3

Zahara, please go ahead.

58:22

Speaker 5

Great. Thank you. Excited about us moving forward with the governance structure. I am concerned, like other comments that might have us continue to evolve it again, we've been working on this for over a year, and so I hope that as we kind of see this again, it's not a new version of this because there has been a lot of work that's been done to that. I keep hearing comments that suggest this is going to continue evolving. That's concerning the other piece, in terms of how the steering committee is seated, I know that there's just a lot of emphasis on the steering committee specifically, even though it's just one of many structures amongst the governance structure. This voting process, what else was considered other than this particular type of voting process.

59:13

Speaker 3

What else was considered in terms of just how the voting process is set up?

59:21

Speaker 1

No.

59:22

Speaker 5

What else was considered in terms of how you collaboratively bring together stakeholders who are there to share

information and understand collaboratively work together? The process I'm looking at is a process that reminds me of something that's more of that could have a lot of inequity in it. Especially because a larger organization would have the ability to even if they just get one vote themselves, they're network based. They have more people to be able to say, like, you should vote for me, or lots of other different pieces. I just don't understand from what else was considered other than doing this type of voting process. Because I know that for so many of us who have worked on collaborative efforts for years, there are many ways to seat a steering committee and many of them don't involve a vote.

01:00:18

Speaker 3

There was discussion, from my understanding prior to me getting here, that there was talk about a selection committee and the selection committee, essentially. I don't want to put words in anyone's mouth, but it felt more like an electoral college where LADC would be in charge of selecting, putting together criteria to decide who would be choosing the steering committee. I may be completely off on this, but regardless, it was a process that regarded that involved LADC to make a decision for the HRTC and that strips us of our neutrality and that's something that we cannot be involved in. I'm sorry, Zaheer, you seem like you're about to say something.

01:01:16

Speaker 5

Yeah, I don't know what can be done within the next week to kind of consider what are the options in terms of seating the steering committee, because I do. As someone who has formulated and sat many steering committees and other entities addressed with governance and as a neutral convener, and that's the type of organization that I run myself, that piece of neutrality just does not end up becoming a concern in those instances because you're not selecting the people. You could also have restrictions in terms of who's even part of that selection committee that they cannot be part of an organization that then would be considered for the steering committee. I would just like to kind of see if there's possibility to still consider other options for seating a steering committee that's not a raw vote, where it starts to end up being something different from what we see typically in our traditional collaborative efforts that really strip away issues of inequity that come up.

01:02:17

Speaker 5

When we're doing a process that is like this, where it's a vote, it's of like a popularity contest. That's different from trying to get the right people at the right table based on a number of different factors of what they bring.

01:02:34

Speaker 3

I understand your concern. I think probably the best way to do it, and it would have to be done very quickly, is for the committees to come together with an alternative to the voting process because I'm sorry if it's really loud in the back. The selection committee idea did not go across very well. If there's an alternative that the HRTC or the committee's co chairs agree upon, I think we can bring that to the HRTC partners and let them decide which one works better for them. The issue is that we need to move forward quickly, but we certainly want, again, everyone's voice to be heard. If the majority feels that the voting process is inequitable, then that needs to be addressed. It needs to be addressed really quick.

01:03:40

Speaker 1

Is that all for the questions? Charles? I believe you're on mute. Okay. I see Tony raising a hand. Tony, it's 159.

01:03:54

Speaker 3
I'm sorry.

01:03:54

Speaker 1

I don't mean to push everyone because of time. However, are we okay with moving forward with the poll just so we can gain these results during this meeting?

01:04:04

Speaker 4

I did put two comments in the chat. One's a clarification and the other kind of follows up on what Sahara was just talking about, the issue of bias and go to the vote.

01:04:21

Speaker 5

I know what I'll be voting.

01:04:25

Speaker 1

Got it.

01:04:26

Speaker 3

Okay.

01:04:26

Speaker 1

Thank you, Tony. We can always have offline conversations with everyone, so we can definitely discuss that further. I'm going to go ahead and open up the poll now before everyone drops off. Is everyone able to see the poll? Okay, I see some people submitting their answers and I'll give a minute.

01:04:55

Speaker 8

I don't have access to the poll. My phone.

01:04:59

Speaker 1

Is there a button? Oh, got you. We have 15 answers so far. 16 out of 35 participants in here. It 25 people answered.

01:05:32

Speaker 3

Alan, someone yardina says she I'm sorry, accidentally closed the poll. Can they get it again?

01:05:42

Speaker 1

I don't believe there's a because I still have it open. It should be open. There a button that says polls on your zoom? Please try to click that button. Otherwise I'm not sure how to bring that back up on your end.

01:05:59

Speaker 3

Okay, so Tony and Libby had a question about voting for the organization or the person. So it depends on who's running. If there is an individual stakeholder who's running for a seat, then that's who you're voting for. If there is an organization, then it's really up to the organization to figure out how they want to essentially quote unquote campaign. If they would just want to have a talking head of one person within the organization talking about if they're using a video, then that's how they want to do it. However, you're voting for the organization, not for the individual.

01:06:41

Speaker 1

With that said, we're at the two minute mark, so I'm going to go ahead and end the poll. Share the results. Are you able to see the results, everyone? We have 27 of 31 people who participated, and it looks like majority vote was 37% for neither preferring 150 word candidacy statement only, no photo or video. Thank you, everyone for participating in the poll. I know that everyone probably has a 02:00 meeting that they're missing right now. So let me briefly go through this. We wanted to solicit some feedback regarding the nomination structure, which we kind of already had that conversation now, but I just want to direct everyone to our cerf@atlaedc.org email. It's really hard to get everything done during these 1 hour meetings. So, please, we're more than welcoming any feedback offline through email or if you want to set up a call with us.

01:07:40

Speaker 1

With that said co chairs. Are we okay with closing up the meeting for today?

01:07:48

Speaker 4

Yes. I believe Kelly had to go already.

01:07:50

Speaker 1

Oh, perfect. Well, thank you so much to Tanua and Kelly. Thank you to all our committee members for showing up today.

01:07:58

Speaker 3

Have a great day.