



## Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee

### Meeting Notes and Transcript

May 24<sup>th</sup>, 2023

#### Meeting Recording

Passcode: =0FJCb.K

#### **Meeting Summary:**

Attendees discussed and brainstormed outreach efforts, CERF Governance Model, selection vs election processes for the steering committee, and roles and duties of different groups within the organization. Attendees shared feedback and suggestions, and there was a discussion about hosting working meetings to clarify issues and answer questions.

#### **Action Items:**

1. Follow up with responses from outreach and engagement
2. Continue outreach with service planning areas one through eight and A and B for spa six
3. Schedule a two-hour working session for people to get clear and understand the governance structure
4. Provide meeting notes on the selection process vs election vote and the results of the meetings
5. Process mapping meeting taking place today in the afternoon
6. Issue preliminary research findings and allow CBO partners and planning tables to comment on them: “Add an additional step to the research vendors to get feedback from all the various tables issue. Instead of final research findings, issue preliminary findings. Share those preliminary findings, allow your CBO partners your affinity leads and planning tables to comment on those preliminary findings and then issue a final research finding report.”

#### **Transcript:**

01:01

Speaker 1

Good morning. Good morning, everyone. Good morning, Stella.

01:04

Speaker 2

Good morning. Good morning, everybody. Hi, Ellen.

01:07

Speaker 1

Happy Wednesday.

01:09

Speaker 2

Happy Wednesday. Indeed. Ellen, did Sharon never get back to you?

01:14

Speaker 1

She did not, but I'm assuming she has something cooked up.

01:18

Speaker 2

Okay, it yeah, because other than the brainstorm, I think I was good.

01:27

Speaker 3

Okay.

01:27

Speaker 1

Yeah.

01:30

Speaker 2

Thank you.

01:58

Speaker 1

Good morning to everyone who's just joined. We're just going to give a minute for everyone to kind of trickle in the meeting and share Sharon to join as well. Good morning, Tony. I see that. I guess the zoom link is still naming you as my doppelganger, so I'll go ahead and rename you.

03:26

Speaker 3

Okay.

03:27

Speaker 4

I would say or I would. It's great. You have a lot of skills that I've always admired and wanted to have, so it's a thrill opportunity.

03:35

Speaker 1

Thank you so much. All right. I believe Sharon is joining in right now. Hi, Sharon. Good morning.

04:18

Speaker 3

Good morning, everyone. I apologize for being a few minutes late. I was busy and roast in preparation for something later this meeting with the lady for this afternoon. How are we? Hey, Alan. You're looking awesome. Good morning, Stella.

04:38

Speaker 2

Good morning, Sharon. All right.

04:43

Speaker 3

I'm sorry. I have a funny is going crazy this morning. Hold on 1 second. Go ahead. I've got to move.

04:54

Speaker 1

This back to my internet being laggy or.

05:16

Speaker 2

Are you trying to share something right now, Alan?

05:19

Speaker 1

Oh, no, I was just having trouble hearing you guys.

05:23

Speaker 2

Yeah, I think Sharon was just going to do something real quick, but I think we can go ahead and get started.

05:29

Speaker 1

Okay. I don't believe oh, sorry. Go ahead.

05:34

Speaker 5

I don't know if this is the right time. I've been doing a lot of outreach to the environmental justice and blue green economy world. How do I know if they're really reaching out back to you? Because a lot of people are saying yes. Yes. Or is there a place that there's an updated list that I I don't know about? Because I'll I'll put the screws.

05:54

Speaker 3

On them if I need to.

05:57

Speaker 5

I don't know if they're actually then following up with you. What's the best way for me to know that?

06:04

Speaker 1

Yeah. We do have a partner list that is put on our website. However, I think in regards to kind of securing those people that you're outreaching to, it's best to do it through email. We could always just let you know. What I do is usually I'll CC someone, but Chioma is our outreach and engagement program manager. It's however she would like to do it. Chioma, if you want to kind of speak on how you want to direct her for that.

06:33

Speaker 6

Sure. Usually, Jenny, I just recommend if you're sending an email just to CC me, and then I'll follow up as soon as I see the connection is made. Otherwise yes, we do have our list that's updated regularly on the website that shows the organizations but right now there's over 300 partners. So it's a pretty long list. You can filter and see if the organization you reached out to is on that list. Either way, either looking by the list or CCME, or if you give them my email or [CERF@laedc.org](mailto:CERF@laedc.org), either way, if you let us know directly, though, we can follow up much more easily via email.

07:17

Speaker 5

So that's great. What I'm going to do is follow up with their responses and put you on it and just nudge them a bit and see do you need any help or what's, an update. Going forward because some people on my team are continuing the outreach. We'll put you on the emails.

07:34

Speaker 3

That's great. Thank you.

07:35

Speaker 7

Great.

07:36

Speaker 6

Sounds good.

07:37

Speaker 3

Thank you. Cool.

07:41

Speaker 2

Ellen I think we lost Sharon again, so if you want to get started. First off, thank you to everybody for coming to the One meeting and really appreciate everyone's attendance. I know everyone's super busy right now, but Ellen, if you want to start with oh, do we have any new members? First time attending the One committee meeting now. Okay. Going once, twice.

08:11

Speaker 3

Yeah.

08:11

Speaker 5

Ellen so if you have any updates.

08:13

Speaker 2

For us or Chioma, that would be fantastic.

08:18

Speaker 1

Yeah, sounds good. Chioma, did you want to yes.

08:23

Speaker 6

My open more general to the outreach. Alan goes deep into the numbers. Yes, we have over 305 partners now signed up who are fully onboarded. Partners. We still have a few partners that are engaged but aren't fully onboarded. We're still working to make sure we get those partners fully onboarded. But, yes, our numbers have hit over 305 now and we're still continuously outreaching. As you see, our partners are still helping us with the outreach. We're moving forward with making sure that the voices in La county are definitely heard. As I always say, email me, CC me on the email, and I definitely follow up. I'm on Zoom almost every day talking about CERF. So the outreach is there. The engagement is there with service planning areas one through eight and A and B for spa six. So, yeah, Alan will go more into the numbers on the types of entities that we have onboarded through his reports.

09:29

Speaker 6

For the overall, yes, we are steadily doing outreach. We had our event, LAEDC at our event, 88 Cities. 88 Cities yesterday in downtown La. It was good to see Stella and a few other stakeholders, some of our HRTC members, in person. Always good to see you guys in person. I definitely met some new stakeholders here in La County yesterday who are definitely interested in signing up their organizations and a couple of school districts, community college partners. So the outreach is steady going on. Just please continue to refer any partners that any of you have here in La County, from Antelope Valley to Long Beach, from the west side to the San Gabriel Valley side. That's all I have for you.

10:25

Speaker 3

Thanks.

10:25

Speaker 2

Thank you, Chioma. You all did a great job at the 88 Cities conference yesterday. That was fantastic. Really just got all of us brainstorming trying to connect the dot. So great job. Very nice job. Thank you, Chioma. 305. Right on. Let's see if we can get a few more in the next week or two.

10:51

Speaker 6

Exactly.

10:52

Speaker 1

No, I'm sure we can. Can you guys all confirm that you can see the demographics report?

11:00

Speaker 3

Yes.

11:01

Speaker 1

Awesome. So, yes, Chioma was spot on with that 305 number and that is as of yesterday. I'm going to move towards the nitty gritty. In regards to our geographic breakdown of HRTC members by service planning area based on where their headquarters are located at, again, we have the same trends because we have a slower increase in our members so far. So Spa, five West La. Kind of took over that third place, or I don't want to rank them, but third highest in regards to representation, although you can see that it's pretty balanced from spa five to Spa six B with some more need in spa seven and spa six B. We have spa four and spa eight, the metro area and South Bay Harbor area that seem to be having the most representation across all of La. County. Moving towards our geographic breakdown of HRTC members by their primary service area.

12:08

Speaker 1

Again, the most that we have here are members that indicated that they serve all of La. County, which is awesome. Again, I just want to point out because I believe Tony had pointed out the other time that because of members or indicating that they serve all of La. County, we're going to see some smaller numbers within the specific spas that they actually service. I'd also like to point out that we have the most need in regards to HRTC members that serve spa Seven, the East La. Area as well as Spa Five, the West La. Area. Other than that, it seems that we have a lot of HRTC members that are specifically serving the Spa Eight, South Bay Harbor area. From my understanding, it's probably majority would be organizations that are serving Long Beach because of Long Beach has done such a great job throughout this time.

13:13

Speaker 1

Moving forward or sharon, did you have a question?

13:16

Speaker 3

Yeah, sorry about that. I got kicked off the whole Internet, so I had to log back in on the Long can you bike breakdown. I know it's going to be tough, but in preparation for next call, can you do a quick number count subcount between you and Shioma on our members by jurisdiction? I know that as we go into our spas, we have great representation in certain spas, but we also want to look at it in terms of municipalities because we have a lot of areas, some of our spas that cover multi jurisdictions, specific jurisdictions, to make sure we have municipal representation.

14:00

Speaker 1

Okay, yeah, sounds good. I'll try to get next week. With that said, I'll go ahead and move forward to our geographic diversity by organizational headquarters and our affinity hub. There are no new members here, so I'm sure you all understand what this table kind of looks like and what we're kind of aiming for. What we're targeting here is the empty cells here so we can look at this across our affinity hub. Academia, it seems that we're lacking in spa six B, seven, eight six A, and then we can also look based on the service planning area. As you can see here, we have spa seven. We have very low numbers across spa seven, but we do have variety across the affinity hubs in spa seven. Spa 60, I believe, was the one with the most need aside from spa seven. You can see here we have civic engagement in place based coalitions.

15:05

Speaker 1

We have a decent number here at four. Four to five is what we're aiming for. However, we do want more variety in regards to we have no representation for academia, spa six B, as well as homeless veterans, seniors, immigrants, and the rest of these empty cells here. That pretty much sums up our geographic diversity by affinity hub and organizational headquarters. Does anyone have any questions? Well, it looks like nobody has any questions, so I'm going to go ahead and stop the share. Sharon, did you want to kind of take the lead on the rest of the committee?

15:47

Speaker 3

Well, I know if there was any update, I will tell you there's a lot going on. Update from La ADC proper? Yes. Can you hear me? Am I muted?

16:06

Speaker 1

No, you're just kind of breaking up a little.

16:10

Speaker 3

Got it. I wanted to make sure that you had a chance to cover any updates that are pending from LAEDC proper, like from the administrative side.

16:22

Speaker 1

All right. Yeah. Chioma went over kind of the most recent outreach activities that she's been engaging in, but aside from that, on the administrative side, I would say that I don't know if we mentioned this in the last meeting, but we have received a contract from CCF. However, our leadership team at LAEDC is currently reviewing that contract,

and so once that contract is fully reviewed and we're good to go, we'll get that signed. I believe once that contract is signed, CCF will be able to provide the funds, the advance pay, I believe.

17:00

Speaker 3

Excellent. Do we have new members? I see a name, one or two names. One name at least I don't recognize.

17:07

Speaker 2

Yeah, I asked first thing, but.

17:12

Speaker 3

Can you introduce yourself? She's on mute. Okay. Everyone else, I think Jamita, we have seen you here before. Yes. Where are you from, Jamita? I'm from Fresno, California. Are you a part of an organization here in Los Angeles? No, but I'm from Jakara Movement, but.

17:47

Speaker 6

We do have plans of having our branch there.

17:52

Speaker 3

Takara Movement? Is that what it's called? Yes. Okay, well, welcome to the meeting. We appreciate you joining and learning about the La HRTC. Anyone else besides Asia? Okay. There's something in the chat that I don't see. All right, well, thank you. I wanted to just move on, so I just want to know I wanted to engage on didn't do a formal kind of agenda because there's a couple of things pending. Those of you that participated in Friday's HRTC meeting know that there's a discussion. There are a lot of pending questions around our governance structure and the proposal that's on the table for the final governance structure, which the HRTC will have to approve. There was some feedback that was provided. Everybody was open and asked to review the proposed structure and provide feedback in the last governance meeting, as well as their last HRTC meeting prior to Friday.

18:56

Speaker 3

Half of that content did make it into governance for dialogue. The other half of it was in a Google doc that did not make it from members to governance. The dialogue on the table at the moment is LAEDC wanted to be jay, can you mute yourself, please? Thank you. LADC recognized that it was a mistake and that the part of the feedback being provided went into the spam by mistake. It didn't get surfaced to governance prior to the meeting. It was there, and it also didn't make it to the HRCC floor for discussion. There was a discussion about having working meetings so people could really understand some of the answers to some of the questions that they had open and really get some more understanding into the nitty gritty, as Luis calls it, of what our selection process and the structure looks like. That dialogue, because there are so many items.

20:06

Speaker 3

The Leedc's recommendation was to host a two hour working session for people to get clear, to ask questions, to



gain understanding, for all of the points and comments and concerns to be vetted. That meeting was postponed, and the co chairs of both governance and outreach are all going to meet. That meeting was tabled until next week because of scheduling. I do know that Charles has asked the state for an extension of our June 6 deadline to submit our steering committee governance structure. That's to give us enough time to finish, get through people's questions, make sure folks feel heard, get clarifications, and get folks the answers to the questions that they put forth. So we're going to continue that process. There was a request by governance that meeting be held with the co chairs before it goes to the general membership. Alan, can you confirm that the working session meeting is committee open, or is it just the co chairs I believe.

21:24

Speaker 1

It was going to be committee open.

21:26

Speaker 3

Okay, well, that is fantastic then. That's going to be Tuesday, is that correct?

21:32

Speaker 1

Hopefully on Tuesday. I know hopefully were shooting for Monday, but then Monday is a holiday.

21:38

Speaker 3

Monday is a holiday.

21:39

Speaker 1

Tuesday was the other option, but we're looking to get it done early in the week since our June 6 date is coming up pretty quickly. I think it's the following week. Yes, I believe we can confirm all the information with the other coaches as well because from my understanding, it was committee open.

21:58

Speaker 3

I know we heard back from Kelly, as well as myself, Vincent, and Stella, as well as Nicole, who hasn't really been on the call lately, but that there's much more flexibility for Tuesday, so we haven't had other locks down. Tony, go ahead, ask her question.

22:16

Speaker 4

I think one of the things that would be helpful, and I apologize if I sound like a broken record player, I am hearing two different things about what we're actually ultimately going to vote on. One is the selection of the additional people that are stakeholder representatives to the steering committee. I'm also hearing sometimes that we're talking about the entire chart, which is affinity hubs and this table and all of that. I think that maybe just starting with what is it that we're going to vote on that might start to break down. Like, oh, it's that piece, I'm okay with that. Or I have three questions about that. Doing it all kind of together is a challenge. The last one, I just wanted to say, we did send

an email in prior to Friday saying that the American Indian Chamber of Commerce of California could not vote on Friday because we'd not received a document or a picture, whatever you want.

23:27

Speaker 4

What is it literally that we're voting on?

23:29

Speaker 3

Right.

23:30

Speaker 4

It particularly relates to the grandfather piece that we've raised. I don't know where Tracy and the board are on that, but it's hard for me to present it to them as anything that's discussed previously. Nailing down what that might be is important. I'm not saying we have a problem, but I can't present it to the board if I can't explain it totally.

23:58

Speaker 3

It's an absolute one of the reasons for the working group conversation, because there are a lot of those kinds of loose end questions where there's clarity in the mind of some of our members that have been on governance. Because this is an HRTC decision. Any one committee does not make a decision on behalf of the HRTC. It has to go before the HRTC. That's a discussion that, again, there's some discombobulation uncertainty, and because you raised you are one of the people that raised significant number of questions, other people put forth questions. Those questions need to have a place to be vetted and discussed and responded. My commitment to how everyone has been. Everyone gets heard, everyone's voice matters. And we run a democratic process. Every one vote, one entity. We are it's shared leadership. I want to support that and encourage that. I want to thank LADC for taking on the leadership in the spirit of what they were intending to do, to call a meeting, to have people heard and flush out perspectives and get people on the same page.

25:12

Speaker 3

I've heard from members of governance on the same issue. I've reached out to Stella, we're on the same page. We do have a couple of issues that are on the table. One, something surfaced this week. I want to make the committee aware of it. I have been informed that something surfaced this week that there was a letter received by LADC asking committees not to take votes. I want to make sure this committee, if there's any discussion on that comes to the table. Because we are a group of inclusivity and equity at the heart, which means our individual collective voices come together and everyone gets that opportunity. The way that we presented it in the proposal is that one organization, one vote. Does anyone have any feelings or any of the organizations that may have participated in that letter? There was request that committees do not take votes.

26:08

Speaker 3

There was also some opposition to LAEDC utilizing the voting platform to ensure that we have integrity in our election process. If anybody wants to share anything on that or your thoughts about that, I want to open up the floor for you to be heard. No feelings one way or the other. We're quick. We're okay on it. Okay. No. Sharon, it's Elaine over to see this. You were saying they sent a letter opposing each committee to vote for things.

26:40

Speaker 6

Or can you elaborate?

26:42

Speaker 3

Yeah, there was a request. I'm going to say there was a request that committees not vote on things. That has been our structure from the beginning. Right? If we are committed to democracy, we have to give folks a way to share their perspective and chime in. Usually voice comes forward in the permit, but they're a vote. There is some things floating where there's some organizations that would prefer a non organization HRTC voting mechanism. They would rather us adopt a kind of a delegate kind of position or a selection model. Again, those are things that have to come before some kind of a group consensus because we did submit a proposal to be transparent about whatever we decide. Right. Again, if there's some thoughts or whatever, I want people to have the opportunity to be forthcoming about it and to share your thoughts. Tony, have your hand still up or is that from before?

27:45

Speaker 4

New? I've been working on a comparison of all 13 regions in trying to see how different regions are adopting different things. I just want to put out there. I'm not voicing an opinion. I just want to share that, well, one, transparency is good, but I'm seeing different models for even the idea of consensus. They're very specific in some of the regions where they say if when they do a voting to come up with where people rank as in, I like it, I could like it, I hate it, we can't live with it at all. If you score a four or a five, then they kind of go for, okay, conceptually people, but that's a consensus kind of based around what's going on. I'm also seeing where some Hrtcs are saying, no, we absolutely want a consensus on every item, and then they talk about how they're going to do that.

28:51

Speaker 4

There's another HRTC that says, we're going to start with consensus. If that doesn't happen, then we're going to go to a poll. If that doesn't happen, then we're going to go to a vote. And so they actually step through. I think there's options for what people are comfortable with. It's good to get things in writing so that you may say, oh, I like what Stockton is doing with the Bay Area with a slash of redwood la, you probably have one of the most complex structures, but I'm from La. We're complicated people. So I think there's options, and it.

29:29

Speaker 3

Would be good to kind of get.

29:30

Speaker 4

To options so people don't feel like they're at loggerheads. As I said, I'm not saying whether we should vote or not vote. I'm just saying there actually are some fairly sophisticated hybrids going on.

29:40

Speaker 3

I appreciate that. And you know what? And that's the conversation that's going on. Although right now in our proposal, we agreed to a transparent process, we also conceptually and in the contract did agree that no one

organization would have any more decision of making authority than any other. We equality of voice and vote was absolutely in our contract. We did that because some populations are bigger than others and some geographies are bigger or more populated than others. We wanted to be absolutely sure that the needs of our veteran community didn't outweigh or overtake the needs of our underserved youth, no matter what size those populations were. That's kind of why we did this very clear. One committee, one vote. As we move into committees, as we move into affinity hubs, everybody's voice is equal. That was a principle that we adopted early on. Kevin, you have your hand up?

30:46

Speaker 1

Yeah.

30:46

Speaker 8

Thank you, Sharon. Okay, so as we've been here since the beginning, if you will, and we've always operated in a way where everyone's voice is heard. I think some of the questions that came up in the last couple of meetings are interesting, where I understand how some organizations might feel that they've worked on initiatives and language and structure for four or five, six months, and they don't want to see it reverse because they put that effort in. But I like that. It's like my wisdom tells me if I'm on a journey and I'm on a path, and that path is not going to lead me to my desired or optimum destination, is it better to continue on that path and not be in the best place? Or do I change direction while I have time to land in the optimum position? So two things to build consensus.

32:10

Speaker 8

There's no other way to measure it than to have a vote. Otherwise, how do you communicate how you feel about something? I think everyone's investment of time and effort should be respected. I would be disappointed if we began to go down the path where voices are not heard and we don't have a way of weighing because this whole concept was based on I don't care how big you are, I don't care how small you are, we want to create a new paradigm. We do not want to repeat mistakes of the past. We want to make sure that as we move forward, that everyone is motivated and continues to be motivated. However we get to that point is what I'm for and what my organization is for as the president of BizFed Institute. And that's all I want to say. Thank you.

33:07

Speaker 3

Thank you, Kevin, I have a question. Okay. Comment in the market from Louise. Luis, thank you so much for your comments. He's asking a question about the voting system, and that's a whole separate conversation. The system, the software, whatever that is, just ensures that the people that are actually casting a vote are actually members of the HRTC. I mean, anybody can get 30 people on a phone call to try and sway a vote. We want integrity. I appreciate the sense of intention behind seeking a system that had integrity. Thank you, Ella EDC, for moving forward in that direction. The question that Luis and you are free to share is that he's resurfacing a comment about having a selection committee select the steering committee. This has been brought to the floor several times, and it has been the will of the HRTC that this would not happen because favoritism efforts.

34:15

Speaker 3

There was some disruption early on in our proposal that caused some mistrust amongst our members vying for control and power that really put a strain on good faith relations. There was a real commitment on behalf of the committee to ensure that some smaller entity is not going to select who has control of the steering committee. That has been addressed numerous times, not only by this committee. Governance put it forth. Governance got it without

vote. After that effort, the governance committee voted it down, and then it went before the HRTC, and they said, absolutely not. So it has been addressed. I do want to address a very valid point. Luis brings up a question about how will we ensure that the disadvantaged communities have the proper seating on the steering committee? And Estella, you're free to cover it. I know even during the midst of what was a potential disruption in the system, when people were at factions against each other, one thing stood clear.

35:37

Speaker 3

Everybody understood and consented that disadvantaged communities would have 75% to 80% of the seats on our steering committee. That was a pretty unanimous vote. It's in the proposal, it's in the contract. One of the things I can say, governance and outreach are locked in toe step to make sure that we are acquiescing, to make sure that happens. That's a positive.

36:16

Speaker 2

That's why we continue to conduct these brainstorming sessions with everyone, because you all are out in the communities that you serve. You know, partner organizations. We really appreciate your suggestions on who needs to be here. We've been doing this every week now and from the very beginning, just trying to get more and more organizations, first off, connected, make them aware of the HRTC, and now make sure that they're part of this table. So absolutely, Sharon, thank you.

36:51

Speaker 3

Now, I do want to kick out some language, and I don't know if one of our LADC partners can help us on this, but I want to draw a distinction between the terminology historically disadvantaged communities and disinvested communities. They are different. These are some concerns that had gone before CERF at the state level. There was some advocacy work done to ensure that the CERF project was about minorities and historically disadvantaged communities, whether there be places, whether there be people. The state pushed back and they did not authorize that. What they did, which is a really nice overlay in my opinion, but what they did is they defined what a disinvested community is. The work that we have committed to has to follow the state's description and definition of disinvested. We're going to revisit that again in this committee because it will make a difference in terms of our election, not on our election process, who we see, but how funds get allocated, because there is a desire to prioritize disinvested communities, right?

38:14

Speaker 3

And so there are four criteria. How our ballot gets structured may be impacted based on that criteria because you have community based leaders, you have community based organizations, you have all the categories that governance has come forward and we are not pushing back on that. We're like, we get it. All of us are singing in the same song. However, we got to figure out what seats are going to be disinvested, what's or not. For example, our organizations like Lacey and Grid and some of the others that are really EJ and sustainability focused by virtue of their work, they are providing services into disadvantaged communities as defined by Cal Environmental Screen 4.0. That is one of the four definitions of a disinvested community based. On the state's rules. Any J agency that is serving and their primary focus is serving Dex is by nature representing the disinvested because that's what they're statutorily there for, right?

39:28

Speaker 3

And that's one of the terms. There's some area median income tests and the Edd publishes something. We will have a separate meeting. It's on our to do list. We took it off meeting while we dove into who should be at those tables. We're going to bring that back in the next two weeks so that we can really clarify. Because one of the things that happened, all of La County at COVID post COVID, when we started writing this proposal, all of La county was designated, and now all of La County is not designated. It had to do with the percentage of an area's unemployment over the state average because that's another one of the tests. We'll revisit that, but we will conform to the state because we're required to. Now I want to just move forward. Anyone else before I jump to one thing that I want to cover because it's important, I will carry whatever voice you want, Stella, into this meeting.

40:21

Speaker 3

We want to make sure that you guys are able to participate in this working meeting since it's a full open meeting and we'll have a time locked down on that. Alan will commit to make sure we get something out before as soon as we hear back from Maria and Genua is traveling. She texted me.

40:41

Speaker 6

For a second. Sorry, I just wanted to add that Allen I think it's Allen and not as double hanger posted the information in the chat for how the state identifies our disinvested communities. I'll say also, any stakeholders that have emailed me and asked me for this information, I've gladly emailed it to them and let them know exactly the four ways in which the state mentions in the Solicitation, how they identify the disinvested communities.

41:17

Speaker 4

Actually, that was Tony. I don't know. Alan and I were so close.

41:20

Speaker 3

We're going to have a whole meeting on that. We absolutely are going to have a meeting on that. I want LADC to bring us a heat map. Libby asked the question. Libby, I didn't know you were here. Welcome. Good to see you here. I think the ballot structure, my intent at least is to bring into that working group meeting a dialogue about ballot structure that absolutely demands that 75% or 80% goal gets met. I will fight for that with every breath of my body. Look, I'm a girl who grew up in Compton, okay? Do I have to say anymore? I went from Compton to the state capitol, okay? I will fight for that because it's in our contract. We committed to it. It is no longer off the table. Okay? I walked precinct with my aunt who was on the board of Compton Unified School District for 43 years, and I internship with Mervyn Daimley and Julian Dixon, and we walk those streets.

42:18

Speaker 3

Willowbrook is my home. I am 100% making sure that the voices of communities that look like the one I grew up in have access to these resources and that they are included and heard. Now it's strangely, I got tears in my eyes.

42:35

Speaker 7

Okay, I would say that Sharon, thank you. And I apologize for joining late. I had a doctor's appointment that avoided me from that anyway, I couldn't make it earlier, and my point of bringing up that particular question was really more to ask. Have we not looked at anything else other than a straight vote? I know that people aren't really

excited about hearing about that. I just came in during Kevin's remarks, but I know that one of the recommendations, and I heard you say that this has been all of the different other options have been discussed and dismissed during both your committee and I guess also the governance committee. Well, the HRTC, I've been participating mostly with just the governance committee and then HRTC. Had anyone ever discussed the idea of having two reps or three reps from each of the six different categories for the steering committee who are part of those, for example, if it's labor union, have two or three people who they have no desire for them or the organization to sit in.

43:42

Speaker 7

The steering committee would serve as a selection screening to make sure that they got the people from their particular sector from labor that could best represent them on the steering committee and also make sure that they looked at their selection based on an equity lens in terms of making sure their representatives from all of the different groups represented in those two individuals that would represent labor on the steering committee and doing the same for all of the others. Was that format or that type of selection process discussed? Because I hadn't heard it. So.

44:22

Speaker 3

There was a discussion about it because originally in November, the steering committee, as governance met until about November, October, November. At that time, we had a recommendation for 19 members. When they reconvened, we knew that there had been a shift to take it to 31 members, but our committee had been asking for that information. Can we see how it shifted from 19 to 31? The committee given, I believe you guys were dark for those periods. They were waiting for that for four or five months. When information surfaced was pretty much when the staff was brought on board. I understand Leedc, they had their own things to deliver on. When Scarlett and Ellen and those guys were placed, the information began to be transparent and available because they've just been pushing it out. We did get a few weeks ago, two to a month ago probably, we got information on the 31 seats and we got to see where the category shift was.

45:24

Speaker 3

There had been discussion around ensuring that one because again, governance was dictating or recommending how many seats needed to be in each area. When went to Sacramento, we had some dialogue with our business groups and we're like, look, we're going to do five industry clusters that are our top growth sectors, which is what research is all about. The request was that there be at least one seat from every one of those five clusters that did not arise, didn't get enough support or rise up. We didn't do anything, make a recommendation or take a vote on it here. There was a clarity that there did not want to be a selection committee to overturn or overcast the decisioning on the vote of the HRTC. It would be one organization, one vote, and there would be a raw selection. I do think that we are welcome. Please participate in that working group meeting because I think there is an opportunity for us to come up together and craft a way and a structure so that there is equitable selection both geographically because that's one of the things that we talked about here is that we're throwing out the idea that maybe there should be three or four representatives from every spa, so that no spa is dominating, but they have to be within those categories.

46:50

Speaker 3

Many of those seats, 80% of them, have to be from disinvested. I think that's going to take some creative crafting of the ballot structure. Please jump into the conversation, join in and participate. Again, nothing is cast in stone because the HRTC hasn't voted. I do know the HRTC has voted twice that there is absolutely little or no interest in creating a selection committee and going to a delegate kind of style. Once selection committee is selected, once the steering committee and our affinity hubs are selected, they will then have duties going forward. I need to take the last unless

there's anything else, I want to take the last few minutes of our call and get some input because there's a meeting this afternoon that we're going to be participating in as it relates to the process mapping, which is a mandate of outreach and engagement. Do I have anybody else that wants to chime in anything before I kind of bring up that and getting prepared for that meeting?

47:54

Speaker 3

Sure.

47:54

Speaker 2

So much has your hand up.

47:57

Speaker 3

Yeah. Thank you so much to respect the.

48:02

Speaker 9

Fact that the last half of the meeting is going to be dedicated to something else. Would appreciate if LAEDC serve team is able to provide with a follow up as the days and times of the meetings in which people voted for not having a selection process. Because since I've been attending that hasn't come about or I don't recall that vote and so I would appreciate.

48:29

Speaker 3

When.

48:30

Speaker 9

That took place and what the results were about because again, I would have appreciated providing some feedback on that specific.

48:37

Speaker 3

Vote if there was one. You guys take on that, please do that. I do know Kelly has chimed in because again, the recommendation did come out of Governance to create a selection committee to selection Steering committee and then that I guess it was voted on or discussed in the November meeting with Governance. Kelly did respond to that, to the query and discussion amongst coach here said, yeah, that never came before. The last few recommendations that Governance made in November did not come forward, but we had been dealing with that. So please go back. It is going to occur in the last year and a lot of it probably, I would assume August, right before we took a two month hiatus because again, there was a lot of discussion right before the grant went in because people were at odds, people were in mistrust. We kept meeting to try and ally some of that concern.

49:36



Speaker 3

If I may, this is a simple not, please do not, this is not Scarlett's work. Scarlett, don't laugh at me, do not laugh at me. Scarlett does such beautiful graphic work. We're going to enter into a dialogue this afternoon on the process mapping. Process mapping will be done at a professional level by a vendor. The vendor's job is to kind of look at the overall functions and processes, steps that we have to go through in order to accomplish the goals that we outlined in the contract. I want to get clear one, one we have currently. This is before Select Steering Committee, the HRTC, which stands at the top. It is the decision making body at this moment. The HRTC will ensure through its commitments and votes that we sit a searing committee through an election process and that our affinity hubs are seated. Now, I will tell you and I want to make sure that everyone that has access to the communications toolkit and the materials that have been shared and I know this is why Tony's bringing it up.

50:54

Speaker 3

Our proposal and our documents say, and every piece of paper that we send out, including the one we just filed with the state May 1, say that our affinity hubs get selected first. In the first quarter of our contract, which we began March 1, we are supposed to seat our twelve affinity Hubs. Our Steering Committee says that it is supposed to be made up of a subset of our affinity hubs and our other stakeholders, our sub regional table. That is why I believe Tony has the question because that's what's in writing, that's what we send out in all of our communications, that's what's in our proposal, that's what's in our contract and we are going straight to Steering Committee. That's a conversation that's going to have to happen because I think there's some threat of, there's some nasty threats on that one. I'm just going to say nasty that might be legal.

51:48

Speaker 3

As we seat our affinity hubs and select those twelve hubs, at some point we're going to select twelve planning tables, I'm at the left and then we're going to seat those whatever other community leaders will fall in. I'm not putting numbers because the discussion, whether it's going to be 33, 36, 34, whatever that number is, they're going to roll into a steering committee. The conversation for purposes of today, we wanted to get real clear about here's, the roles and duties. We have these long documents on what people do and there was somehow one of them got changed. The micro grantees are going to be selected through a process yet defined. It is their job to conduct outreach and engagement and gather data from our and I'm here from our 27 subgroups and our Disinvested communities. That is their role, that is what they were defined.

52:47

Speaker 3

For each ten of those organization, 90 of those organizations will receive \$10,000 grants. The way that our affinity hubs are structured is there is affinity hub lead. Sitting at that table is one representative from every spa. The affinity hub lead calls their tables together, they are hosting a meeting for a region wide meeting. That's part of their scope of work. They will convene the ten, excuse me, the nine funded organizations and any other community micro, community organizations or community leaders at those tables along affinity lines. The youth will come together, the under formerly incarcerated will come together. The veterans and seniors will come together with the homeless. Again, we have the various affinity hubs. According to our documents, the affinity hub leads it on the steering committee. That's something that has not been put in, that has not been pushed out. It is definitely going to come to the discussion next week because it's on every single piece of paper, including this beautiful work that Scarlett is putting up.

54:04

Speaker 3

Yet. We have to figure out how does that happen along and still commit honor the wishes of the governance

committee, to see folks in that steering committee that are 80% from disinvested as well as all of those categories that they've outlined honoring that wish, that's a part of why the working discussion. That's something that I know will be on the agenda. The duties of the affinity hub is to collect and share information from the subgroups, from those grantees. The grantees will gather demographic data. They'll understand, they'll define the recovery needs of our constituents, COVID post recovery. They'll dive into economic barriers that each of our groups are facing and challenges that they have. They will have to gather information on workforce readiness of their given population because we're looking at pathways to high growth jobs. That's what this is about. They're also going to have to look at readiness of that population to participate in transition to a carbon neutral economy because that's what CERF says they have to do.

55:13

Speaker 3

As our CBO groups do this work in the outreach process, I have no idea why this thing get out of there. Thank you. As they do this work in our outreach process, they will then share convene at the affinity hub table over here and participate in those affinity hub meetings. They will have to do some reporting and fill up some documents and submit some reports, maybe some sign in sheets from their community outreach meetings. They're also going to be responsible for checking off and saying, hey my constituents, I had a meeting with 30 people and six of them needed childcare. Here's the sign in sheet and here's the evidence of the ones that signed that said they needed childcare. That's going to somehow going to need to get all the way over here to CCF in some kind of a portal so that they can get paid.

56:01

Speaker 3

Bottom line, what we're trying to do, and we're having another one of these meetings this afternoon is with LADC, is really look at the steps that each function has to carry out so that the contractor who's doing the process mapping that will help us design the data flow systems can do their job. I want to be clear, there's going to be a lot of data flow between the affinity the small community organizations here where through some type of raw data portal or something so that information that's collected can get over to research. Because the research vendors have to not only conduct research, three areas of research that are required by the state, but they're also the ones that are going to be aggregating our lived experience data from both our 90 organizations and our twelve affinity hubs and any of our planning tables. The information that we gather in that process with our constituents has to come back and flow, this data has to flow back so that research can aggregate it.

57:11

Speaker 3

When they aggregate it, they will be collecting race based data and geographic based data so we don't have to fight over race because that became another point of conflict. We're like, oh, we can deal with that on the back end, but we haven't forgot about it. Research and what's being amended right now is in those research contracts is they will issue their research finding reports based on the stuff the state requires. They will also issue research finding reports based on the aggregation of all of our collective community gathered information and that information is going to flow right back. We need to have some lines to our affinity Hubs and our steering committee so that we could have a clear understanding how we share that with committee is where I ran out of time, is we have budgeted for geographic planning forums. We actually can sit down and talk to our people by geography, by each spa, and we will have data on what we found out collectively.

58:15

Speaker 3

We'll also have racial planning forums where at the end of, we can sit down and look at what the racial data tells us. Gaps, challenges, needs will already be gathered on a live basis and research will be providing us finding reports.

I'm going to stop there because what I want to say is this is a flow of information. Today's discussion, I only played around with this scarlet, forgive me, because I wanted to ensure that we had a real crisp clarity on key functional roles, that's what we called it, of each of our key groups, so that when we go into discussion with the process mapper, they get it and not have to read 60 pages. Was that a question? Somebody has a question in the chat. Okay, so I don't want to take up time, but I want to be clear. The role of the steering committee is to review stakeholder needs, to research findings, to code, develop and refine the economic strategies, not to decide and to make decisions for the HRTC.

59:24

Speaker 3

Most importantly, which is one of the reasons why there's so much I believe there may be so much hot to try dialogue, is because the steering committee is the one that has to approve and recommend phase two project funding. Everybody wants to have a voice on whether it's \$70 million or \$100 million, who gets it, and the steering committee is in charge with that ability to make that recommendation. Comments before I know we're out of time, I needed to bring something into that discussion. Again, this is for only for process mapping purposes. There'll be another discussion early in the week on the whole working group, who does what and how do we elect, and we really focus on what's our process for getting one, two, three, and four these groups seated and eventually funded. The funding is happening. The conversation, of course, be involving CCS and Leedc, but it's how do we get these in place, right, given that right now the ultimate authority rests here?

01:00:28

Speaker 3

Questions and comments because I know we're 11:00 and I talked and that was really fast.

01:00:33

Speaker 2

No, that's very helpful, Sharon. It just gets clearer and clearer, hopefully, for everyone each time we have these discussions. So, final questions. I know it's you.

01:00:43

Speaker 3

Put the AC on there. Was that Alan? That's me.

01:00:48

Speaker 4

I guess I made a comment to add an additional step to the vendors to get feedback from all the various tables issue. Instead of final research findings, issue preliminary findings. Share those preliminary findings, allow your CBO partners your affinity leads and planning tables to comment on those preliminary findings and then issue a final research finding report. It's always good for people to be able to see what the final is.

01:01:25

Speaker 3

I think that's something thank you for that. That's something that I will definitely take into the conversation, because there are two sets of planning forums for geography. There's an actual forum that takes place at the front end. Forgive my lights. There's another forum that they get to have two for every geography, and they get to have two for every racial group.

01:01:47

Speaker 4

I'm sure they have input, but what we often get from researchers, because we run out of time, is they're like, oh, that's really great, et cetera. It'd be great for us to be able to show that one of their duties in the RFP is to issue preliminary take in feedback, respond instead of just assuming they do it. I'm sure your response can be excellent.

01:02:11

Speaker 3

I will bring that again. I think that's a great idea. Tony, Leedc, would you guys make that note? Because, again, the scope of work is being done really right now for those positions. So there we go. That's wonderful. Thank you. I know we're over time. I'm sorry that I talked so long, but I hope that at least some part of this has been helpful as we are co creating this whole process. Della, you're muted. Yeah, sorry about that.

01:02:44

Speaker 2

Thank you, Sharon. Appreciate it. Thanks to everyone for their questions, feedback, their suggestions. I know everyone's probably headed to another meeting, so Sharon, anything else before we I'm complete?

01:02:59

Speaker 3

Thank you. Allen, would you save the chat, please?

01:03:04

Speaker 2

Did you say Allen or Stellen?

01:03:05

Speaker 3

Yeah, allen or somebody at La. Okay, take a look at the chat.

01:03:10

Speaker 1

Thank you.

01:03:11

Speaker 2

Okay, good deal. Thanks, everybody. Have a great holiday.

01:03:14

Speaker 3

Bye.

01:03:15

Speaker 1  
Take care.

01:03:15  
Speaker 3  
Bye.

01:03:17  
Speaker 1  
It great work, team. Take care. Thank you, Chris. See you soon.