CERF

L.A. HRTC

CERF LA HRTC Partners Bi-weekly Meeting

Summary Notes and Transcript

June 15th, 2023

Meeting Presentation

Meeting Recording:

Passcode: &F5=X1%s

The Partners meeting focused primarily on the new CERF Catalyst Program, which will allocate funding to regions for pre-development activities in Phase 2. The presentation was done by Matt from the Office of Planning and Research. The program aims to prepare more projects in disinvested communities and maximize funding streams for CERF projects. The program will also help alleviate timeline constraints and reach communities sooner. The breakdown of the 25 million allocation includes career coordinators, a community asset survey, a revolving loan fund, anchor institutions identification, and project investment. A timeline is also discussed starting from when the regional plan part one is due on August 31st.

Matt announced that a public comment period on the Catalyst fund will be open for three to four weeks, inviting suggestions and feedback. The timeline for the Catalyst program includes releasing applications immediately after the regional plan is due in August, with catalyst applications closing about six weeks later. The funding would be released to regions by May 1, 2024. There are additional funding streams available from state climate and jobs funds, private investments, etc. Matt also discussed how ready-to-go projects or priority industries can get into the Catalyst program and apply for implementation funding or additional funding streams if they are still in development. Finally, he addressed concerns about equal division of funds among regions and encouraged public comments on this issue during this process.

Matt and Chris from GoBiz discussed the criteria for projects eligible for implementation and CERF funds, which include being ready to go with all necessary planning and approval processes completed. They also addressed concerns about flexibility in funding allocations and emphasized the importance of community input. The timeline for upcoming events related to CERF funding was also presented. Attendees were encouraged to provide feedback during public comment periods, as transparency is key in this process.

OPR will be planning to host a webinar during the public comment period timeframe to explain further and gather feedback. Chioma gives updates on Process Mapping and outreach efforts. Scarlet provides a stakeholder analysis, highlighting an increase in representation but seeking more from certain groups. Important upcoming meetings are mentioned, including the Governance Committee meeting where seating criteria and selection/election for the steering committee members and affinity hub leads will be discussed.

Chapter 1: Introductions and Agenda Overview
1. 02:32-09:07 - Participants introduce themselves and Chandra Heyman provides an overview of the meeting's agenda.

Chapter 2: Catalyst Program Update
2. 10:17-21:47 - Matt from OPR gives an update on the Catalyst Program, which will provide funding for projects in the region.

Chapter 3: Timeline and Process Overview
3. 19:01-21:51 - Overview of the timeline for the regional plan and how it overlaps with the Catalyst Program.
4. 21:51-23:39 – Explanation of the inputs and outputs of the process.

Chapter 4: Questions and Concerns
5. 28:12-33:00 - Participants ask questions and express concerns about the timeline and the plan's feasibility.
6. 33:00-33:40 - The moderator announces that there are more questions to be answered later.
7. 33:40-37:57 - Participants ask questions about the types of projects that will be funded and the winning applicants.
8. 39:16-46:37 - Participants ask questions and express concerns about the process, including the timeline and how their voices will be heard.

Chapter 5: Updates and Next Steps
9. 46:46-54:12 - Presenters give updates on upcoming meetings, a Jamboard for identifying underrepresented groups, and stakeholder analysis.
10. 54:12-1:00:07 - Participants discuss upcoming meetings and next steps for addressing concerns about the plan's timeline.
11. 1:00:07-1:09:26 - Participants make suggestions for addressing concerns and discuss the possibility of sending a letter to request an extension.

Transcript

02:32
 Speaker 1
 Hello.

02:32
 Speaker 2
 Good morning. Can you guys see my screen right now?

02:38
 Speaker 1
 Yes.

02:39

Speaker 2
Okay.

02:40
Speaker 3
Yes. It just needs to be in presentation mode.

02:43
Speaker 2
Yeah. So I'll go ahead and go on presentation mode, and then we have 20 people.

02:48
Speaker 1
Over 20 people.

02:49
Speaker 2
So you guys are able to let.

02:51
Speaker 1
Them in, correct it's? Yes, I usually do.

02:57
Speaker 3
Let me go to chat.

03:02
Speaker 2
It's not allowing you right now.

03:05
Speaker 1
Let's see.

03:10
Speaker 2
Let me see if I can make you co host.

03:13
Speaker 1
Give me a second.

03:15
Speaker 3
I don't see the admit all button I usually see.

03:23
Speaker 2
So I just made you co host.

03:25
Speaker 3
Okay, now I see it.

03:27
Speaker 1
Okay.

03:27
Speaker 2
So let me go ahead and just share my screen, and then you can.

03:31
Speaker 3
Let and then I'll add okay.

03:34
Speaker 1
Yep. Okay.

03:46
Speaker 2
Ready for you.

03:48
Speaker 1
Ready?

03:49
Speaker 3
Here we go.

04:19

Speaker 1
Good morning. Good morning. Good morning. Good morning. Give it a couple more minutes. Well, maybe a couple more moments before we go ahead and get started. Okay, so good morning. Existing HRTC partners, pending partners, and new partners. Three day weekend coming up. We try to keep it light for you today. If there are any new partners who join cerf and would like to introduce themselves, please take this moment to do so now. Do not be shy. You have the floor.

06:08
Speaker 4
Okay, I'll start with can you hear me?

06:10
Speaker 1
Yes.

06:11
Speaker 4
Okay. My name is Chandra Heyman. I am the founder of the nonprofit organization Talking Angels. We are celebrating five years this year. And what we do is we donate keepsake blankets to those with chronic illnesses, primarily cancer. Some of the organizations that we donate to healthcare facilities is Cedar, Sinai, City of Hope, miller's Children's in Long Beach, and a number of smaller nonprofit organizations, including acute care facilities and so on and so forth. And our main purpose is really to give these keepsake blankets to bring warmth and comfort. But we're also trying to get more in the community. So that's one of the things that we're working on now has been have more community involvement in the La. Area and also in the Inland Empire. So thank you very much for having me, and I look forward to being a part of the group.

07:10
Speaker 1
Thank you, Chandra. We certainly need more organizations like you. I lost my father cancer, so I understand importance of what you guys are doing. Cedars is also one of our partners as well.

07:21
Speaker 4
Okay, great.

07:23
Speaker 1
Anyone else? Yes. Good morning. My name is Jorge Hernandez. I am the new director of the director of economic Development for Rising Communities Only community Health Council. Very nice to meet everybody. Thank you, Jorge. Hi.

07:48
Speaker 2

My name is Jen Garcia. I'm from Employee, California. We provide career building resources for the public sector and for small businesses. It's a pleasure to be here. Hi, Charles.

08:00
 Speaker 1
 Hi, Jen. How are you? Glad to have you here. Hi.

08:04
 Speaker 5
 Drew Mercy, executive director with AV Edge at the Economic Development Corporation for North La County.

08:13
 Speaker 1
 Drew, you're awesome. Brother. How are you doing?

08:16
 Speaker 5
 Doing well, thank you. Good morning.

08:18
 Speaker 1
 All right. Good morning. Glad to have you on the call, man.

08:22
 Speaker 2
 Hello, everybody. This is not my first meeting, but I haven't introduced myself yet. My name is Claudia Valtista. I am with the Pomona Economic Opportunity Center. Fernando Romero used to join this meeting, but he left a couple of months ago from the organization. So I've been joining the meeting since then, but I hadn't had a chance to introduce myself. Nice to meet everybody. Have a good day.

08:49
 Speaker 1
 Thank you and welcome. Anyone else new on the call or someone who's been on the call and just haven't introduced themselves? Okay, let's get down. I'll just go over briefly over the agenda, and then we can just jump right into it. We're going to go over some of the important dates, some that's already passed, but some that are coming upcoming, talk a little bit about what they're calling the Cerf Catalyst Program. We have two representatives from the State, from GoBiz, and from OPR, who will be talking with us. We'll discuss a little bit about how we can move forward with the Catalyst Program, how the Cerf Program can move forward with the changes through a unified letter, and then our normal updates with the process mapping, stakeholder updates, and some upcoming meeting dates. So if we can advance the slide. This is, again, for some of the newer members.

10:01
 Speaker 1
 March 1 was the date that the contract between Cerf and the State was executed. So everything was 2021 months from that starting date. May 1. Last month was our planning phase plan, which is one of the bigger plans that kind of updates that we submitted to the State. The governance structure is governance structure was sent off to the State that has been tentatively finalized. We'll be talking a little bit more about a governance meeting coming up. The big one, though, is July 14, where the governance seating is due to the State. And what that means for the new members here is that we have to have a process in place of how we're going to choose the steering committee members and affinity leaders, the hub table leaders, as well as the names that are attached to those seats. And then the two bigger reports. August 31, the regional summary report, and then next year, June 30 is the final plan.

11:24
 Speaker 1
 So I'm going to turn this over to Matt from OPR. Are you on the call? I guess I should have asked if he was on the call first, making sure that he was here. Hey, Charles.

11:32
 Speaker 6
 Yeah, I'm here.

11:32
 Speaker 1
 Okay, great. Matt, if you can introduce yourself, especially for the newer members, and you can discuss why you're about to give a presentation, update everyone on what they're calling the Catalyst Program, we greatly appreciate it.

11:50
 Speaker 6
 Yeah, of course.

11:51
 Speaker 1
 Thanks, Charles. Morning, everyone.

11:53
 Speaker 6
 Thank you so much for having me. My name is Matt Phillips. I am a senior program analyst on the cerf team at OPR. The Governor's Office of Planning and Research. I'm also the regional point person for the Southern California cerf regions. So La is one of my regions. There's two of us at OPR that have the tip on the full state as regional representatives. So I'm here to talk today about the by the way, OPR is one of the three agencies that administers cerf, just to be clear about that. So I'm here today to talk about the Cerf Catalyst Program, which is a proposal to allocate additional or allocate funding to regions specifically for

what's called pre development so project. Pre development. So these are activities that would help a project go from sort of the initial stage of conception where the HRTC might be thinking of a project, maybe thinking this is something we want to spend money on, spend some cerf funds on, but may not be able to get to the point where it's ready for implementation funding yet.

13:08
 Speaker 6
 So sometimes a project might need to do undergo feasibility studies, it might undergo a business plan, community engagement process, local planning approvals, environmental approvals, things like that. And so these funds will be used to shepherd projects along from the initial exploratory phase up to the point where they're ready to go. I'm just going to talk a little bit about our rationale for doing this. Overall, the catalyst fund. One of the best things about it is that it's going to prepare more projects in the disinvested communities that cerf is targeting. A lot of communities that we understand as a result of the economic development pilot program, a lot of communities haven't had the resources or haven't been given the resources to develop projects that are actually ready to go. That might be the other word is shovel ready. You may have heard that one. That applies to infrastructure projects usually.

14:09
 Speaker 6
 So I'm using ready to go as a sort of broader category to match the types of projects that serve can fund, which aren't just infrastructure. So predevelopment funds bridge, they bridge the gap between planning and implementation. As I mentioned, we learned from the economic development pilots that a lot of these communities don't have the resources to do that. We also think that this will help cerf projects that are developed by the Hrtcs and by and for disinvested communities actually reach those and be built in those disinvested communities. The Catalyst Fund will also help maximize funding streams cerf. The program is a fairly large number, but as far as a statewide program, it's sort of just a drop in the bucket as far as transforming the state and regional economies. So the Catalyst program will help build projects that can then leverage and apply for and win federal, state and private funding that is usually only available for ready to go projects because federal and other state agencies often want to have a ribbon cutting and so they want to invest in projects that are at the point where they can be implemented.

15:19
 Speaker 6
 So the Catalyst program will help get projects to that point. This also increased the amount of capital flowing into regions. So the initial Catalyst Fund investment can be turned into and magnified by additional funding streams, especially federal and state, that are flowing now. Last, the Catalyst Fund also helps us alleviate cerf timeline constraints. We are up against the clock. As you all know, with planning and implementation, the cerf timeline ends in 2026. That is a legislative mandate and that can't be changed except by the state legislature. Right now, as the timeline stands, we have the planning phase ends and then we have two years of implementation. So the only projects that we think Feasibly could get built in the two years of implementation are projects that are already ready to go. So the goal here is to get some more of those projects that are built by the Hrtcs throughout the planning process into that ready to go category that could then receive implementation funds or apply for additional funds outside of the cerf process.

16:29

Speaker 6

 This funding will also help project help funding reach communities sooner and help projects be built sooner. So instead of a project going through implementation and not maybe getting fully built because it hasn't undergone all the approval processes, these funds will reach communities by EXP, sort of speeding up the process of project development. We also want to ensure that we expend the full amount of cerf funding available allotted to serve through the legislation. And so this program will help us do that next slide. So just to give you a breakdown of the Catalyst funding streams, so what we're proposing is to allocate up to 26 and a half million dollars per region. One and a half million of that would go to HRTC maintenance, and then the other 25 million would be available for project development. And that's the project development is obviously the main portion of Catalyst, and it's this predevelopment activities that I've been talking about.

17:35

Speaker 6

 We further broken down that 25 million into several other buckets. We have a careers coordinator or an industry lead that will help coordinate industry developing industries priority sectors with careers and workforce development agencies. A community asset survey to sort of map what's available in the region that could be used for economic development. Some regions haven't had the opportunity to do this, so providing some funds for that, a $5 million revolving loan fund, 1 million to identify anchor institutions. So those are institutions that are really critical for a particular industry, especially a tradable sector in a region or a really important community hub that may be at risk of insolvency or at risk of shutting down. So we would fund up to a million dollars for regions to identify those anchor institutions and then figure out a plan to support them. The biggest bulk of funding here is for project investment.

18:46

Speaker 6

 And those are really the bulk of the predevelopment funds. So this will be for Hrtcs to take projects that they want to build and start them on the pathway of developing towards readiness. Next slide. So this slide is just a timeline of what we're thinking. And we've had a lot of questions about the timeline and the overlap with the planning implementation phases. I just want to say that this timeline starts when the regional plan, part one, is due on August 31. I want to say that before then, in the next week or so, we're going to open up a public comment period on the catalyst fund. It'll be open for about three to four weeks. And so there that is a really excellent opportunity for you all to come in and make suggestions, tell us what would work about this, what might not work for your region.

19:43

Speaker 6

 We have built in time to factor those suggestions and those public comments into the development of this process. And so we really honestly want your participation in the public comment process, and we want to know what you're thinking and what could work or what may not work so well about this proposed use of funds. So just to give you a quick sense of the timeline, the regional plan, the first phase of the regional plan is due August 31. I'm sure you all know that by now. We would release the catalyst program solicitation immediately after that. And then there would be about a two month period, maybe six weeks. The catalyst applications would close. The applications would only be available to fiscal agents in partnership with regional conveners in each region. So it would be a closed but competitive solicitation. By competitive, I mean each application would have to score above a certain threshold to receive funding.

20:48
Speaker 6
By December, we would begin the catalyst contracting and then the contracting process at the state just it takes six months. And that's been a pretty big burden for getting cerf funds out. And unfortunately, it's just the reality of the way the state works. And so it's a six month contracting process. So the plan would be to release the catalyst funds to regions by May 1, 2024. That's right before the regional plan. Part two is due. The way this overlaps. We're trying to prevent any gaps in funding so that the HRTC through that HRTC maintenance, that one and a half million reserve for HRTC maintenance, so that there's no gaps in funding, so the HRTC can continue to work. And can start at the end of the planning phase to start thinking about projects that it might want to put into the catalyst. The Catalyst timeline.

21:47
Speaker 6
Next slide. And then this is just I just want to give you a sense of some of the inputs and outputs for this process so you can sort of see how it all flows together. So out of the planning phase will come two things, projects that are identified as ready to go, as well as priority industries and investments that the HRTC prioritizes in the planning phase. Some of those ready to go projects can go straight into the can go straight into implementation and can apply for implementation fundings. Some of the priority industries and investments, however, won't have all the projects that come out of those. All the potential projects won't be ready to go. And so those projects can get into the Catalyst program and can start the development process. Out of the Catalyst program should come a set of developed projects, which could then, if they're developed quickly, could apply for implementation funding, or if they're still sort of in development, could end up in an additional funding stream, applying for federal Maybe IIja or that's the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law or funding from the Inflation Reduction Act.

23:00
Speaker 6
And then those projects from both the additional funding streams and also the implementation phase will end up in our communities building much needed projects in California communities. So this is the proposed catalyst fund. And again, I just want to plug that. There will be a public comment phase coming in the next week or two. We'll send that information out to all the regional conveners so that you should all hear about it. They'll also go out on the OPR listserve, which I can drop in the chat shortly if you aren't already on it. Charles, I'm happy to answer questions if you have time.

23:47
Speaker 1
Yes, we do have time. We were certainly leaving this meeting specifically for you and Chris. Okay, great.

23:58
Speaker 6
Jermaine, go for it.

24:00

Speaker 1
Hey.

24:01
Speaker 7
Good morning, Matt. I hope all is well. Thank you for that presentation today. A question that kind of really jumps out for me, really on behalf of the La County HRTC. Really is it appears as thus I mean, we know that there was a $450,000,000 pot of funding. It appears as thus this Catalyst program, it sounds like there's some additional funding streams. So one question is what are the additional funding streams? And then the other piece is, it appears that it's been divided proportionately among 13 regions. And our concern, which has come up in multiple conversations, is over 51% of La County residents live in a disadvantaged community, meaning we have roughly a little over 5 million folks that are living in a disadvantaged community. And so communities that need to be impacted and can be impacted by this project and will be impacted based upon the processes that we've put together.

25:01
Speaker 7
And so that being said, we're trying to figure out what's the logic behind the Equal Division of Funds and then what are the additional funding streams.

25:13
Speaker 6
Thanks, Sharon. So the additional funding I'll take that one. The additional funding streams. First, the additional funding streams are there are public, state, federal, and private funds that are available. I mentioned the Inflation Reduction Act. There's the bipartisan infrastructure law. Those funding streams, we know are supposed to become. The bulk of that money will become available in probably 20, 24, 20, 25, 20, 26. So some of that funding will be available. These are the types of projects that would be funded through those funding streams. There are also private investments. There are other philanthropic or companies looking to invest in new and emerging sectors. There are state climate and jobs funds that are available as part of the budget that was released yesterday. So there's a whole host of additional funding streams that part of our job at the state will be and this is especially GoBiz and my colleague Chris is on the line.

26:36
Speaker 6
The Community and Place Based Solutions team will be responsible for helping regions apply projects that they've developed and help them apply for additional funds in the future as soon as the catalyst funds start flowing. Just want to make sure I saw this comment in the chat as far as the equal division of funds yeah, I hear you. I'm based in La. So I have a personal understanding of the concerns you're talking about. I think that part of the reasoning is to make sure that regions across the state all have access to funding. Of course regions across the state, la. Is a huge region. There are regions across the state that have not received a lot of economic development focused funding before. And I think some of the thinking is to get some of the funding out to them. But I think that I don't have a super clear answer on why the equal division breakdown was decided.

27:49
Speaker 6
But I would definitely add that to a list of public comments and suggest that we change it because it's totally open for change. I can also get back to you specifically if I have a better answer on that.

28:04
Speaker 1
That works. Thank you. Tony.

28:17
Speaker 8
Hello. I had actually my comment and my question is really more of a technical piece relative to the timing. And what I am wondering now, and I appreciate, Matt, that you went through the different pieces. Did the state consider doing a contract amendment rather than a new contract that takes six months? It seems that considering only fiscal agents that are already under contract with the state are allowed that there might be the ability to do that or at least for the maintenance dollars in order to keep the HRTC going. And I think that was a really good point that you made. So I'm concerned that the timeline isn't doable because let's just say by magic were able to come up with part one by that August date, turning around in three to four weeks with a comprehensive plan for a community as large as Los Angeles that's identifying three industry sectors.

29:27
Speaker 8
They're going to get an economic development district. The elements of the piece are all valuable economic development activities, but being able to then do that in six weeks and turn in something that reflects the diversity of Los Angeles just seems really undoable. So that's kind of why I'm asking these kind of technical questions. First. I don't think the August 31 deadline is reasonable. We've talked about that. I think that needs to get to at least November or December. But I'm wondering on this contract issue, if the whole thing is pushed out, I think it becomes more workable.

30:07
Speaker 6
Thanks, Tony. Sorry, can you clarify what the six week turnaround you're talking about?

30:12
Speaker 8
Is it's going to take a lot of effort to finalize part one of the regional plan and then for the same group of people to come back and then put together an application for this program where you have to have agreed to. In part one, you might have five industry sectors that you think are great. But in your Catalyst program, you have to be able to identify what are going to be your economic development districts. In which of the primary industries are you going to go for? And so that's also a capacity issue. So it's not simply grabbing what you just did and putting it into another application. It's kind of like a whole other round of discussion. And with a community as large as Los Angeles, that's just a lot to.

31:08
 Speaker 1
 Do.

31:11
 Speaker 8
 Particularly if you want to meaningfully include input from historically underserved disinvested communities, but just geography for Los Angeles. So I think the timeline as well as the dollar amount for the size of Los Angeles is not practical and for the reasons that have already been stated. I mean, the size of this area is just much larger. But as I said, my questions are technical in understanding why you want to do it, but maybe how you're trying to do it and maybe the funding allocation doesn't quite work.

31:55
 Speaker 1
 Yeah.

31:56
 Speaker 6
 Thanks, Tony. I don't have a super technical answer to your question. If we can do it as a contract modification to the existing planning phase contract and alleviate that six month contracting burden, we would do that. I don't think it's possible based on what Edd has been looking into.

32:22
 Speaker 8
 Well, I was thinking the maintenance component, because that's really the driver of why you need that. So if you pulled that out and gave more to the organization and there might be some other element, but you would then be allowed you could have a different timeline, allow for different input.

32:44
 Speaker 6
 Yeah, that's a great idea. I will definitely bring that back to Edd. Charles, I want to let you moderate since there's some questions in the chat. I just want to make sure that we get to them all and I can't necessarily follow everything.

32:57
 Speaker 1
 Yeah, no problem. Thank you, Matt. For everything. It looks like we have a few more questions I'm kind of keeping track of so we can have some of the questions answered later on. And they don't seem to be directly connected to what you're speaking on right now. So let's just go to Luis, who's had his hand up for a little while, miss questions, and then we'll go to Sharon. Okay.

33:24
 Speaker 5

So I was curious, do you have any examples of what would be considered either a ready to go project or priority industry or investment? I know the state earlier pulled out some money to do a pilot project. I'm not sure if anything was ever funded through that. I'm curious if you guys have any ideas of kind of what you guys envision when you're seeing some of these when you're outlining some of these types of projects.

33:49
Speaker 1
Matt, I think he's referring to Louise. I believe you're referring to the pilot program that the applications were due back in February or March of this year. Yes. Okay. Jermaine, if you could, because you know more about the organization than I do, can you speak about Pace? Because Pace was awarded $5 million from that pilot program. Just kind of give a quick summary of what they are. And they were supposed to be on this call today, actually, to talk a little bit about receiving that award, but we decided to push them until later on because of the Catalyst program. Yes.

34:42
Speaker 7
So, yeah, they were awarded I don't want to speak on behalf of their organization. I'm not authorized to do so. What I will do is we can follow with them to make sure that they're on the next HRTC call so.

34:52
Speaker 6
That they can explain.

34:53
Speaker 7
I know they're more than willing to participate and essentially provide some information. It looks like Chris just put some small information in there, but a little bit more about their in terms of their actual pilot project. We'll make sure that they get on the next call.

35:10
Speaker 1
Okay. Thanks, Jermaine. And so to answer your specific question, I guess, Matt, maybe you can go into that.

35:16
Speaker 6
Yeah, Luis, it's a great question. So the link that Chris just shared in the chat is an example of the type of projects that we think that implementation and cerf funds could fund. We will have a specific definition when we roll out the Catalyst SFP. The Catalyst solicitation the request for proposals of what a ready to go project is. We'll have more criteria there. We're still developing it. But generally what were looking for was projects that had already undergone all necessary planning and approval processes. So that was whether it was getting approval from a local planning agency or a city council or either owning or already having a title to some land that they were going to build on or if it was having a feasibility study done that

they needed to do anything that would have prevented the project from any other additional hurdles that could have been done before funding the project through cerf.

36:24
 Speaker 6
 We wanted all of those things to be done. The Pace one was a little bit, I think a little bit simpler because they already run revolving loan funds that organization. And so they didn't have a ton of overhead to sort of they didn't need environmental approvals or they didn't need to secure any land to build something on. So that one was, I think, a pretty obvious readiness factor. But all the projects here, we evaluated and believe that they are ready to go and can be starting to be implemented immediately.

37:07
 Speaker 1
 And I think that just to piggyback on that. From what I heard about Pace, their application process for that pilot program, they put in a ton of work, a lot of research before doing that submission. And that's one of the reasons we like to have them on this call, to discuss the efforts that they put into in order to finally secure that grant.

37:32
 Speaker 5
 Last quick question before thank you for sharing that information about those programs are funded. Is it possible to do you guys have those listed publicly, what the application looked like? So for others who are on the call to kind of see not just for Pace, but other groups who are awarded just to kind of see the type of work and product that those are successful?

37:54
 Speaker 1
 Yes.

37:55
 Speaker 6
 You mean sorry. The applications that were submitted on behalf of each of the winning applicants?

38:02
 Speaker 5
 Yes.

38:04
 Speaker 6
 We don't have those listed publicly. I can find out if it's possible to get those. I know they're not listed publicly, but it may be possible to just share some of those with you.

38:21

Speaker 1
Okay. Thank you, Luis. If you can lower your hand, I appreciate it, and we turn it over to Ms. Sharon.

38:31
Speaker 3
Thank you so much.

38:32
Speaker 4
I appreciate it. And thanks, Matt, for sharing this information with us. I have two questions. The first is there was $450,000,000 allocated. The 13 times 26.5 is about 345,000,000. Can you tell me what is the plan for the additional 100 million?

38:52
Speaker 6
The additional 100 million will remain the same implementation bucket that we've been talking about, so it'll be competitive statewide funding. So regions will be competing across the state for those funds. The solicitation we publish for that will likely follow pretty similar to the economic development pilot solicitation, but it's the same funding that we've been talking about.

39:16
Speaker 4
Okay. And do you anticipate that will have any specific caps on it?

39:25
Speaker 6
I don't anticipate that, but also, I don't know the leadership team that makes these decisions. I don't always have the most up to date information, so I don't anticipate it, but I won't rule it out.

39:39
Speaker 4
Okay, so that's my first question. And then I wanted to really give a question that goes to the heart of the mission and purpose of Cerf funding. The intention, as I understand, around the structure, was to ensure that local Hrtcs could delineate and determine how to best utilize the funding in their region based on their regional needs. Right. And so we have been engaged at the state level to fully understand that there are some regions. That don't need as much money or some regions that have specific purpose. I talked to Glenda quite a bit.

40:20
Speaker 1
Up on the coast, the AG's perspective.

40:23

Speaker 4
 But from our perspective, included in our plan were dollars specifically allocated for research that appear to be same as what you're attempting to do on two of the designated funding uses. So how do we approach it where you are kind of dictating how our funds get used and in our pre planning and structure, we've already allocated for that. It seems that the state is determining what's best for our region and not thinking, taking into account we funded the research committee, we funded Career, we structured our use of funds to address those needs. So how are you addressing this kind of Mitchmack and Mismatch in mission?

41:09
 Speaker 6
 Thank you, sharon, Alan or whoever's running the slides. Can you go back two slides? Just want to make sure we're talking. So Sharon, you're talking about these five at the bottom, right?

41:21
 Speaker 1
 Yeah.

41:21
 Speaker 4
 So we career coordinators, community Asset service, that's stuff that's in the RFP of our research strategy. We put a million dollars into that. Right. Yet you're telling us we have to spend what could be community money for projects on tasks that we've already thought through.

41:36
 Speaker 1
 Right.

41:37
 Speaker 6
 So I'll tell you the rationale for this and then I'll tell you what we've done since hearing this concern. So the rationale is that basically we know that these are things the state team and leadership team believes that these five things, these five buckets are all we know that they help drive local and regional economic development. Right. So we know that these would be solid investments for every region to make. However, we've heard this concern a lot, especially after the community of practice meeting. And so we are building in more flexibility for regions to design the funding allocations as they want. I can't tell you exactly what that's going to look like because it's going to be shared as part of the public comment document and that document will go out to all regions at the same time. But I can tell you that there will be more flexibility as far as how these funding buckets are allocated and what regions decide to spend money on.

42:37
 Speaker 1
 Spend their money on. Thank you.

42:40
Speaker 4
That makes sense.

42:44
Speaker 1
Jermaine.

42:46
Speaker 7
Yeah, I actually meant to put my hand down. I had a similar question to Sharon.

42:50
Speaker 1
Yeah.

42:50
Speaker 7
My only other thing is this is supposed to be a community driven process. So when we start kind of putting in different processes that are not reflective of the community voice, it just poses a tremendous concern. Because when we're talking about equity and diversity and inclusion, I don't know how we can move forward with anything as it pertains to funding and what strategies can look like without hearing the community voice and what is actually going on in the communities in general. This is a similar piece that I brought up on community practice meetings. I know other regions have brought that up and even when we did the launch meeting in Sacramento so just uplifting that because I just want to make sure that we keep the community at the centerfold of all this.

43:34
Speaker 1
That's all. Thank you, Jermaine. And to piggyback on, that what Jermaine just said, just so the HRTC knows that I have expressed those sentiments to the state in our community of practice meetings, both the bi weekly ones that is held by California Forward and directly with the representatives from the state, which are on a monthly basis. So hopefully that'll resonate with it. Again, we'll talk a little bit about a unified action letter in a second, but I want to make sure that Matt and Chris get through their presentations.

44:16
Speaker 6
Thanks, Charles. I also noticed I'm sorry if I missed any questions in the chat. I noticed Jenny asked about reviewer feedback for organizations that applied for funding through the economic development pilot projects. So there is feedback available. You just have to reach out directly to the Employment Development Department. I can share their email with you. I'll put it in the chat. But if you're an applicant

who applied for economic development pilot funding and did not receive it, they will be able to give you a much more detailed breakdown of the scoring and why the funding went elsewhere.

44:56
Speaker 3
Just to follow up quickly. We've tried and we haven't gotten a.

44:59
Speaker 6
Response, but we will try again.

45:03
Speaker 1
Because.

45:05
Speaker 3
We like to learn from rejection.

45:08
Speaker 6
No, of course. Did you email the email I just put in the chat?

45:14
Speaker 2
I will check with our lead on.

45:16
Speaker 3
It, but I think so.

45:18
Speaker 6
Okay. Yes, I'll also include my email in case if you emailed them and you didn't hear back, then shoot me an email and I'll follow up.

45:29
Speaker 1
Thank you.

45:32
Speaker 4

I do want to ask the HRTC to make a formal Pio request so that all the awarded applications be made available to our HRTC members.

45:47
Speaker 1
There was one question in the chat that I do think is somewhat important here. Soma, Hernandez, her question is, will career coordinators be staff at OPR or is the concept for them to be staff at each HRTC?

46:03
Speaker 6
They'll be staffed at the HRTC level. I think we're calling them industry leads now that the lingo has shifted a little bit. But those will be individuals who are staffed at the HRTC level in the region to work connecting all of these different programs and processes together to make sure that the industries that are invested in have provide the high quality jobs that regions need. And that Cerface is about trying to provide.

46:37
Speaker 1
Matt, did you want to continue? Did you have any more to present? If not Chris?

46:46
Speaker 6
Yeah, I can just talk through this slide real quick if that's okay.

46:48
Speaker 1
Go ahead. I'm sorry. Yeah.

46:50
Speaker 6
So just to give an update on where we are. No worries, Charles. I hadn't realized this was included. So right now it's June. We're still reviewing planning phase plans that all regents submitted. We're also reviewing the contract modifications that were due 90 days after the initial contract was executed. We're also planning to release the SFP for our tribal intermediary. That should come out at the end of the month. And then in July and August, as you know, the planning phase plan part one is due. We'll be scoring the tribal intermediary applications. We'll also be launching a cerf rebrand, which I will have more information on at a later date. September and October, we should have the EDP contracts fully executed. This is a pilot project, contracts executed. We'll also be doing some contracting with the tribal intermediate, the awarded tribal intermediary, some evaluation work. And we'll also plan to launch the Predevelopment application.

48:05
Speaker 6

And then in November December the predevelopment, which is the catalyst fund application, will close. So that's just a timeline of the next the rest of the year, six months or so.

48:18
Speaker 1
Okay. If you want to advance the slide, we can go past this one because it seems like there was a little bit oh, wait, I'm sorry.

48:33
Speaker 6
Chris.

48:34
Speaker 1
Chris from GoBiz? Yeah. Good morning, everyone.

48:39
Speaker 6
Thank you, Charles.

48:40
Speaker 1
And. Yeah. Thank you, Matt. Hope everyone is doing well.

48:43
Speaker 6
I'll just keep it brief.

48:45
Speaker 1
Just going off of the last RTC meeting that we had, making sure that we are staying engaged and finding the I don't want to say silver line, this is still going to be a great program. Charles and I have been working on a list of presenters to be coming in throughout the next several months to make sure we know of all the other funding pools that will be available. So make sure you keep coming to the meetings. And I want to just uplift what Matt said earlier about public comment. It's going to go a long way for you all to show up and provide the invaluable feedback. Some of the technical feedback that we're getting are good questions on the career coordinators asking about how the criteria or what the criteria was and the scoring.

49:40
Speaker 6
Was for the pilot program or for.

49:44
Speaker 1
The pilot awardees too. Those are all going to be huge.

49:47
Speaker 6
Right.

49:48
Speaker 1
Transparency is really key in this process. We will have three different interagencies that we're working with on our side, and it's a heavier list than it may seem. But I just want to say that we are trying to be as responsive as possible. I know it doesn't always look like.

50:06
Speaker 6
That, but we are doing our best.

50:10
Speaker 1
On our side, especially in the La. Region. I put my contact information here as well. If there's anything that comes up, if there's questions that aren't being answered or you're not getting responses, that's part of.

50:23
Speaker 6
My job, to make sure folks are.

50:28
Speaker 1
Engaging with our region here in La. Thank you, Chris.

50:35
Speaker 6
No problem.

50:36
Speaker 1
Looks like we have one hand raised from san Gabriel Valley economic partner. Hey, it's Lucy.

50:41
Speaker 5

I'm sorry, real quick question. For the distribution of the funds where it was being distributed evenly, you said there was that's still not finalized. When's the deadline for that to be finalized, or so if changes are made, how long do we have to try to make our voices heard, to try.

50:57
Speaker 6
To argue for that change we made? Yeah, go ahead, Matt. Sorry, could you repeat the question? I didn't quite understand it.

51:07
Speaker 5
So the monies for the awards, you just went out that they're being distributed evenly, you said that's not necessarily finalized yet, that theoretically the state could change its minds and start giving them out differently. And if so, when's the deadline for.

51:21
Speaker 6
That decision to be made for the Catalyst Fund? Like the 26 and a half million? That decision will be made at the end of the public comment period, which will close in July. So the opportunity to explain why that decision may not work for La or may not best for La would be in the public comment.

51:47
Speaker 1
Matt or Chris, can you verify these dates? June 20 is the release for the public comment. June 27, there'd be a public comment webinar, and July 19 is the close of public comment. Is that accurate?

52:04
Speaker 6
Yeah, those are estimated dates, but they're not set in stone. But, yeah, we're aiming for the public comment to open at the end of next week. It would be about a month. And then OPR plans to host a webinar within, I think, the first two weeks of public comment opening to explain the Catalyst further and solicit feedback there, too.

52:22
Speaker 1
Okay, so the moment that OPR sends us that the solidified dates will make sure that the cerf team will make sure that we get it out to everyone at La HRTC. Yeah, and just really quick, sharon asked or mentioned that the La RTC phasing plan document had an error in it. Luckily, we've been working really well with Edd to be fluid and make an exception. Not an exception, but approve those as they come in within reason, so that shouldn't be an issue. Sharon okay, if there aren't any more comments, I'd like to turn it over to Ms. Chioma, who would give updates on our deliverables. Yes.

53:22
Speaker 3

Good morning, everyone. That was a lot of information regarding the Catalyst Fund, so I'll keep it brief here with the process mapping. As I mentioned at the last meeting, we do have a vendor selected the mark. We have had a delay in the processing of the vendors just because we do have to work with our fiscal agent, CCS, but we do anticipate moving forward with the mark and the processing of them as a vendor by next week. And so the process mapping will happen. Just one and a half week delay, but we do anticipate moving forward next week with the mark. And then on the next slide, we have a Jamboard.

54:12
Speaker 1
Yes.

54:12
Speaker 3
So our Jamboard, our outreach and engagement co chairs have requested that we set up a Jamboard specifically for a couple of items and I believe the Jamboard link is in the chat. If not we will add it to the chat. But this Jamboard is needed for, as it states here, identifying the groups that may lack sufficient representation within the HRTC. If any of the partners would like to add any groups they feel would need to be on that list, they can list them on the Jamboard so we can easily collect the feedback. And also if you would like to provide suggestions for refining the affinity eligibility criteria and the conversation will happen next week when we talk about our next steps, we'll talk about the upcoming governance committee meeting where that conversation will take place. But we'll put the link for the Jam board in the chat and any of the partners who would like to provide feedback can easily enter it on the Jam board so that we can have that information for the upcoming governance committee meeting.

55:24
Speaker 3
And I see Sharon has a question.

55:25
Speaker 1
Go ahead.

55:27
Speaker 4
No, thank you so much. And this came out of this was feedback directly from community members that they wanted to chime in on ensuring how affinity hubs are selected and make sure that recommendations gets to governance. I do want to also ask similar to open up a separate page because we had 25 people in a working group meeting that dialogued and actually came to an interesting kind of a consensus recommendation to governance on how we seek equity for affinity hub and other steering committee members. I would like to ask that also be included as a because only 25 folks were on that call, which means the HRTC has not had it seen it, they have not had a chance to chime in on that recommendation. And I'd like to make sure that gets included for not only review comment support before we engage it at additional recommendation to governance and the full HRTC will have to approve it.

56:32

Speaker 3
Thank you for that Sharon. Note taken. So yes, we'll put the link in the chat and we'll make that available and Scarlett will also send that to all the partners in the email communication.

56:48
Speaker 1
Thank you. I'll hand it over to Scarlett.

56:52
Speaker 2
Yes. Hi everyone. I will be providing a quick stakeholder analysis seeing that we are running out of time. But just to highlight, we have an increase of four partners in the last two weeks and we're looking to reduce the number in red to ensure that all entities that are engaged but not a member of the La HRTC become a member and then moving forward. An increase in representation is being highlighted in spa six B, spa two, spa four and spa three was seen as notable. Spa six B no longer has the least representation within the La HRTC which as we've seen was something that was highlighted in the past. It's now Spa Seven, which is East La. So any of our partners and folks that are in that region, we can please receive your assistance in engaging organizations that might not be partners right now with the Lahrtc to ensure that we're sharing information with them.

58:00
Speaker 2
We do have a fact sheet on our website as well as a recruitment email template on our website that can easily be sent to organizations to ensure that they know what cerf is and how they can join our program. And then in this graph here, we see an increase in representation and employers in business, which was Lagging. We have government agencies and philanthropic organizations as well being seen as an increase, still seeking more representation from worker centers, california Native American tribes and labor organizations. We do have some very important upcoming meetings. We have our Outreach and Engagement Committee meeting on June 21 at 10:00 A.m.. Then we do have our governance Committee June 21 at 12:00 P.m.. This will be an extremely important meeting that will be overGoing some of our open items in regards to the seating of our steering committee, the seating of our affinity hub leads the criterias that we are looking for and the processes because we do have an extremely important deadline of July 14 that we have to submit the seatings and the names that will be attached to these different tables.

59:25
Speaker 2
And so we do want to make sure that we have all input from our HRTC in regards to how we can move forward with that very limited space that we now have left for this specific deliverable. And then we do have our next HRTC biweekly meeting June. We do continue to encourage participation. These upcoming meetings will be critical in some of the votes that will be taken or some of the approvals that will be needed to move forward with, again, our tight deadlines that we have coming up. And then Charles, if you'd like to just close it off with next steps.

01:00:03
Speaker 1

Sure, yeah, just making sure. So Reiterating Scarlett was saying the Governance Committee meeting is on Friday from twelve to one. We highly encourage you all to show up for that and voice your opinions, listen to the suggestions that are coming through and put your thinking caps on ways to move forward so we can make sure that we meet that July 14 deadline. And some of the things that will be discussed in there in that meeting will be about the steering committee being comprised of a subset of the affinity and subregional tables and of course, the seating criteria, the process, the selection process, voting process, whatever mechanism is going to be chosen. All of that is going to be discussed there later on this month. There'll be the launch of the dedicated website for cerf, and Ms. Scarlet will probably give the presentation on that. So it looks like we got a couple of hands up.

01:01:19
Speaker 1
We have a few minutes. Yes.

01:01:21
Speaker 2
Charles? Sorry?

01:01:24
Speaker 3
For the governance committee meeting. It does say Friday, June 21, which is an error. Sorry. It is Wednesday.

01:01:31
Speaker 1
Oh, Wednesday. Wednesday. That's right.

01:01:35
Speaker 3
Wednesday, June.

01:01:36
Speaker 4
It's on Wednesday. Aren't governance meetings on Friday? Didn't the HRTC vote for that? Because that means that outreach members have to attend multiple full on meetings in order to so we've been in meetings from ten to one in order to participate.

01:01:54
Speaker 1
Yeah.

01:01:54

Speaker 3
No, our meetings been on Wednesdays.

01:01:56
Speaker 4
They have been okay. I thought there was a vote taken in the last couple of months to change meeting times, and I thought we even changed our meeting time.

01:02:05
Speaker 3
I don't know. Governance made that took a vote because we didn't take a vote for that.

01:02:11
Speaker 4
No, it was done committee. It was done HRTC wide. Was that changed to Wednesdays or Fridays?

01:02:19
Speaker 3
Well, for this, I think that was that special occasion for just that one.

01:02:22
Speaker 4
Because there was no you weren't involved in those months.

01:02:25
Speaker 8
Trust me.

01:02:26
Speaker 4
I did not want to change to 10:00 on Wednesdays.

01:02:29
Speaker 3
Yes, there was a poll taken, but for these upcoming meetings, we did have to take in consideration the availability of members and co chairs.

01:02:42
Speaker 1
Ms. Tony, we have about 1 minute. You're on mute. You're a mute.

01:02:57

Speaker 8
 With Matt and Chris here, I just thought it would be important to give some feedback relative to the August 31 deadline. And I'm here for the American Indian Chamber of Commerce of California. We've been participating in a lot of committees, so we know everybody's been working very hard to get this whole thing going. It's not workable to be able to get the deliverables that are supposed to be done by August 31. And I thought if we could I don't think we're the only organization who has concerns that community members aren't going to have a chance to voice that. And I thought this is an opportunity to speak directly to them, and potentially we should vote to send a letter requesting an extension or explaining why that date is not workable for a large area like us.

01:03:50
 Speaker 1
 Thank you for that comment. Certainly after that public comment area is up, we'd like to compile as many data points grievances as we possibly can and put it professionally in a letter, a unified action letter. Make sure we get that off not just to the state, but also to officials in our region who may support our issues.

01:04:19
 Speaker 8
 I think there's two parts. I mean, one is the August 31 date for part one deliverables, and the second is the Catalyst Fund. And I'm concerned if we wait for the public comment period on the Catalyst Fund that we will essentially be shooting our own selves in the foot if we can try to resolve the August 31 date. They're completely combined, but I'm wondering if we could possibly deal with them both separately.

01:04:52
 Speaker 1
 Maybe if Matt or Chris you want to take that quickly? We're overtime as it is. But Matt, Chris, how would you guys like to handle that?

01:05:05
 Speaker 6
 I think this is up to you all to decide. I would say if you would like to see a deadline push back. It's always better to send a letter sooner rather than later. I don't know if it's possible to change that deadline. I have heard that it's not, but if you want to send a letter, I would do it sooner rather than later.

01:05:25
 Speaker 1
Jessica, your hand is up. I'll let you go ahead. Quickly.

01:05:29
 Speaker 2
 Hi, everybody. Really quickly. There's a lot of discussion, decision making, voting processes that needs to be considered, and I know I've mentioned it before, we really need to have an in person meeting. It seems that we're going to have an all day meeting, three hour meeting from ten to one. Can't we make that in person meeting so we can all come together and go through this whole process together in person? I

don't know how we're going to get in 1 hour to be able to come up with the decision making, do the voting, make recommendations, who's going to be on the governance committee, the affinity groups? That's not possible.

01:06:26
Speaker 1
I remember you bringing that up a few months back and it seemed to be a point of contention within the La HRTC. Unfortunately, we're out of time right now, but I do believe at the governance meeting, well, we are going to have to figure something out. It is possible that 1 hour is not enough to iron out these issues, and we as the regional convener, we are neutral in this process. The La HRTC needs to come up with a solution of making sure that everyone is included, whether it's online, in person, a combination of both. But it needs to be agreed upon. And if there's suggestions on how to do that from multiple members, let's do that. Send it to cerf@laedc.com. I'm sorry, cerf@laedc.org so we can move forward with it. We certainly want to make sure that everyone has their voice, but also that no one's feeling like that.

01:07:37
Speaker 1
They're putting themselves out in position where they're overextending themselves in order to do so. Luis? Yeah.

01:07:49
Speaker 5
Just a final comment. I think I'm really frustrated with this whole monies being divvied out evenly throughout the regions. I was doing a quick glance at some of the other regions. The red coast region includes del norte, humboldt, lake, mendocino. They have less than 400,000 people in that region. They get the same amount of money as La County. I think if we try to chime in as an HRTC, it's not going to make a difference. Let's be honest, it will not change anything. We need to start leveraging our delegation from La County, our elected officials. The speaker of the assembly is from La County. We need them to start contacting. I'm not sure if it's the Director of Edd who it needs to be, but we need to start mobilizing our local delegation to start reaching out to the officials and saying, this is unacceptable.

01:08:33
Speaker 5
You need to change this, and we control your budget strings, and we will make the changes if need be. But this idea of us just kind of writing a letter, I think that's passed. If we're serious about changing that amount, we need to mobilize our local La county delegation to get them to start putting pressure on the governor, putting pressure on the Edd, putting pressure on whoever the department OPR, and really start hammering home that they need to be hearing from them on this issue. That that's unacceptable.

01:09:02
Speaker 1
Amen to that one. We're five minutes over. Jessica, I see your hand still up. I don't know if you just didn't lower it or you had one more comment.

01:09:12

Speaker 2
No, that was my comment. I just think with technology, we could do a hybrid meeting. Folks can come in person or people can't be there, can chime in via technology.

01:09:26
Speaker 1
So this could be an outreach and engagement. Unfortunately for Euchioma, an issue that you may have to try to help work out. But at the cerf team, we can huddle together and just figure out a way to get some type of sample size of what would best for the HRTC.

01:09:51
Speaker 2
That would be great.

01:09:53
Speaker 1
Okay, thank you. So we're seven minutes over. My apologies for this. It was a lot of information. Try to enjoy the three day weekend and let's digest everything that Matt from OPR and Chris from GoBiz. Thank you both for being on the call. The information that they Wied out to us, and let's just find a way to move forward. That's it. Let's enjoy the weekend, and we'll you in two weeks, or hopefully before, certainly at that governance meeting. Thank you, everyone.

01:10:29
Speaker 2
Have a great weekend. Bye, everybody. Bye, everyone. Thank you.

01:10:35
Speaker 1
Bye bye. Bye, everyone.

01:10:38
Speaker 4
Thank you.