



**CERF LA HRTC Partners Biweekly Meeting
Summary Notes and Transcript
May 19th, 2022**

[Meeting Presentation](#)

[Meeting Recording](#)

Password: ?W4PN&O4

Meeting Summary

Today's Partners meeting covered the CERF Governance Model and Steering Committee, no vote was taken to approve the Governance Model today.

The model relies on collaborative efforts from various entities, including affinity and subregional tables, to develop an inclusive economic regional plan. The Steering Committee validates decisions made by the affinity and subregional tables, with representation from disinvested community members. Membership criteria and commitments are outlined in the draft Steering Committee fact sheet included in the discussion.

HRTC members requested a grandfather clause in the Steering Committee role to ensure that all decisions made prior to the establishment of the Steering Committee cannot be overturned. The responsibilities and commitments of steering committee members include actively participating, advising on needs and analysis, sharing information and decisions with HRTC and community, validating major decisions, committing to attending meetings, revising materials, and being involved in drafting the regional economic development roadmap. Feedback was received regarding on recusal of voting on conflicted projects due to potential conflicts of interest for members serving on both the steering committee and hub structure. There are suggestions from HRTC partners about increasing business/industry seats from 2 to 3 as well as labor seats from 2 to 3 which requires an increase in CBO seats from 25 to 30 or having equal representation for each SPA by increasing CBO section seats from 25 to 27. A two-hour working meeting is suggested before finalizing governance structure/seating/voting mechanisms/selection criteria etc., due in June while maintaining transparency among partners who provide feedback via open communication channels.

The group discusses the need for open dialogue and feedback from all stakeholders, including those who have not fully onboarded yet. They also discuss working towards balanced representation within service planning areas and mandated stakeholder groups. There is a focus on community-driven decision making in order to ensure access to quality jobs and opportunities aligned with a carbon neutral economy.

A two-hour working meeting was suggested a SurveyMonkey poll was launched for feedback on meeting times. Members are being asked to submit their response to the poll by Monday at 5pm. There is discussion about the governance structure and election process for the steering committee, with some members expressing concerns about inclusivity and clarity in the current structure.

Resources:

[Working Meeting Time Poll](#) - Please submit response by Monday May 22nd, at 5pm

[CERF Steering Committee Fact Sheet](#)

Outline:

1. Introduction and Agenda

06:04 - Agenda is discussed

2. New Partners and Changes

06:17 - New partners introduced and changes discussed

3. Governance Model and Narrative Steering Committee

06:26 - Governance model discussed

12:49 - Narrative steering committee fact sheet presented

16:56 - Governance narrative showcased

34:18 - Committee structure discussed

39:34 - Suggestions and comments from stakeholders discussed

4. Two Hour Working Meeting

06:36 - Two hour working meetings introduced

27:55 - Importance of the working meetings discussed

56:57 - Suggestion to present to relevant groups before having a two hour meeting

5. Stakeholder Analysis

47:53 - Stakeholder analysis presented

6. Questions and Comments

Action Items:

1. There will be a working meeting next week to work through issues and suggestions that have been presented, and to finalize deliverables.
2. The Steering Committee fact sheet is in draft form, and feedback is being accepted on it.
6. The HRTC members are encouraged to participate in the upcoming working meeting and provide their feedback.
7. The poll for the upcoming Outreach and Engagement Committee meeting will close on Monday.
8. The Governance Cochairs will work to get an agenda for the working meeting.

Transcript

Good seeing you all. Some of you I saw yesterday at the Urban League event, which was outstanding. I hope everyone took some of that message back and embraced it and is reinvigorated this morning. Looking forward to the call today.

04:49

Speaker 4

Rhonda love. What a great name.

04:55

Speaker 2

I'm sorry I said that gets amen.

05:01

Speaker 5

Thank you.

05:03

Speaker 4

Thank you for being here.

05:05

Speaker 5

Thank you.

05:10

Speaker 4

We're going to give a few more moments to let more people in and then we'll get started. Welcome again, Tony.

05:47

Speaker 6

Good morning.

05:49

Speaker 4

Thank you for coming back. Okay, let's get going here. Good morning. La HRTC partners, current partners, new partners and existing partners. Let me get this out of my way here. Alan, you can go ahead and go to the agenda. We probably should have this up anyway, so I'm just going to read through the agenda . Obviously we want to give time to have the new partners introduce themselves, go over some important dates and some changes we can discuss. The governance model, review of the narrative steering committee fact sheet has been created by Ms. Scarlett. Thank her for that. One of the changes we want to talk about is doing two hour working meeting time. Jermaine to go into that . We'll have some our usual updates for the stakeholder and meeting dates. We want to take a little time. If there are any new partners on the call, please feel free to introduce yourselves.

06:58

Speaker 4

Please don't be shy.

07:05

Speaker 3

Hi. Hello everyone.

07:06

Speaker 7

Good morning.

07:07

Speaker 1

My name is Pablo Barrios. I am the business development specialist for the Seiuhw joint employer Education Fund. I'm actually standing in for my colleague.

07:20

Speaker 4

Who will be here regularly, Carl Van Williams.

07:23

Speaker 1

Just standing in here for today, but great to be here.

07:27

Speaker 3

Thank you.

07:28

Speaker 4

Welcome. Anyone else?

07:30

Speaker 5

Good morning. I'm Joy Hermson with Futural Health.

07:33

Speaker 8

We are a nonprofit that gives away scholarships with the support of Fiuhw and.

07:39

Speaker 2

Kaiser Permanente to get a diverse group.

07:41

Speaker 8

Of people into allied healthcare roles as quickly as possible. So Lily to see you all and.

07:46

Speaker 3

Thank you for this meeting.

07:50

Speaker 5

Hi everyone. My name is DeAndre and Gillo. I'm joining from capture six. We are a direct air capture company based in California and we're really excited to be joining the La HRTC informing some potential partnerships with you all.

08:11

Speaker 4

Thank you, DeAndre. Anyone else? Christian Delay, I'm first meeting here. Thanks for having me.

08:18

Speaker 3

I work for a springboard.

08:20

Speaker 4

We are an online tech boot camp and we essentially train people for entry.

08:27

Speaker 3

Level tech roles in various fields, basically.

08:31

Speaker 4

So software engineering, data analytics, design coding.

08:35

Speaker 3

All different kinds of tech fields.

08:37

Speaker 4

We're an online training provider.

08:41

Speaker 3

Good morning. Jorgevianueva with SCAU. UHW, we're a healthcare union with over.

08:47

Speaker 1

100,000 members across California. Hi, I'm Drew Mercy.

08:57

Speaker 9

I'm the executive director for Analog Valley Edge. We're a regional economic development not for profit, covering North La county, the Lake, Caster, and Palmdale area.

09:09

Speaker 4

Welcome. Anyone else?

09:11

Speaker 5

Yeah.

09:12

Speaker 8

My name is Olivia Kelsey.

09:13

Speaker 5

I'm kicking over for Arora West.

09:16

Speaker 8

We're a consulting firm that helps with community development. I'm specifically looking into climate change consulting and just really excited to be here.

09:25

Speaker 2

Thanks for hosting this.

09:27

Speaker 4

Thank you for being here.

09:30

Speaker 3

Hi, I'm jonathan nicholas, I'm with ICANN california abilities network. We work with adults with disabilities and helping them find jobs within their community.

09:42

Speaker 8

I'm Melissa Els Barnacoat, I work with Allied Up. We're a healthcare staffing company focused on allied healthcare workers within the state of California. From education to first jobs and beyond.

10:05

Speaker 7

Hey, everyone, this is Stella. Not a new member, but I can't connect via my computer, so I'm on my phone.

10:11

Speaker 2

Just wanted to give a shout out.

10:14

Speaker 8

Stellar sewer from Grid Alternatives. Thank you.

10:17

Speaker 4

Thank you, Stella. Anyone else like to introduce themselves?

10:25

Speaker 5

Hi.

10:25

Speaker 7

This is Kimberly Roth. I'm the director of the Southern California Virtual Business Center, where we provide capacity training for diverse suppliers. We are the smaller entity under covered community, which provides health and wealth to the community. And we're not a new member. We have been here for some time and hoping to continue to learn more.

10:55

Speaker 4

Thank you. Okay, anyone else?

10:59

Speaker 7

Hi, I'm Stephanie C. Harper, and I'm not a first timer, but I thought I'd reintroduce myself. I am an HR compliance coach, 30 years in human resources, and I help small businesses who do not have a formal human resources department to stay compliant.

11:18

Speaker 4

Very important, what you're doing.

11:20

Speaker 8

Thank you.

11:27

Speaker 4

Okay, if there's no one else who like to introduce themselves, we can get started. So you guys seen this slide before? The contract for you newer people, the contract is starting back from March 1 of this year 21 month

process from going straight out. The planning phase plan was already submitted to the state on May 1 and then June 6. These are the important dates that are upcoming. June 6, the final governance structure is due to the state, and July 6, we have to have bodies in those seats, names attached to them. I put in a request to try to get an extension on that because July 4, a lot of people are going to be leaving town. We want to give you guys ample amount of time so you can do your due diligence and make the best informed decision. Whenever the state gets back to us with answer on that, we'll make sure to update you guys on that.

12:35

Speaker 4

Then, of course, the regional summary report. The first one is due August 31, and then June 30 is the second one. Pass it over to Ms. Scarlett.

12:49

Speaker 5

Hi. Yes. Hi everyone. Scarlett Peralta, community program manager for communications for surf. I will be going over these next two slides or next two graphics. Ellen, do you mind pulling them up? We did review them in the last meeting. Since then we did have feedback that we've received from our HRTC partners. I did just want to run by them again since we do have a fairly big group of new partners joining us. This is our current recommended Surf Governance model. Alan, if you can downsize it but we go ahead and explain kind of what this Surf Governance model entails. The functioning of the Surf government model really relies on the collaborative efforts of various entities, including the affinity and subregional tables. Those are our CBO Spa based micro grantees. We have 90 of them and as you see, they are represented by stakeholders that are being mandated by the state.

13:59

Speaker 5

Our goal is to have representation in every identified service planning area. We also have eight table partner leads and those table partner leads are still in discussion in regards to how we will identify them. We have our affinity hub leads. Those are twelve affinity hub areas. We also wanted to make sure that or the one committee really worked to ensure that the Affinity hub areas were broken down to represent groups that for the most part, have not been included in economic development processes. Disinvested communities that have not had their opportunity to be a part of these conversations. To showcase that, we linked our Affinity hub breakdown, which is the orange text right there. If you click on that Allen, it will take you directly to our Affinity Hub areas. As you can see, every stakeholder mandated by the state is then broken down to include disinvested, specifically targeted disinvested communities that we wanted to ensure we're a part of this process.

15:13

Speaker 5

We will share these in the chat as well and they are included in the newsletter that has been sent out this past week. We will allow you guys the opportunity to go through that at your time. If we can go back to the other to the main one sorry.

15:35

Speaker 3

To.

15:35

Speaker 5

The main governance model. There we go. Thank you. The affinity and subregional tables will actively engage in outreach activities and gather feedback from specific stakeholders, allowing for the development of an inclusive economic regional plan, which is our goal of this program. The valuable insights and data will then be collected and shared with the steering committee. As of now, this is the recommended steering committee of 33 seats that the governance committee has worked on for the past year. The steering committee will incorporate the feedback and data received from the affinity and subregional tables and will utilize this information to make informed decisions and provide overall guidance for the governance structure and really wanting to emphasize that they are a validating body of the HRTC, that the decisions are really stemming and coming from the affinity and subregional tables. We have our Stewardship Committee, which plays a crucial role in implementing these decisions.

16:36

Speaker 5

They will act as facilitators and technical advisors, and the Stewardship Committee is made of our regional convener leedc as well as our fiscal agent. If you scroll up we also linked in our governance narrative on the top right there. If you click on the orange, this governance narrative just was created to showcase the way that these tables and committees work together in a very circular, non hierarchical process. If you scroll down, we also went ahead and fleshed out the roles and responsibilities and representation of the affinity and subregional tables, the Steering Committee and the Stewardship Committee. We did go through this last week, but wanted to make sure that for our new folks, you were able to see some of these graphics that really, in a digestible way, tried to explain the governance model of the Serve program and really going deeper into the different roles and responsibilities of each of these structures within the program as a whole.

17:48

Speaker 5

We will include this in our recap of today's meeting, which will be an email that will go out to the whole surf program to ensure that you guys have access to these important documents and then we can go back to the main presentation. We also went ahead and created a Steering Committee fact sheet. This was at the request of our HRTC members. If you can click on the link, I'd like to kind of showcase some of the information. The Steering Committee fact sheet really outlines the function and roles and responsibilities, membership criteria and commitments. Information was pulled directly from the proposal, items from the Governance Committee that they've discussed throughout the past year, and feedback from the HRTC members. This is still in its draft form, but as you can see, we have the current recommended structure that the Governance Committee has worked on. They've worked on three renditions.

19:02

Speaker 5

This is the most current one. We do have a section on representation and this stems directly from the proposal that was submitted to the state. The Steering Committee is made up of disinvested community members. There are seats that are the majority of the leadership is being comprised of 75% to 80% of grassroots and community based leaders that work within our communities. It also just reiterates the importance that the committee will be allowed to also participate in the Hub outreach structure grant opportunities. I know that was an important concern or question that has arised in regards to members being able to serve on the different opportunities that are being provided in this program. If you go ahead and scroll down more we also have the role of the Steering Committee. Again, per the proposal, the Steering Committee is the validating body of the program. There was feedback in regards to HRTC members wanting a grandfather clause within the steering Committee role and ensuring that all decisions made by the HRTC previous to the establishment of the Steering Committee cannot be overturned by the Steering Committee.

20:33

Speaker 5

This is to really value the work and decisions that have been made prior to the steering Committee being seated. We have responsibilities and commitments of the steering members per the governance committee. They have worked in the past year through a presentation that was included in the newsletter that really highlights important responsibilities and commitments that steering committee members will be making as far as being active participants, advising on needs and analysis, ensuring that all information, all decisions are being shared with the remainder of the HRTC body as well as the community. Again validating major decisions, committing to attending meetings, revising materials, and really being actively involved in the drafting of the regional economic development roadmap which is the goal of this program. There was also feedback that was received from our members in regards to ensuring that there was refusal of voting on conflicted projects because we will have members that may serve on the steering committee but also may serve on the hub structure and receive funding for outreach work for our program.

21:56

Speaker 5

It's really important that there is no conflict of interest. Having this recusal clause within our commitments is what has derived in regards to feedback that we've received from our HRTC members. We will go ahead and share this as well. The steering fact sheet. Again, it is in its draft form, but we wanted to make sure that you all had an opportunity to review this and as well provide us any further feedback. That concludes my section and I believe we have Charles up next.

22:34

Speaker 4

Sure. So thank you for that, Scarlett. There's been a lot of discussion from our HRTC partners about the number of seats. As it's been increased three times already. I can't remember the numbers off the top of my head, but up to this point, there's been agreed upon 33 seats for Steering committee. 25 of those seats are reserved for 25 of those seats, or 75% of the entire Steering committee is reserved for community based organizations and resident workers. 20 out of those 25 seats are strictly for community based organizations and five seats are for resident workers and community partners. The remaining seats, two for business, two for labor, two for municipal partners, and two for education. Now, even with that, there's been some feedback where HRTC partners has suggested increasing business and industry from two seats to three seats and increasing labor from two seats to three seats.

23:54

Speaker 4

What I did was put together a scenario of what that will look like because per the contract, we must maintain that the CBOs and residents section maintain a 75% to 80% majority. If were to increase business and industry by one seat and increase labor by one seat, that means that we would need to increase CBOs by seven seats. Thank you for correction. 75% to 80% is set aside for community based leaders and organized. Thank you for that, Sharon. Sorry, guys, it popped up. Sharon's text popped up, right? To block what I was trying to read. If were to increase from business and industry from two seats to three seats and labor from two seats to three seats and maintain that 75% to 80% for the CBOs and resident workers, we would have to increase the amount of seats for that for the CBOs to 30 seats.

25:10

Speaker 4

We go from 25 to oh, my God, it keeps blocking me. I'm sorry, guys. Overall, we would go from 33 seats to 40 seats. In order to maintain that 75%, we also have another option. We've also had feedback from HRTC members where to increase I'm sorry, not to increase to have an equal number of steering committee members for each spa. In order to do that, we would have to increase the CBO section from 25 seats to 27,

which will give three steering committee representatives free spa. The two seats for business, industry, labor, municipal partners in education, that obviously would not change. Just given that scenario, in order to have a balanced representation throughout each of the service planning areas or spas, we would have to increase to 27 seats. These are things that you guys are going to be working through in the next slide that Jermaine will go into.

26:39

Speaker 4

There's a lot of work that and discussions that the HRTC partners need to collaborate. Put your heads together and figure out what the best option is in order to move forward. Again, just keeping in mind that option one is the current model right now. If you can go to the next was the definition of a CBO community based organization, tony, to answer your.

27:07

Speaker 6

Question, no, I know, but you could have a community based organization that does healthcare, you could have a community based organization that does training. A CBO could fall into some of the other categories. I don't know if you guys have actually talked about what counts as a CBO for those 2022 or 25 seats.

27:34

Speaker 3

Yeah, I think I hear what you're saying, Tony. I mean, traditionally when we're talking about community based organizations, typically you're looking at organizations that are really driven in equity, obviously, but most importantly, driven by residents and community. Overall, they could have different missions, different functions. Typically, they're nonprofits. I think this kind of is an excellent segue, though, into this two hour working meeting that we're suggesting. Given all of the different questions and suggestions that have been coming through. The reality is we're getting into the nitty gritty, right? We're getting to a point in this process we're three months in, we've been doing this that we've actually been contract, but we've been doing this for over a year at this point. As we're building up our partners, as we're building up our stakeholders, we're to a point now where there's a lot of critical points in time that are going to help move all of this work forward.

28:32

Speaker 3

What we're suggesting before we move forward and actually finalizing our governance structure and seating it and the voting mechanisms that we're going to use, the selection criteria, et cetera, we want to just get more input. We want to get more feedback, and we want to actually have a working meeting where we can come to some conclusions and then essentially poll the HRTC one last time before we move forward with anything. Here we'll go ahead and launch a poll, if you could. We're going to have a two hour working meeting next week, and we'll just suggest a few different times for folks to participate in this session. Essentially we're going to go over all of the questions, all of the concerns, everything that we've been kind of getting from our partners. In addition to that, work through some of the suggestions that have been presented here today, kind of work through some of the definitions and terminology to make sure that we have a consensus and obviously everything won't get resolved in this to our working meeting.

29:29

Speaker 3

There's a few different deliverables that are due that are forthcoming. One is obviously the governance structure and how it's changed from what we presented, if at all, in the proposal to where we are now. In

addition to that, essentially the final governance structure, which would be the seated governance structure, is due in July. We're happy on behalf of HRTC to advocate for more time if it's needed. We may have to have multiple to our working sessions. The reality is, I think it's time to have those uncomfortable conversations. I think it's time to get to a point where we're kind of getting into the weeds and pulling back the onion on some of these things. Because that's the only way that we're going to get to a point where we have some consensus and that folks are comfortable in this community driven process because that's exactly what it is.

30:18

Speaker 3

A lot of the things that you've been seeing on the screen aren't things that LADC is sitting in the room and doing or anything of that nature. This has been done in unison with multiple Subcommittees and it's been happening for quite some time now. For a lot of our new guests and partners that are on the call today or those that are going to hear this recording later on, this two hour working meeting is really just to kind of high level go over some different things that have been transpiring in some points in time that we've arrived at. In addition to that, work through some of the questions and suggestions that have come from partners as well. Now I'll take a few different questions because I see some hands up. I think Somas went up first, then Luis and then Tanua, I think.

31:00

Speaker 5

Yes, you are. Hi, good morning. Thank you.

31:04

Speaker 7

Yeah, I guess I'm a little surprised by the two other options that were presented this morning, because attending the last governance meeting, weren't informed for those who were attendees that we would get two other renditions. It was my understanding that today were going to move forward or have discussion over the 33 seats. I'm just concerned how there was a decision to move from the original option that was presented on Friday to now being presented with two other options. I happy to learn how that took place. I don't know if the governance committee met again and I wasn't aware of or if the co chairs had discussions and so any background would be helpful. Thank you.

31:53

Speaker 3

Absolutely.

31:59

Speaker 4

Yeah, sure. Being that the 33 seats were never finalized, and since the last 30, when the 33 seats have come in from the HRTC members, there have been additional feedback. What we wanted to do was make sure that everyone's we presented the scenarios from everyone else's feedback. If you can go back, Alan, to one to the previous slide. The 33 seats have been agreed upon by the HRTC, but not finalized. Since then, there have been more suggestions from the HRTC members to increase the seats from two to three in business, from two to three in labor. We just put together a scenario of what that could look like just so you guys could see it. Option three was exactly the same, was where an HRTC member suggested putting together where there's equal representation in all of the CBOs. We put together a scenario for that.

33:19

Speaker 4

LADC has not made any decisions. We're just presenting you with the options and giving the feedback from the HRTC partners to make sure that everyone's voice has been heard.

33:32

Speaker 3

Thank you. Just really in the spirit of being transparent, folks are providing feedback. We always have this open to serpa ledc.org for questions and comments, and we have obviously new partners as well. This is just really just furnishing some of the things that have come through. Not to say that we're going to move forward with any three or any of that thing of that nature. It's just more so just being transparent in what's transpiring amongst the partners. So the other piece would be Luis. I think Tanua had a question as well after that just mentioned.

34:09

Speaker 9

I like your idea of, like, we're going to need multiple of these. I think we oftentimes on these meetings for the last year have been really taking very high points. We need some time to really get into the nitty gritty. I would recommend that if we do, for the first one, kind of lay out a structure so that like, hey, the first working group meeting of this two hour thing, we're simply going to focus on the committee structure, get some final decisions and analysis made on this. Like, is it 33? Is it 36? Whatever it might be, let's get now, next we're going to go into kind of outline some of the major issues that people have raised and start making some decisions. I would say maybe go as far as schedule at least two of them. I understand that may be a time constraint for a lot of folks, but this is important work, and we need to be able, when you're getting at the finish line, and we need to make ourselves available.

34:53

Speaker 9

We need to make ourselves reschedule things if needed. I would say this is what a lot of us have been asking for to get into the nitty gritty of this stuff. I would say to the extent you can kind of structure it so that at the first meeting, we're discussing these three items, getting some finality, and the next meeting, we're discussing these three items, getting some finality, with the goal of taking it to the board, to the group. At this group, I think would be an effective way to try to get some consensus.

35:20

Speaker 3

Thank you, Louise. So there's a few different parameters here. One thing I know, we have an upcoming meeting with the state, and so we'll voice a few of these different things in terms of timeline. The suggested governance structure, though, is due June 6. We'll have to be mindful to make sure that while we want to have and encourage these working meetings, that we do so in a timely manner so that we can still meet that deadline in the event they're not willing to move it. Right, because it could come that they don't want to move the deadline. We don't want to be in non compliance. Certainly open to that, and we'll definitely advocate on behalf of the HRTC for that. Tanoa, I see you got back.

36:07

Speaker 5

Yes.

36:10

Speaker 8

Beautiful.

36:12

Speaker 5

Is someone else muted?

36:15

Speaker 3

I think it's fine. Go ahead.

36:17

Speaker 2

Okay. I absolutely consider myself a partner with LAEDC in this process. For those who have seen me know that I've served as one of the co chairs of the governance structure, the presentation here disheartens me because it absolutely bunks the process that we had set out as a governance committee. I was not informed of that for today. At the end of our last governance meeting, we determined that we would accept feedback. We determined that once that feedback came in, that we would then look to schedule a conversation or a meeting that would be had at the governance level. I'm not sure why I would come to a meeting today and have a presentation regarding specific governance items and the processes that we've been following in order for there to be broad support and understanding about would be presented here today. That I am extremely disappointed about because I'm not sure why that was the case.

37:30

Speaker 2

Second, the concept of us having a series of what you call working meetings in two hour sessions to me is conflated with a whole nother conversation we need to be having regarding the concept of voting for the steering committee. That in and of itself is a whole nother conversation that we need to have. Yes, some working conversations need to be had, but I'm not sure why we would conflate that to be also a conversation about the overall governance structure when we have worked quite hard over the last year to do that and to respect a process in getting that done. What I would like to suggest is that I'm looking forward to working with the co chairs, getting with the committee, going back and following the process that we've been following the entire time and seeing where that feedback landed and having a conversation as a governance committee to see where we can get consensus, bring that consensus back to this group for review and consideration.

38:47

Speaker 2

Once we get to that point on the agenda, which I don't think we have, then we also do need to have a conversation about how the steering committee is seated. I have been very vocal that I do not believe that a voting process will be able to intentionally include equity and as a result needs some working. That's where I think a working group conversation could potentially take place. I just wanted to make that clear.

39:18

Speaker 3

Absolutely. Thank you. Tanoa I think on the LEDC side we see different vantage points that others don't. The biggest thing for us is to be transparent, whether it's an newly onboarded partner or one that's been here for a year. We try to essentially take all of the information and the suggestions and the comments from literally over 300 plus organizations and 400 plus stakeholders and put it in a digestible format so that everyone can form some type of consensus. The working group meeting that's being suggested doesn't even necessarily have to happen, but it's more so an opportunity for not only the co chairs of the different subcommittees, but the co chairs and the individuals that are participating in the subcommittees to come

together in an open session, to have open dialogue about these different things that have been shown here on the screen. This isn't meant to undercut any type of process that's previously been happening.

40:16

Speaker 3

It's more so meant to just have an open process so that folks can voice their opinions so. Their voices can be heard. That's essentially all that this really is. Once again, it's a suggestion, right? A lot of this can still just move forward in the regular committee meetings. It could just be that we have another governance subcommittee meeting and then folks are open to join. I think the other piece that folks have to understand is that all of these committees have been open for people to collaborate and join and take place in for the entire year. Right now we're just trying to make a concerted effort as your regional convener to ensure that we have as many voices heard and at the table and we can take as much input as possible. I don't know how much of this can be changed per se because of how far we are in with this work and given our timetables and deliverables and the fact that we literally have \$2.36 million that we need to put into the community to do the real work as part of this effort.

41:17

Speaker 3

Just trying to kind of do our due diligence at this point to see if there's any more suggestions or anything else that we can arrive at collectively. That's really all the purpose of this is and what that working group session would be next week. And then Sharon.

41:38

Speaker 8

Thank you. I do want to wholeheartedly let you know that one of the good things is we do have a great consensus at least between the O and E and governance in terms of the commitment to equity and the 75 supermajority of both community based leaders and community based organizations, which is how it's written in the proposal. We are absolutely supportive, but there has been a number of issues and questions that have rolled forward and because people were asked to submit that in writing via to LAEDC. What we discovered, and it was a very short order, is that apparently a document that folks were sharing comments and feedback in went into LAEDC spam and so it did not make it to the governance committee and it had a tremendous amount of input for people that wanted to share concerns or provide feedback. That is one oversight that nobody probably knew as a result of our last meeting.

42:39

Speaker 8

I will also tell you that we were advised that the Phasing plan had been submitted and so members of One E reviewed the Phasing plan and we discovered some changes in structure that would have disempowered our community organizations ability to complete and carry out the outreach and engagement function that was in our original proposal. They also would not have been funded until six months after that work was done. We do need some transparent conversation, I think on all level and I at least would like to be a part of that because I'm one, as you guys know, to really stand for equity. I'm also going to read the details that's the lawyer in me. I just want to say that any way we can, however we want to structure it, we want to make sure that feedback that did come in because they were asked to put it on a jamboard, it did not make it into the meeting.

43:39

Speaker 8

The stuff that came in writing did not make it to the floor. So however that needs to transpire. I would encourage just at least people to feel like they're included.

43:48

Speaker 6

Thanks.

43:51

Speaker 3

Thank you. I don't know if you put your hand back up or if you had something else. No choppy to know.

44:08

Speaker 4

Tanoa, if you're saying something, you're on mute.

44:15

Speaker 3

She was having a connectivity issue earlier, so while Tanua will take her in a second. Just to kind of reiterate, totally understand your comments, Sharon. So that's really what we're doing here. To be clear, this option one is the suggested governance structure that we anticipate moving forward with. These other options are really just being transparent and showing other suggestions that have come to LADC. I feel as thus, we will be doing a disservice if we did not furnish those suggestions on this recorded conversation, so that all of those that do access this conversation can actually see that their voices have been heard in the reasoning behind it. So that's essentially what's going on here. We can move on to the next slide. I'll take to newest question when it comes in this two hour working meeting. Just to reiterate, we just want to poll really quick so that we can really bring together all of the different committees on a unified conversation and have a working meeting to kind of work through some of these final details before we present anything to the state on June 6.

45:26

Speaker 3

From there, we have another month, about a month and a half, to work through what the seating of the governance structure will look like. The other piece I just want to kind of before I stop talking, because I've been talking too much on this meeting, I think, is that this is a community driven process, right? We just have to be mindful of the fact that essentially there's a lot of work that needs to happen, there's a lot of work that needs to be done. I think we can collectively do it, but at the same time, we just need input. We value everyone's opinion. LEDC cannot make any final decisions. We will not make any final decisions. We're going to take everything and try to make sure that everyone's voice is collectively heard across this process. And so it's going to be challenging. I can tell you right now, a lot of the other regions are not in the space that we're in.

46:16

Speaker 3

We're much further along, probably all of just maybe one of the 13 regions. So, that being said, I appreciate everyone on behalf of LEDC, and I thank you all for your commitment to this process. I see a lot of passion in the things that folks have been saying, and please continue the efforts. And so we need your help. We need your brain power and your ability to kind of bring all of this home so that we can start moving in to the next portions of this process. Because there's a lot of work that still needs to be done. We really need to honestly come to a consensus on this governance model, how we're going to select our leads, and then really going into that table and hub model, because that's where the real voice is. That's where the real decision making ability

is. Those conversations that are going to be happening in the community center over on Crenshawn and Slossen.

47:10

Speaker 3

Right. Those community members that are meeting up in Antelope Valley, those are the voices we need to hear. Those are the voices that we need to bring and uplift to the table, because a lot of the folks on this call, we might represent folks that are disinvested, we might represent and serve those that are in our community, but the reality is we need the community voice. We need that input, and we need to be able to roll that up into a strategic plan that's going to impact individuals appropriately and give them access to quality jobs and opportunities that align with the carbon neutral economy, right? Lots of things to discuss, lots of outstanding work to do, and so I'm confident we can make it happen and I'll stop talking.

47:52

Speaker 1

Thank you, Jermaine. I'm just going to move forward to our stakeholder analysis for this week. As of May 16, we have a total number of 418 organizations engaged. I know we have a decent amount of new partners on the call today, so I'll go ahead and briefly explain what that means. Engaged means that they're not necessarily a member of the HRTC, but they've been engaged or participated in a meeting or they're interested in some way. The number of organizations officially onboarded, which are individuals who submitted a surf collective partnership agreement, is 302. I'd like to give another round of applause to our outreach and engagement committee and our program manager of outreach and engagement, Gioma, because we hit past that 300 number, which is awesome, and that last number there in red, 116 organizations have not fully onboarded. Out of that 418 from the last two weeks since our last meeting, five of those organizations have fully onboarded.

48:57

Speaker 1

So we're making progress slowly but surely. I'm going to go ahead and move towards our geographic breakdown of La HRTC members by service planning area based on their member headquarters. You can see here spa four metro la and Spa Eight. South Bay harbor are still dominating pretty much in regards to representation in our La HRTC, but I'd like to note as well that Spa Five West La has taken the place of Spa One, Antelope Valley. As you can see here, the numbers are really close together. We have the most need of representation in Spa Seven, East La. As well as Spa six B, southwest la. We're continuing to work on trying to get balanced representation within the service Planning areas. Outreach and Engagement Committee has been diligently working on that as well. If you're interested in contributing to that process, feel free to join our Wednesday's meetings that occur at ten in the morning.

50:05

Speaker 1

You could either put something in the chat or just email us at surf@laedc.org. So, moving on to our number of entities, each entity type within the HRTC. Just to explain what the entity type is, again, these are the mandated stakeholder groups that the state is requiring us to have balanced representation of. You can see here that the majority of types of organizations that we have would be grassroots and community based organizations. The most need continues to be California Native American tribes as well as worker centers, labor organizations and philanthropic organizations. I know that we have been doing breakout rooms in our Outreach and Engagement Committee sessions to try to do targeted outreach and figure out where we can find or outreach to these types of organizations or these different constituents that they serve. In regards to the California Native American tribes, we have noted in our monthly progress status report to the state that we'd appreciate some more guidance in regards to how we can outreach to our Native American tribes.

51:20

Speaker 1

We do have an update on our stakeholder map. Let me go ahead and give you a brief breakdown of how to use this map. We actually have new staff on Laudc's Institute for Applied Economics team and he was able to provide me this link here. I'm happy to show everyone that we have been working on showing representation from our individual residents. I believe this link should be dropped in the chat as well. You can play around with it, but you can use this filter feature right here. Before I go into that, let me go ahead and show you the legend. As you can see, the points here are the state mandated required stakeholder groups. Based on the color, you can identify red as a CBO and the spas are outlined here with that gray outline as well as the gray bold text here. So this filter option is really cool.

52:19

Speaker 1

If you want to kind of check this out, you can press Add Expression here, and then once you press Add Expression you can locate an organization so you can type that in. It does have to match exactly the name of the organization that's on here. However, I want to showcase the individual resident. If you go ahead and type that in and you go ahead and press Save it filters it. As you can see right now, we have two individual residents mapped as part of the La HRTC. Don't be worried, this is actually map based only on zip code. This is not identifying their home address. Feel free to ask any questions about our stakeholder map or play around with that. With that said, I'm going to go ahead and move forward to our upcoming meeting dates. As I mentioned before, our Outreach and Engagement Committee meetings occur every Wednesday.

53:17

Speaker 1

The next one will be on May 24, next week on Wednesday at 10:00 A.m., and those go for an hour long. The next meeting date that we could potentially have is the two hour working meeting. The SurveyMonkey link should be in the chat for everyone to take. Again, we will be closing that poll on Monday at 05:00 P.m., so please make sure to take that as soon as you can so we can kind of see when the HRTC is available for this meeting to get as many voices as possible to do that real work. We'll go ahead and schedule that and send out a registration link at the end of the day. Of course we have our HRTC Biweekly meetings, so that is every other Friday. The next one would be two weeks from today on June 2 at 09:00 A.m.. With that said, I'm going to go ahead and pass it to Charles to elaborate on our next steps.

54:16

Speaker 4

Sorry everyone, our next steps are for everyone to chioma is did you just drop the link in the chat? Thank you, chioma. There's a poll in the chat for everyone to vote on which date and time works best for them for the two hour working meeting. The poll closes end of day on Monday, so once we get that feedback, we will be sending out the time that we'll be meeting for that. Of course that all gears towards finalizing the Serve governance model. Of course part of that discussion is going to be about the affinity hubs table partner leads. There's been a lot of discussion about how to apply to become a table partner I'm sorry, a hub lead and how the tables will be formed from that. Again, in that two hour working meeting, a lot of that can be discussed as well. We have eight minutes left, probably seven and a half minutes left.

55:29

Speaker 4

You guys have any other comments from Liliana to the two hour meetings? Are they weekly? No. Maybe you came in later on the conversation, but this will be one, maybe two times just to kind of work through what the

governance structure can look like and also voting or selection process for picking members of the steering committee. That's okay.

55:58

Speaker 1

Thank you.

55:59

Speaker 4

You're welcome. Are there any more questions or comments. Jermaine is the OG on the panel here, so he's got all the answers.

56:12

Speaker 1

Did Tanoa ever come back on? I don't think so.

56:18

Speaker 3

Tanua, were you able to come back on? I don't know if you had another question.

56:22

Speaker 2

Are you there? Can you all hear me?

56:25

Speaker 3

That's annoying.

56:26

Speaker 5

Yes, hello?

56:27

Speaker 3

Yes, we can hear you.

56:29

Speaker 2

You can hear me?

56:29

Speaker 3

Okay.

56:30

Speaker 5
Sorry.

56:30

Speaker 2

I was only able to join by phone. I think something's happening with some of the zooms. I want to register a concern about hosting a two hour meeting specifically on the governance structure. I believe that really upends the process that we have been holding so far here and would like to.

56:56

Speaker 8
Remove.

56:57

Speaker 2

That from the agenda, focus on a governance committee meeting, and then use that time to focus on the seating of the steering committee, the two hour meetings. That is my recommendation.

57:12

Speaker 3

Thank you, Tanoa. Luis, did you have a luis, just.

57:17

Speaker 9

In response to that, I'm fine if we don't want to do it through the two hour separate group, but we really need a time for us to get into the nitty gritty of the proposal. If that's something that the governance committee wants to do and whether they need a block of two to 3 hours to do that, I'm perfectly fine with that. I think I want to thank the coaches for all the work they've done. I know they put in a lot of time and effort, and I think where we're at the process is we have a proposal that's been really well fleshed out. Let's go through, present it to the relevant groups, and see if everybody is on board with all those things. Because for the longest time, I think sometimes I hear people saying, we've worked on this for a year. Not really.

57:58

Speaker 9

We got the proposal for the first time in detail a couple of weeks ago, so it's not really something that most of us have seen in detail, and we really need a venue to go into the nitty gritty of it. If that wants to do it through the committees, I'm perfectly fine with that. We need some kind of venue for this.

58:16

Speaker 2

I hear you, Louise, and the term nitty gritty. I'd like to take a moment to spend some time with you so that I can make sure that we have what are the series of questions that you want to have answered and the topics that you would want to go over in that meeting so that we can use the meeting focused in on that. I'd like to make sure I can get that from you. Of course, anyone else who has similar kinds of concerns can raise those

as well. I know Serf has always had an email address, but Luis, let you and I talk. I want to understand what nitty gritty.

58:54

Speaker 3

Means for you, and real quick, thank you both. Luis and Tanua. What I'll just share is that before I get to you, Sharon, what I'll just share is that what the LEDC team will do, we'll reach out. It sounds like our co chairs are more than willing to work together to create 1 hour, two hour session, whatever it may be, at least a window of which we can essentially reiterate what the suggested structure is. More in detail, we will work with the community chairs to get an agenda for that two hour meeting or two hour window meeting so that we can essentially have some consistency and work through some things that we have questions about. A lot of this also to just note is regarding the election process and how we are going to actually seat our governance committee as well. There's a few different kind of open items that I think we can close the gap on if you have two hour session.

59:53

Speaker 3

Yes. So Sharon well, I think there's more.

59:57

Speaker 8

Than that and I really do appreciate what you were saying and Louise both, because I do understand the role of the committees in trying to honor that. There needs to be a bigger inclusivity play here. I know governance had met back in November and then there was about four or five months that outreach people were asking for, how went from 17th during committee recommended to the 33 and it took four months. A few weeks ago, as Luis indicated, we got that information maybe three or four weeks ago. What has happened is the information that comes forth from both committees, it's our side as well and is sharing of information after discussions as opposed to inclusive conversations. It's that inclusive conversations that often I just want to finish because I'm.

01:00:52

Speaker 2

Not going to that's a different version from my version of what happened as well. This information has been on the website since then and we presented this back at the end of the year.

01:01:05

Speaker 8

You did? Absolutely. You did present it. I'm only going to speak for the Outreach Committee. Outreach Committee had been asking LADC to provide the document with that detail. Again, presenting it at a meeting and wanting to be able to have it in their hands to go through. That didn't happen for a few months. I'm not blaming anyone for it, but it did not happen until the last month. Again, we found out about the Phasing plan and again, it shifted the funding for the 90 CBOs to January and they were supposed to be funded this. There's a lot of dialogue on we've got a document that says we're supposed to be doing this, yet there's a shift happening. So I just wanted it. I just did not call for this meeting. I do want to honor people's ability to gain clarity and I just don't think in our current meeting structure people are getting enough clarity.

01:02:01

Speaker 8

We had to back up an outreach and to figure out who sits on each one of those hubs and what the committee

thought those should be comprised of. We had to let them do brainstorming sessions because we wanted input, and I want to be cognizant of that. I'm open to whatever is being suggested. I do believe, based on the comments, and please share with governance that two page document of comments that have come back and feedback. It did not make it to governance, and were surprised. It did not make it to the agenda last Friday.

01:02:36

Speaker 7

But, Sharon, this wasn't ever a we and a them. Everyone was invited to attend and participate on all three of the committees that they chose to. It was never as if to say that the outreach and engagement only had to stay with an outreach and engagement. They didn't have a voice at the governance. They had a voice. They had an opportunity to. I'm not saying that they still don't have that ability to have input, but to present it now is if the feedback and thoughts from the members who have been participating with outreach and engagement did not have a voice heard or made clear or had their recommendations or concerns, ability to have that at the governance committee is not really fair or correct.

01:03:15

Speaker 8

They were asked to provide feedback, and what I just said is the feedback was provided. It didn't make it to the committee agenda, to the committee floor. That's an oversight. However that happened, there was a jam board. There was also a document submitted. It did not roll up. That is why there are still outstanding dialogue and questions that need to be had.

01:03:37

Speaker 3

Got it. So thank you all. I don't want to hold folks, over time, we'll follow up in touch base with the co chairs on a potential agenda for that working meeting so that it's clearly identified and we're not essentially kind of rehashing things that have already transpired, but more so working together to move forward. Outside of that, are there any other questions? Any other questions before I let folks go? Libby, I don't know if you still had your hand up or you're muted. Libby let me lower my hand. There we go. No worries. All right. All thank you all so much. Thank you for your passion and commitment. I'm confident we'll work through all of this. Tony, you have your hand up?

01:04:23

Speaker 6

Yeah. I just wanted to say that on behalf of the American Indian Chamber of Commerce of California, one of the pieces that we are looking for is a specific document that says, this is the document we're going to vote on. I think you guys have been excellent about providing varieties of narratives and graphics, and it's been very helpful. What I'm not able to bring back to my organization is to say this is literally what we're voting on. Particularly with phrases like we're going to honor grandfather clauses of what we previously approved. Understanding what is it that we previously approved is that every conversation that ever happened is that votes I think it's important to honor the prior conversations, to be able to narrow down what we specifically wanted. I went back to my group, they were saying, hey, this is all really wonderful, but we don't know how to have an opinion about that because we're not sure what is specific.

01:05:28

Speaker 6

I just want to say you guys have done a great job in having lots of information, but on an election, we would like to have a specific piece of paper, even if it's 20 pages, if that's what you think it needs to be. But that will allow us to be.

01:05:42

Speaker 2

Able to move forward.

01:05:45

Speaker 3

Absolutely. Thank you, Tony. Yes. When we get to that point, we certainly will have that queued up and ready for folks. I think the biggest piece, though, is that we have to ride there together. It can't be something that we just kind of make haphazardly without the input from the HRTC as a whole. I encourage everyone to join those subcommittee meetings. They're still ongoing. If we're able to get this two hour working meeting scheduled, it'll be helpful in kind of making sure that we, as the regional convener, can document these questions, answer questions collectively with HRTC partners, and then, in addition, get some more leadership in regards to various items from our co chairs who have done an excellent job, I think, managing this process to date. Thank you all again and have a wonderful day.