



## LA HRTC Partners Meeting Summary Notes and Transcript May 31<sup>st</sup>, 2023

### Meeting Recording

Passcode: [G@zT8dKd](#)

### Meeting Summary

The working meeting was regarding the governance structure and steering committee. The main topic is selecting or electing affinity hub leads and ensuring equity representation on the steering committee. Some attendees express concern about their inclusion in the process, while others propose options for achieving 75-80% supermajority goals and fulfilling commitments to affinity subregional table community group organizational structures outlined in contracts. One proposal suggests designating 8 equity seats from each of the Affinity Hubs off the top, leaving either 24 or 21 seats available depending on whether they stay at 33 or move up to 36 total seats respectively. Governance has requested for five additional seats to go towards residents and workers.

The discussion moves to the allocation of seats on a steering committee, with a focus on equity and community representation. Labor representatives expressed concern about their representation within the committee, with suggestions for one union representative, one low-income-focused workforce labor representative, and one non-low-income representative to be included in addition to those already represented through affinity hubs. Overall, there were ongoing discussions around how best to balance different perspectives while ensuring equitable representation within the steering committee.

The group discussed the governance structure and representation for different organizations. They talked about criteria for selecting members, term limits, and informal groups like farmers or PTAs. There are five resident seats reserved specifically for local workers to participate in decision-making processes, and small organizations will be getting \$10,000 grants in the Subregional Tables, as another form of participation beyond the Steering Committee. The group also discussed academia affinity hubs and ensuring that low-income students have a voice at the table. They talked about community-based organizations being equity-focused and including workforce development seats as well as environmental justice seats. The steering committee has 33 seats with 25 for CBOs/resident workers broken down by CBO leaders having 20 and resident workers having five.

The group discussed the number of seats needed for the steering committee, which currently stands at 33. They discuss how to adjust those numbers if community-based organizations (CBOs) and resident workers are combined or separated. Tony suggests a middle ground where CBOs with different focuses can be represented without redoing anything. Charles points out that not only CBOs and residents can meet the requirement of being representative of disinvested communities but also business workforce training organizations or labor unions, etc. The group discusses increasing the number of steering committee seats to ensure geographic equity and participation while maintaining equity and commitment to the supermajority. They propose having three representatives per spa, nine spas in total, plus some countywide seats for organizations serving Constituents countywide. Sharon proposes 36 seats instead of 33 as it would allow each spa to have three representatives while ensuring fairness amongst all groups involved in this process.

The group discussed the number of seats on the steering committee and settled on 33 members, with a focus on ensuring equitable representation for community-based organizations. They also discussed selecting twelve affinity hubs and determining the criteria for individuals or organizations to lead them. The responsibility, funding, and duties of these leads were also discussed.

**A vote was taken to confirm the decision for 33 steering committee members.**

Further discussions on membership criteria, selection/election processes, and affinity hub leads will take place at the upcoming Governance Meeting on Friday, June 9th.

**Outline:**

Chapter 1: Introduction

07:18 - The meeting begins with a greeting to the HRTC members.

Chapter 2: Agenda Items

08:22 - Request to take edits to the agenda.

09:59 - Discussion of agenda items and call for topics.

11:30 - Discussion of recommendations for the agenda.

12:37 - Acknowledgment of time constraints.

Chapter 3: Steering Committee

14:39 - Sharon introduces the issue with the order of steering committee versus the affinity hub.

16:23 - Discussion of the language in the proposal and contract.

19:52 - Discussion of representation in the steering committee.

24:32 - Request for input from governance.

46:16 - Discussion of how to select steering committee members.

47:43 - Summary of the selection process.

50:08 - Discussion of the criteria for selecting members.

53:30 - Review of the planning document.

1:23:24 - Discussion of the selection and voting mechanism process.

2:02:52 - Discussion of a potential extension.

Chapter 4: Closing Remarks

2:19:40 - Acknowledgment of the need for collaboration to make things happen.

**Transcript**

04:33

Speaker 1

Hey, guys, I'm going to start admitting people now. Good morning, everyone. We're just going to give a

couple minutes for everyone to kind of trickle into the meeting. Hello, HRTC members. Good morning. All right. All okay. We're going to give maybe a couple of minutes just to see how many more people will come on the call. All right. See, Sharon is popping on right now. Psalm is here. Stella is here. Okay, let's keep them going. I think we're just waiting on Tanua. That one governance co chair. Right? In the meantime, I'm just going to throw up the agenda on the screen for everyone. Thank you.

08:22

Speaker 2

Are you going to take edits to the agenda, please?

08:28

Speaker 1

Sorry, what was that?

08:29

Speaker 2

Sharon, we're going to be taking edits to the agenda, please.

08:34

Speaker 1

Yes, I believe I saw your email right before this meeting so we can go out and discuss.

08:40

Speaker 2

Yeah, I think everybody needs to have the opportunity to add to the agenda subtract. That's normal when you convene.

08:48

Speaker 1

Okay. Are you guys able to see if Tanua joined in the participant list? Doesn't look like it yet.

09:06

Speaker 2

She hasn't joined, Alvin.

09:08

Speaker 1

Thank you. Soma we'll give it another minute where we start. So obviously I didn't see the changes to adjustments to the agenda.

09:59

Speaker 2

Well, first I think we want to ask people to be able to chime in because you asked folks for agenda items. I think we need to get some concurrence around what the agenda will be so that everybody has a chance to be heard and have their concerns brought to the table in terms of what we're going to be working on.

10:22

Speaker 1

And just so everyone knows, this working meeting is regarding the governance structure, particularly the number of steering committee members we need to get that locked down and how equal or equitable representation can be finalized for the hub and tables. I'll go into a few visuals once we get more people on the call, and you guys feel free to state items along those lines that you like to discuss on this call or work through, because it's going to be a working meeting.

11:19

Speaker 2

I sent in. Good morning. Hi, Jesse. Welcome. So I will put in the recommendations that I shared on the steering committee for the agenda today. So I'm going to put those into the choppy those into the chat. There's some other items regarding table partners and fiscal stuff that I think we are not going to be able to get today personally, based on what I expect the voluminous content to be shared. Oh, God, that looked horrible.

12:02

Speaker 3

Charles and Sharon, I'm just wondering if.

12:04

Speaker 2

We have time just to address the email that came out yesterday about the grant itself. Just the changes that were coming down from the state.

12:16

Speaker 1

Yeah, if we have time, we can go into that. We're still waiting to get clarification from the state. I did send an email out to them, and they got back to me, our local representative from Gopid I'm sorry, from OPR got back to us and said that they're going to be sending something out, but we should definitely have something by Friday. Okay, yeah, if we have time, we go through it. But this is very important because it's time sensitive. We're dealing with a vendor who wanted to essentially create a voting mechanism for the La HRTC. It's custom made for the La region, and if you guys agree upon it, then he will continue building it. He's done this on spec so far, he and his company, I should say his team of engineers. And if you guys want to move forward with it, I'll green light for him to go ahead and move forward with it.

13:18

Speaker 1

If not, then we will abandon it and you have to come up with another process. But is Tanua on the call? If not, I think we need to get going for the sake of time. No, I don't see her on the call. I was emailing with her assistant earlier right before this meeting, so I was thinking that she would join, but she might be

joining a little late. I'm not too sure, but I think it's a good time to just get started. Okay. Before I do that, are there any other items that anyone would like to try for us to discuss or work through on this call before we get going?

13:56

Speaker 2

I'd like to take the table partner items off of the agenda and move them to the back of the meeting. I'd like to move the 1135 items to the lower and move up affinity tables to the top.

14:14

Speaker 1

That only makes sense. You can't really choose the table partners until you have the affinity hubs.

14:21

Speaker 2

You can't choose a steering committee until you have affinity hubs. That's the issue that I want to bring as number one before we get to anything, we kind of have.

14:36

Speaker 1

Okay, let's go ahead and get started. Sharon, since you want to, why don't you lead off with that, with your issue with the order of steering committee versus the affinity hub.

14:56

Speaker 2

For that I would need screen access or scarlett, if you can bring up our quickly bring up our affinity hubs, our twelve affinity hubs. Your document is fine. I have it open. I know it's proposed. It has not been the one that with governance has not been approved, but the language is on the second page on what the steering committee is comprised of is in the contract, it is in the proposal, and it is on every piece of communication that we've sent out in terms of our governance structure. So I want to make sure everybody sees that in writing. Here's what we're committing to. Sure.

15:33

Speaker 4

You can go ahead and do you have it?

15:35

Speaker 2

I can bring up I think I have the website open, so just give me I have it open on the website. I also have 35 windows open. So the language as it reads on page 20 of the contract is that the steering committee is a subset of our affinity hubs. There we go. I think Luis is waiting to get in. I'm just going to grab that off of the web. So this is the document. This has not been approved by the HRTC, but it captured the language just described. So in keeping the representation, the language here that says the steering committee is comprised of a subset of affinity and subregional table representatives, it actually says affinity hub leads.

The way it's written in the proposal and contract is the language that is on page 20 of the proposal and the contract. And in order to see the steering Committee, we first need to see Rfinity.

16:36

Speaker 2

We need to select Rfinity hub leads because they are automatically part of the seats on the steering committee. So my conversation that I'd like to bring up to the first issue is from an integrity standpoint, we started at 128 members. We are now over 300 and our outreach activity has all been anchored using the language that is this language that our steering committee is comprised of both our affinity hub leads and sub regional table representatives. That's actually written differently than it's in the contract. And then it goes on to say that we are committed to making sure we have the super majority of seats on the steering committee. So the first issue that I think we have to address is how are we going to select or elect our affinity hub leads and ensure that we have equity. Because if we don't, I will tell you what I'm hearing from members, is that if we fail to do that and we have been misrepresenting to all of our newly elected members on this process, that we're going to face potential litigation that we are telling them to join us and do this and do that in order for them to have a voice on the steering committee.

17:57

Speaker 2

Because the affinity hub lead is the convener of the micro grantees and all the other tables and they share information between the steering committee and the community groups and they have to do monthly reporting. So I want to bring that to the table first. I do believe that there is I'm going to say upfront there is automatically a path forward for us to achieve both our 75% or 80% supermajority goals, fulfill our commitment to the Affinity Subregional Table community group organizational structure that we have in our contract and still honor and align to support this committee structure that Governance has put forth. I think there is a pathway forward to do it, to make it mend and blend. But I want to start with talking about the affinity hubs because that's where somehow when this was put forth out of governance, there was no reviewing of what does the contract say, what does the proposal say?

19:02

Speaker 2

How is this comprised? Because I've looked at it, I've tried to figure out how to mend it, but I want to hear what people have to say about it first. Nothing.

19:23

Speaker 5

I'm going to jump in. And this is Kimberly roll. Hi, I'm director of the Southern California virtual business center and I'm a member that was not there from the beginning. And I completely agree with what you're sharing, Sharon, because being someone that wasn't there from the beginning but now participating and trying to be active, I would definitely like for my voice as well as the other organizations that are joining to be heard and definitely to have a role. And so in my review of the materials, one of the things that I saw was just looking in terms of how we would be represented here. And I'm a little bit concerned that the current layout doesn't show us being included in this process. So I want to be able to understand how we can be more active and be elected on the steering committee and participate underneath these different affinity hubs.

20:23

Speaker 5

So for me, inclusion is really important. So I totally agree with what you're saying, Sharon.

20:32

Speaker 2

Does anybody have an issue in terms of understanding that? Is there any issue or disagreement that the way we're structured that the affinity hubs are supposed to be on that seat on the steering committee, does anyone have any challenge with that or have they not seen that? And I think Louise said to me when we started talking about a little bit in our committee, he's like, I'm not real sure how that's measuring up. Is there any feedback, I mean, from the partners on that particular issue? Tony, hi.

21:08

Speaker 6

That was my understanding is that these seats were supplemental to the affinity hub leads or whatever was set in the contract. It was a combination.

21:22

Speaker 2

Okay, is there anyone I've looked at it. I know we can get to 75%. A little bit of negotiation and discussion and give and take would maybe required to get to 80%, but I can see. So I'm going to switch my screen share to something that I've been working on to try and figure out. Can you see my this is what I'm considering to be an option B. Okay, guys, there's an option on the table with 33 seats. I was been playing around with options A, B and C. What happens if we stay at the 33? We're at 31 is where the last and it came out at 33. What happens if we go to 36 and how do we move forward? So my first question becomes on the affinity hubs. If we're committed to getting to the 75 or 80% that is written in our contract, by the way, because it did come back in the language in the contract, then I'm going to say from our perspective that we should address the elephant in the room and say there's a such thing as an equity seat on our steering committee.

22:31

Speaker 2

And those are protected seats that will be representative of community leaders or equity focused CBOs. That's what we committed to and I think the people we're going to honor that. So what I attempted to do was go through the Affinity hubs one through twelve. There are twelve Affinity Hubs, but two of them I'm sorry, my little thing went crazy. Two of them numbers ten, and the last two, each one of these seats, I'm proposing that we give eight equity seats of those affinity Hubs to the community and then leave four other ones that are other stakeholders. So that becomes off the top of whatever steering committee seats that we have. Because the definition is we committed to 80% of disinvested communities, which is 80% people representing 80% of AMI high employment area or EPA defined DAC. So if those are the eligibility criteria for an equity seat, then we should be seating those people from representing those markets I just went through and kind of did a quick overall.

23:46

Speaker 2

And that would give eight seats of the Affinity Hubs, eight to the community and then four other stakeholders that would leave if we go to 36, that will leave 24 seats available after the affinities are off the top. If we stay at the 33, then that leaves us 21 seats. So I did this to say we could get to I was playing around with this option, but we could get to a designation of our Affinity Hubs off the top, leaving 24 seats. And then governance has asked for five seats to go to residents and workers. And those are community are those intended to be community seats? Since somebody from governance speak up. Anybody speak up on that. The five seats are intended to be community. The resident workers are supposed to be equity based seats because they're in that pot on your scarlet, on your spreadsheet.

24:52

Speaker 2

So that's five more seats. But those are in the community based leader or resident column that are absolutely designated as equity seats. Right? So that gets us from eight to five, that gets us to 13. Then when we go down the rest of what the governance committee has proposed, they said they want two governance or municipal seats. Well, there is already an institutional and government seat in the Affinity Hub, right? Number nine. That's an affinity hub. So we have one institutional government seat that is non equity. So if there's going to be a second one, it looks like governance are recommending somebody recommend if it's a municipality or economic development. I'm not sure why those definitioners, but if it's a municipal government seat, there's your second one. And again, it's non. Please putting something in the chat. We're not going through selection process jelly. We're kind of going to table that.

25:55

Speaker 2

And so I wanted to cover the structure of the seats based on affinity hubs. And then selection process is a whole discussion how we get them there. But what we have, I think we can get aligned on the seats that governance wants to set aside, and then we can go back to process. Right. I'm sorry. My numbers are crazy. They went nuts. So these are the 51234, your five residence seats. They are community focused. I'm going to make this a little bit smaller so I can sit on the screen. Sorry. Didn't even do that. There we go. Good call. Good call, Luis. And we need to figure out how to do that. That's a good point. That should be odd. I think that's a great idea. Let's put that on the discussion.

26:55

Speaker 5

Can you zoom in just a little bit more on your screen? Okay.

26:58

Speaker 2

A little bit larger?

26:59

Speaker 5

Yeah.

27:00



Speaker 2

Okay. I was trying to make sure I could get let me scroll down a little bit. I'm sorry. I didn't have a chance. This was not pretty. This was better than my sketch writing because nobody can read my writing, including me. Sometimes a little too big because then I can't are we there? Okay, so we got the residents. That gives us five seats. Government is a non equity seat. There was a discussion on the thing around business employers. The business employers, there is a business and employer affinity hub. Right. And that's been put in other stakeholders. And then the governance committee is asking for the second business employer seat, and it to be small business. So the question is I think that is a non equity seat, but I wanted to hear feedback because it has to meet equity definition. On state's definition, the individual has to be 80% of AMI.

27:59

Speaker 2

It has to be located in a high employment area, or it has to be an EPA defined disadvantaged community. Those are the criteria, you guys. Tony, you're a smart business expert. Yeah.

28:11

Speaker 6

I do think that it is for the second position, and I'm not sure I'm following everything, so I'm just commenting on this. I do think that for the second business employer position, it would not be difficult to find a representative and have multiple. So there was a choice. That small business ownership, diverse ownership. It's completely doable. It can be an association. There's multiple ones that we've been seeing.

28:40

Speaker 2

I think it can definitely be small business. You're right on point. And that's what the governance asked for. They wanted a small business represent somebody representing small business right in that second employer seat. If there are some objectives to that, is there concerns with that other than stella, you got to help me out here. I can't reach Chat. Yeah, hold on 1 second. Let me just bring that up.

29:06

Speaker 3

We did have a question. Comment from Crystal. From a labor perspective, labor, one of the contractually obligated partners, have major concerns.

29:19

Speaker 2

Around the 75% to 80% breakdown. Majority representation labor does not feel adequately represented in this structure, especially as the.

29:28

Speaker 3

Epicenter of what a good and high.

29:31

Speaker 2

Road job is defined to the state.

29:33

Speaker 3

Our concern is that this process will.

29:35

Speaker 2

Not honor the objectives for serve that the state has outlined.

29:39

Speaker 3

Thank you for that crystal.

29:41

Speaker 2

Very valid point. Labor is next. It's right behind small business, behind employers. So is there any issues regarding the employer? Because, again, small business was the ask from governance, but because small business can doesn't necessarily have to be an 80% AMI household or a high employment area since it's tracked, I slide it as a non equity seat. But clearly, as governance has asked for as a small business focus, so now we move on to workforce.

30:18

Speaker 6

I'm sorry, Sharon. So in your chart, it's showing employer business, small business, whatever you're calling it, as a non equity seat. Are you saying that you believe that it can be an equity seat? I mean, that's what I think we're saying. It can be, not that it always is. So I'm just trying to follow your chart.

30:38

Speaker 2

Well, why would you? Equity means it has to be a business organization or small business owner that is 80% or less of area meeting income, right?

30:56

Speaker 6

No, I know the definition. I do. No, or it's an association that represents the thing within the census tracks. So there are associations that have real track records in supporting the needs of businesses that are located in those census tracks?

31:18

Speaker 2

Absolutely. We can do that. If that's what the membership wants. It's not a problem. All that's going to mean is that becomes an equity seat and then we flip another seat because we had a whole bunch of community seats sitting out there. Absolutely. If the consensus of the group is that the second seat actually be someone that representing really? We're talking about low income businesses, not micro enterprises. Low income. It's an income evaluation.

31:45

Speaker 6

No, I think it's a geography evaluation for residents and for businesses. It's where do you live? Those four categories are geography based, so if you live in those areas, they're not asking for tony, please show me your income statement. You're trying to get people that live within the defined disinvested geographic area.

32:14

Speaker 2

It is for two of them, Tony. You're right, but the 80% AMI test is not a geography test.

32:21

Speaker 6

I think all of them, but it's one of the five categories. But it's one of the four categories.

32:27

Speaker 2

You don't have to meet every are you thinking no, you just have to meet one of them? No, one of them. Any one of those. I just put these on here as this is the eligibility factor of whether you are disinvested or not disinvested, whether you're representing a disinvested community. So you get high unemployment, area geography. Absolutely. And you're going to be an equity seat. You can be an EPA DAC, and you're going to be an equity seat if you are representing individuals that are in business owners that have 80% of low income business owners, then that is an income test. That's the way it's written. Because, I mean, I remember that when we had a Solano involved, they wanted to change that to 30% of AMI and it just wasn't well, I know.

33:12

Speaker 6

But I'm just saying that if we're trying to identify where seats are potentially equity seats, then that could be defined. That way you could meet in two or three of the categories.

33:28

Speaker 2

So is the consensus of the group that you want equity you want the second employer seat to be an equity seat? That's what the question is, I think, on the table. And again, I'm all about you make a decision, Theresa. Sorry, I took it back. I was responding tony's comment. I think the framing of it can be and based on those geographic layerings sounds good to me. So is the proposal to make the employer business an equity seat? I just take politics. Is that is that what the group is? I'm throwing stuff out. None of this is

baked. I'm trying to figure out how we can merge two different models and still reach the goal of 80% inclusion. That's what really this exercise is about because our affinity tables are upfront. Okay, clear on what?

34:24

Speaker 5

Equity versus non equity seats.

34:26

Speaker 2

Okay. Right. I wouldn't call what Tony described as a non equity seat. No, she's calling it an equity seat. She wants to describe it as an equity seat. It's coming from a low income area. It's coming from low income business owner representing low income business owners. It's coming from somebody representing businesses in a high unemployment area. Somebody representing sure. Yeah. All sounds good. Thanks. All right. So that's what we call an equity seat. So if the second seat becomes equity, I take this box away and I move it over here to the community column. Right. And now we have another seat here, workforce and labor. Someone just concerned, a very big concern. This has come up over and over again that there is a labor focus and we have only had two individuals. We're only allowing workforce and labor two seats on the steering committee.

35:25

Speaker 2

I'm going to say this. It's what Kelly said, and I wish she was on that. She mentioned this. I voiced that concern. But I'm really glad to hear other people voice it. Remember, one of our affinity hubs, number seven up here is already workforce development and union. So we have one seat that is automatically led by it's an equity seat. That's an affinity hub. But because governance wants two, that means we need another seat on union.

36:02

Speaker 3

Hi, Sheriff.

36:03

Speaker 2

Right. We need another seat for workforce and union. My concern is that we had unions. We have to have labor and unions and workforce centers at the table. And if they're only getting they're going to sit at a table because their hub is going to be on steering committee and there's going to be nine organizations as subregional tables under them, one from every area funded. So there will be at least ten workforce and union organizations at the table. But what Steering is recommending is two seats on the steering committee. And if the pushback is it enough? Are you comfortable with that? Because one of the things that has to happen is if you're going to have workforce development and union at the table, then you got to have your low income unions, right? Your janitors. Your janitors and your restaurant workers or whatever, those union workers.

37:04

Speaker 2

But you also have union representatives that are making 60, \$70 an hour. And so both need to be engaged. And we had La County Federation of labor participating on Outreach, who's representing all of the unions. So I think, from my perspective, I was thinking one union, one low income focused workforce labor representative, and one non low income. I want feedback because, again, this is a suggestion. I'm just trying to figure out how we get to what both groups, what both goals are. Honor Crystal comments because I understand labor is not as well represented as someone like Sharon. Can I jump in real quick? Yeah, of course.

37:51

Speaker 1

Yeah.

37:51

Speaker 2

Thank you for sort of outlining the governance structure, and I think it's more clear now the sort of way we're going to operate. But thank you for finding that. And I think I just want to highlight one of Charles comments in the beginning when we kicked this all off was to have the little guy at the seat, right? So fair representation, ensuring that there's a proportionate voice in the decision making processes. And I don't want to go into the process right. Of selection. But is there like, some membership criteria, term limits, and certain considerations for informal groups like farmers, more like faith based or local clergy or PTAs, if that's being considered? Or maybe in the future, is there a consideration for developing or creating or forming some type of subcommittee under the Affinity hubs? It's called subregional tables. And that is absolutely there. I am liking how you're thinking, because the PTA is a place where we're going to get down to education, and the PTA is a place where education happens outside of the school districts.

39:18

Speaker 2

But there is a focus. There are five resident seats numbers. These resident seats here that I'm highlighting right here, these particular seats, these are just for local residents, for workers. It's not an organization. They're being reserved specifically so that we have individuals at the table who can have their voice and participate. But also the small organizations are going to be getting \$10,000 grants. There's 90 of them. And so it's eight of 30 equipment, Jesse. It's not eight of 32. And that's why I'm still rolling. Hold on, just let me get down to the bottom, because at the bottom, you're going to see the numbers, right? Based on Tony's recommendation, where those numbers are going to increase. So let's keep rolling. So on the union side, I really think we need to have some representation of reg non low income from the union, and we also need to have some low income or equity.

40:18

Speaker 2

So my recommendation, since government wants only two, is to try and split them. And I'm sorry, Crystal, but we'll figure out remember, there are ten seats that are paid at the labor and union tables. Now, I also want to let you know and hold that thought because I'm going to get to community groups. So there is an education, there's an academia affinity hub number ten, and that is non equity because it's representing all the community colleges, all the universities, the school districts, yellow, blah. Right. Dr. Inn has been on the calls consistently, and they aren't coalesced. But there's a lot of other academia

opportunities that we defined when we were going through we spent the last several weeks, five weeks, going through every single affinity hub, determining what types of organizations need to be at those tables. And that was community driven. And so at academia, we had things come up like our vocational schools need to be represented.

41:18

Speaker 2

I love Jesse's idea. The PTAs are a great role there, right? That's a community voice. But there's also things like, we found the Department of Rehabilitation has prison based school programs, and so there's a lot more in the academia that allows community to come forward. So the idea of my thinking, and this is just your feedback requested, is that the other educational focus seat be made an equity seat. So the voice of the low income student, unemployment based student that's living in a high unemployment area gets pushed through. I know organizations like ABC have been very vocal about stuff like that. Any thoughts or concerns on that? Because, again, I'm trying to figure out how do we get to the numbers? All right. And so here's where we are. Now, the last seat, governance asks for 20 seats for community based organizations. So if we were to take all the remaining seats to get us to 36, then that would give us 22.

42:31

Speaker 2

And based on 22 seats for equity community based organizations and five seats for community based residents and workers. Now, Kelly made a point in one of our meetings. So is it Crystal Gal from labor that felt labor workforce wasn't adequately represented? You made a very valid point, and that point did get brought up in our meetings. And Kelly Leabanco made a comment and I said, well, why are we only having two workforce development seats when this is a workforce high roads job focus? So we need to have our folks represent it. Our business is going to employ these people. Workforce needs to have a pathway there. And then we also need to have academia helping to shape that. And so what Kelly said was I thought was brilliant. Our community based organizations that are equity focused should include the workforce organizations that are equity focused.

43:38

Speaker 2

So I don't know if there's a limitation on the community based organizations not being workforce. I think they could be environmental justice. They could be workforce. These are the community youth guys have asked for all these community based seats, CBO seats, and as long as they are representing the under, the disinvested, I think there's flexibility of the type of work that they're doing to be there. It could be workforce investors, it could be the environmental justice.

44:12

Speaker 1

Hey, Sharon.

44:14

Speaker 2

That's it. I covered them all, so I wanted to just like I said, I can't do that. You're not listening to itunes. With this way we get to 75% and if the suggestion is to move it to 37 and that additional seat is added that

Tony has suggested from labor, this goes to 23. So 28 out of 37 I think gets us there. So I just provided this just as a framework to say, one, affinity hubs have to come off the top and two, there is a pathway forward so that governance can get everything at once in terms of the specific seed alignment and still us keep to this 80% goal. I was hashing out numbers all day long. The only issue that is on the table that I saw and you guys got to figure it out and talk about it, is because our language says that we would not only see our affinity hubs, but we would have a subset of our subregional tables.

45:26

Speaker 2

There are 90 subregional grantees. We can't put 90 people on the steering committee, but it might be possible up to the governance committee and you guys to take nine of those community based seats and provide one of those seats at least from every spa. And that would give you and designate those seats for sub regional table micro grantees. You can figure out how you're selecting them later, but you could meet the requirements in what you have said you were doing in your proposal and you could still meet your geographic because remember, the subregionals are geographic. So that's just my way I was trying to figure out how do we do it all? I shared what I have. I'm sorry it took up so much time, but I really wanted to just kind of start with before we had began to talk about the how we select, because I think that's going to be a big fight that we really had a conversation around, that it's achievable.

46:33

Speaker 2

Both blending the missions is achievable, but we would have to go to probably a 36 or I like as Louis is saying, maybe even a 37 member. All right, I'm done. I'm going to stop sharing.

46:50

Speaker 3

So can I just summarize what I believe you said Sharon was based on the proposal? Because I think lots of us actually pulled up the proposal to actually look at it and read from that. Page 20 on how the 80% needs to how we had said 80% is going to come from disinvested community organizations and that the affinity hubs would be or that the steering committee would have a subset of those affinity hubs. And you're stating that there are twelve affinity hubs and hub leads, and each of those hub leads will automatically be seated on the steering committee and then the remaining seats, you've mapped out how we could make sure we still meet the 80% representation and also reflect the nine spa geographies to be included within that. Is that a summary?

47:45

Speaker 2

So wonderfully done, Libby.

47:49

Speaker 3

With the exception of changing it from an even number to an odd number, I do agree with that the steering committee needs to have an odd number of representatives on it.

47:58

Speaker 2  
Okay.

48:03

Speaker 3  
So what's our next step, Charles?

48:08

Speaker 1  
So I like to if there was from Soma on page 20 of the cerf proposal, we agree that there would be 80% of the seats. There seems to be can someone on the call from HRTC clarify the 75% to 80% versus just the 80%?

48:33

Speaker 2  
Yeah.

48:35

Speaker 1  
What was the decision on that?

48:38

Speaker 2  
That came out of governance. It was actually on the deck and it came out of Zariah's mouth. I think I saw that. We did met. I think I go back and look at that. But I'm going to let governance speak to that because I do know the language did go 75 to 80. It's in writing, but it's in writing a couple of places. But originally were at 80, and I kind of stood with community on that 80 summer. I was absolutely there on that. But I do know that when it got written, when I saw the grant proposal come back, the language is a little softer than that. And I think Bill made that edit or Bill had the grant writer make that edit. And then everything I've seen coming out of governance has said 75 to 80. And that was, I think, as Zariah calls it, in the spirit of negotiation.

49:36

Speaker 4  
Yeah. And so I placed it there in response to why labor was saying that they disagreed with the percentage. It's what we committed to. And through consensus of governance, we reached the 75 to 80. So just wanted to highlight for all those that are new to the process that this has been vetted and it has gone through a lot of conversation and that we are looking at a seeding of 75% to 80%.

50:06

Speaker 1  
Okay. So with that and of course, I apologize, I may have to go get my charger in the other room, but I want to share my screen, and this is dealing solely with the steering committee.



50:26

Speaker 2

Let's see.

50:29

Speaker 1

1 second here. Screen. You guys see an Excel sheet?

50:49

Speaker 2

Yeah. Little bit bigger, though.

50:52

Speaker 1

Okay, I'll see if I can how to make it bigger, but I'll do what I can.

50:59

Speaker 5

Yeah, we definitely need it bigger because it's really difficult to see.

51:03

Speaker 3

Yeah, much better. Can you make it take up your whole screen?

51:09

Speaker 2

Yes.

51:13

Speaker 1

So right now, there are 33 seats. Can you guys see my mouse moving? Okay, great. So this is the agreed upon number of seats for the steering committee at this moment, 33 25 for CBOs resident workers. And that's broken down by CBOs having 20, resident workers having five, and then two for the remaining categories in order to increase in order to maintain that 75% to 80%. If you want to increase labor by one, increase business by one, you have to increase this area by five in order to remain the 75% to 80%.

52:01

Speaker 3

Well, let me stop you right there, Charles, and ask what makes you say that? Because I'm looking at the how are you defining the different groups in column A as whether they meet that criteria, the disinvested? Because I can see any number that we can decide upon. We can put the parameters in there that will meet the 75 to 80. So how are you defining labor, business, education, municipal partners? Are you assuming

that all of those are non equity, meaning that they don't meet the 80% criteria, and that's how you made that determination?

52:38

Speaker 1

Carla, can you pull up the chart? Which chart, Charles, that has the breakdown of the steering committee seats?

52:52

Speaker 2

Yeah, give me 1 second here. Let me pull that up on the fact sheet. Give me a second.

53:05

Speaker 1

Scarlett. I think I have it open. I think I can go ahead.

53:09

Speaker 2

Yeah, it was shared earlier. Thank you.

53:13

Speaker 1

Just give me 1 second.

53:15

Speaker 3

Yeah, because I'm looking at your breakdown at bureau. You are just looking at those CBOs, those 25 as meeting the equity.

53:22

Speaker 1

Are you guys able to see this?

53:26

Speaker 2

Yes.

53:30

Speaker 1

Okay.

53:33

Speaker 3  
Got you.

53:35

Speaker 1

All right, so this is what you guys have been seeing for quite a while now since it increased 233 seats. Now, if there's a new process because of the equity versus non equity, then the chart that the Excel spreadsheet that I just presented will have to be revised. However, at the end of the day, it's still a number of seats that you're going to you need to agree upon for the steering committee. And right now, it's 33 seats. And you have to figure out how you're going to adjust those numbers. If the CBOs and resident workers are combined, if they're still combined, then the way that it was shown, the way that I just showed the chart, the Excel chart, that's the way it needs to stay. If there's a new process for that, if you're segmenting the CBOs from the resident workers, then that needs to be addressed and essentially just come up with a new process of how the steering committees are going to be, the new calculation, essentially.

55:11

Speaker 2

So Tony and Libby have their hand up.

55:14

Speaker 1

Charles sure.

55:17

Speaker 6

Tony yeah, I think there's a middle ground here.

55:22

Speaker 2

I really do.

55:23

Speaker 6

So there is a community based organization. There are a handful that might serve every single purpose, every single need that someone in a disinvested community might need. But a lot of community based organizations have a focus. It might be education or they're very focused on youth, or they might be we're going to help entrepreneurs, they might be home based entrepreneurs in order to get that community based piece. So I don't think we're necessarily trying to redo or undo. I think it's because the definition of community based leaders is so broad that it allows for an authentic and legitimate discussion of what organizations might represent that, so it's not trying to redo it. As I said, I think that I personally know several examples of education community based organizations that would fit this. I know business organizations that do micro enterprise or something. I don't know the other categories, but I just feel like there's a middle ground and not a redo.

56:37

Speaker 1

Okay, so Alan, how do I go back to sharing my screen just so I can go ahead and unshare and you should be able to share. Okay, so the formula is put in here for each of these. So there's nothing that's done by hand. So if you guys are.

57:18

Speaker 2

Well, Charles.

57:19

Speaker 3

I still had my hand up.

57:20

Speaker 1

Oh, I'm sorry.

57:22

Speaker 3

That's okay. No, only thing I was just going to point out is that I don't believe we have all made the assumption that the only groups within steering committee that meet that 80% goal or in terms of being representative of disinvested communities are only the CBOs and the residents. But that we just talked about examples where business workforce Training organization, group a labor union can also meet that qualifier of being considered a disinvested community group or representing the disinvested communities. Meaning then that your supermajority down there would change because we're not making the assumption that they're all going to be easier equity and non equity. And that's why I was saying that in order to keep the 75% to 80%, you don't necessarily need to add all those additional representatives from the CBOs and residents. If we are having more of an open mind to the possibility of different organizations that are for example, was it Tony who said you could have a small business that represents business that is from one of those disinvested groups, and they meet that criteria.

58:47

Speaker 3

Therefore, they're part of helping us achieve that 75% to 80% without adding on additional representatives under CBOs.

58:57

Speaker 1

Right, I understand the process now. So you're saying that a CBO can also be here?

59:08

Speaker 3

I'm saying that a representative from education or workforce training provider, since that's how we have it listed, I believe I don't have that screen pulled up, can still meet that qualifier because what is the qualifier? To my understanding, the qualifier is I just had it pulled up.

59:30

Speaker 2  
Dedicated to.

59:31

Speaker 3  
Community based leaders of disadvantaged communities rooted in grassroots and community based organizations. So there could be an organization that represents or workforce training provider that actually does represent those disinvested groups or their target audience or their target customers, clients, whoever is that group. So they could also be seen as meeting at 80%. I think that's what Sharon was trying to break down in her spreadsheet and how she was also pointing out that automatically twelve of these 33 would be the affinity hub leads. So they'd automatically be seated on the steering committee. And then that's on us, is to determine the selection process of the remaining 21 and also ensuring that those remaining 21 still keep us at that 75% to 80%. How do we do that in terms of that selection process? And one of the recommendations she even put on there was that out of the community based groups, we should have one from each of the spas to make sure to guarantee we have at least one representative from each of those nine spas as well.

01:00:45

Speaker 3  
So that's what I heard her say, and I know it was a lot that she presented and shared, and believe me, I'm surprised more than anybody that I'm actually following it. But I do understand that now, reading our proposal narrative, that we did say that were going to have the affinity hub lead as part of the steering committee and the fact that were originally coming at this with voting for the steering committee first. I see now it's jumping ahead of us. Voting the affinity leads first and then moving to the steering committee remaining spaces. So I understand how we got here and how we're now having this discussion, how we move forward.

01:01:32

Speaker 1  
Okay, so suggestions on how to move forward are these numbers sorry, as of right now, this is the way and I hate to focus on the steering committee seats, but they're going hand in hand. Do you guys feel that it's proper to maybe decide on the number of steering committee seats before you move forward or something else?

01:02:17

Speaker 2  
I don't want to jump in, but I don't know how we cannot. Maintaining equity and our commitment to the supermajority means we just lock that in.

01:02:27

Speaker 1  
Okay.

01:02:31

Speaker 2  
Just for the same reason that you represent it has to be there.

01:02:38

Speaker 1  
How would you like to increase the numbers or decrease, I'm assuming just I.

01:02:44

Speaker 2  
Mean, I proposed 36. I think Luis came in and said 37. And I want to be clear on why I'm proposing 36 because I don't think I shared that. We were at 31. That the last time they committed. So there was a discussion sidebar that moved it to 33 that never came before. Both. But it doesn't matter. Here's the idea. If we have nine spas and we're committed to geographic equity and participation, then nine doesn't divide by 31. But if we were to go to 36, you could have the nine divided by that. And I think for fairness, because we have what Alan's been sharing in our demographic reports is that a good 30% in excess of 30% of our members represent that they're serving Constituents countywide. So if we had three steering committee members per spa, that would get us to 27. And then if we add it tick the other six or 07:00 a.m.

01:03:55

Speaker 2  
I right. My addition is going crazy. Now, suddenly, if we took the other one and left those as county wide seats, meaning for organizations that are serving county wide, I think we could still have equity in that. We are ensuring that there's at least three steering committee seats for every spa, and then we have some seats for our countywide organizations as well. That was why I was suggesting that we go higher just so that we could ensure that. Again, everybody's kind of been in agreement in the last HRCC, but we didn't have a vote that we don't want six steering committee members from one spa or seven. We're trying to make sure that we don't have concentration of control.

01:04:42

Speaker 1  
Sure, Libby. And so I'll get to you in 1 second, but I just want to address what you were saying here. So, Sharon, can you still see the screen with the jumping cell to sell?

01:04:53

Speaker 2  
Where are you at?

01:04:54

Speaker 1  
So, using your example here, increasing from 25 to 27, this will give three reps in any spa.

01:05:05

Speaker 2

Three times nine. Right. We'd have three times nine.

01:05:08

Speaker 1

And that's without increasing any of these seats.

01:05:11

Speaker 2

Now, those seats, that's what we're having. The challenge. Can you open up column jump here? Because that's what we said. That whole thing that I just went through is a little bit different than here. Can you go just copy your fields into column G? And then you can manipulate the numbers without destroying what you already have.

01:05:29

Speaker 1

Just the numbers, are you saying?

01:05:41

Speaker 2

All right, so let's say let's just drop the numbers in. Okay, so on the model that I laid out, let me tell you what I had 20. Our community based organizations. We have 23 community equity focused community organizations. There's 23 of them. And then there are one, two community based organizations that are non equity. So it's 25. We're moving community to 25. CBOs going to 25. Let me just make sure yeah, the community is 25, and then your residence is five.

01:06:34

Speaker 1

So do you want 25.

01:06:37

Speaker 2

Total or you have on an equity, are you doing the total count or are you doing the equity count? Which one are you doing?

01:06:46

Speaker 1

You tell me which one what you want.

01:06:49

Speaker 2

Your hand is up. And I know this is where her heart string pulls. I just want to remind people that.

01:06:56

Speaker 4

We're an hour in and I'm not seeing any type of anything, and we can spend another hour coming up with tables. And so based on what Libby was sharing and some others, if, for example, like CRCD, they're in south La. They're community driven. They're working with underrepresented people. So my understanding is that they would be able to their workforce development, they would be able to be eligible for being a representative of that 75% to 80% if they were to go for it. And so I think that's for me, it's like, let's not stick to if you're isol, you do a specific focus. But I think this is cerface giving us an opportunity to not think traditionally. So, for example, Slate, Z, we do a lot of different work where we're a nontraditional environmental justice group and we focus on all these things. And so I would encourage everyone to really think about if your organization is serving community members and are underrepresented and are small, that you may fall into the 75% to 80%.

01:08:15

Speaker 4

And so I'll drop it there. But I just wanted to really highlight that because it's past an hour and I really want us to get to some consensus and some resolution.

01:08:25

Speaker 2

Yeah, I think I hear you right on point, and it doesn't really matter. Here's the thing. We have an affinity hub for workforce development. We have an affinity hub. We have community based organizations that are going to sit on the steering committee. You can apply for what you want to apply for. But I think what we've already demonstrated so far already, is that we can get to 75%, 36 or 37 and have all of our affinity hub seated and meet all of the requirements that governments have outlined. The only shift that would happen, and it's not even a shift, is that we have designated some of one of the employer seats to be an equity based small business seat. We have designated one of the workforce labor seats to be absolutely an equity focus seat, and we've designated one of the education seats to be one of an equity CBO.

01:09:25

Speaker 2

And so with that, we're there. So the question is, are we going to go to 33, 36 or 37? I think that's the conversation that needs to come down to right now and then we can move on to process, which is, I think, where the real dialogue is. The challenging dialogue is so, Sharon, why.

01:09:51

Speaker 1

Don't you throw out your wait, libby, I think you had did you oh.

01:09:55

Speaker 3

I had put it down. I did want clarification from Sharon, though. So if we moved it to 37, that is what



would allow us to make sure we have a rep from each spa group as well. Is that how you that's why you expanded it.

01:10:09

Speaker 2

Originally you said 36, but 36, we had three reps from each spa and then we also had a room for folks that are representing the county that they don't just get excluded.

01:10:23

Speaker 3

Got you. But then you suggested or recommended we move up to 37. So we keep it as odd the way that Luis has stated. And then I guess our next step would be to determine how we go about putting the requirements, not almost like requirements, but what are the qualifiers for the individual organization to lead an affinity hub? Because we have to determine how we're going to select vote, seat those twelve and then how we're then subsequently going to do the selection of the remaining seats on the steering committee. That's what I hear is the rest of this conversation, if I'm correct, Charles.

01:11:05

Speaker 1

That's the way that I'm comprehending it right now, digest from you guys. Jermaine has got his hand up.

01:11:13

Speaker 7

So let's hear from yeah, my only question is I'm just wondering if there is any change that is suggested here. How does this group of 20 really not even like 24 if you subtract all the LEDC staff on the call? I just want to make sure because the governance team was meeting for quite some time to come up with this suggested structure that they have. And so that being said, I don't know that we have the bodies here to overrule 300 plus organizations that are part of this process. And so if we do come up with another suggested structure, I'm just asking this group how we intend to be inclusive of those other individuals that are not on the call today to vote which structure we go with, essentially.

01:12:03

Speaker 2

And I think that's so important, Jermaine, because the point that I'm actually making is that was why I spent the time on that table, is that it build us out. And I just did another calculation. So I want to ask a question, is that it takes exactly what governance recommends and puts it in the box. And that was really important from my perspective, is that we not eliminate, we commit it to affinity. We commit it. And governance has come forth with these seats per organization. And so that gives us we have to do both. That was my thinking. And so a question, I had said three per, but if you look at the math, again, your recommendation is we actually could go four per spa and leave, what, five left over for county wide? No, that would only leave one. So it's three or four per spa with some for the countywide.

01:13:06

Speaker 2

That's kind of your guys' call, but I'm going to shut up now.

01:13:11

Speaker 3

Can we also just leave it at the 33, though, and still just make the requirement that at least each of the spas have to be represented in there so we don't have to go back to the whole group and have the rest of the group, a couple of hundred group representatives don't feel as if we change the rules the last minute.

01:13:32

Speaker 2

If we go with 33, if we go with the 30, if we stay with the 33, we end up with 27 and yeah, we end up with six. We have the 27 and we end up with six members that are counting wide. If the idea if everybody is understanding that county, that's important, that we don't forget the 30% of the groups that say they're counting wide.

01:14:03

Speaker 3

Yeah, I think that's going to be easier than trying to have the rest of the couple of hundred groups.

01:14:09

Speaker 7

So it sounds like zeroing in on the criteria, more so than changing the number and then making sure everyone's clear. At least that's what I'm gathering, right?

01:14:17

Speaker 3

Yeah.

01:14:19

Speaker 2

I'm just trying to figure out on this table, what does that do from us in terms of giving us the actual numbers?

01:14:28

Speaker 1

I'm not exactly sure it really matters, Sharon, because everyone's point, if it's based on criteria, then they can fall in any of these buckets. As long as you have 33 and you kind of spread it out just like, make this 20, it doesn't matter because they can be there anyway. But if three are represented from each spa or whatever number that you want to make it equal, everyone's represented without you having to go and change the numbers. Is that what I'm hearing from Soma and Jermaine? I believe it was.

01:15:16

Speaker 2

I'm just looking to see that we have our non 33 minutes.

01:15:22

Speaker 1

Olivia, why don't you go ahead while she's working it out?

01:15:26

Speaker 3

I meant to lower that back down. I didn't need to still pick up.

01:15:30

Speaker 2

You know what? It does. Okay, so staying at 33, based on the numbers, I got this right, I've got 1234-5678. I have eight stakeholders on the steering committee that are non equity seats. That means we cannot have one community based organization that it doesn't leave any CBO seats at all for non equity seats. So organizations like the La Chamber organizations like Lisa's organization Lisa's in sangriable Valley If you are a community based organization and your constituency is not defined as a disinvested, you don't have a seat on the steering committee. Because we have no CBO at 33. We have no CBO seats at all for non equity stakeholders in order to achieve that number. That was part of the logic. So your non equity seats, if you look at all of your affinity, hubs, institutional and government academia, one of the business seats in economic development are non equity.

01:16:58

Speaker 2

And then the only thing you have left is one workforce, one labor for non low income workers, and that's it. There's not a community based seat for any organization that represents general population. That means your chambers that are not located in the low income area would not have any seats. The way I proposed it is we put two of those seats available for community based organizations that are not concentrated in high unemployment areas, DAX or serving only the equity, low income resident business owners.

01:17:47

Speaker 1

And that's your justification from increasing 33 to 35?

01:17:52

Speaker 2

Yeah, because there's no seats for them at all. But it doesn't mean it just means that there's no room. So we have like, for example, because there's a conversation, for example, Glac. Black was on the table and she was a coach here. There's not a table. There's not a seat. Because Glack represents low come and non low income. Right. They're not located in a high unemployment area. There's not a community based organizational seed as opposed to we look at someone like Vermont Slossen who is located in a targeted equity area. So that's just the logic. Whatever you guys want. I just want to make sure we know what the numbers are going to be.

01:18:38

Speaker 1

Well, you guys want to try to figure out how you want to break this down, which numbers you want to stick with? Is it 33 or 35? Any other suggestions past that? But it seems to be 33 and 35 of the numbers that locked on. Definitely an odd number. Seems to be are there any other does anyone else on this call have any other suggestions?

01:19:07

Speaker 5

I have a question and I guess this is what I'm trying to understand in terms because I've heard a lot of comments regarding the community based organizations and sort of fitting into these different areas. Why can't we start with the different areas and then fill in the community based organizations within those areas and then represent the different is it possible to do both.

01:19:30

Speaker 1

The areas, meaning these here entity types.

01:19:37

Speaker 2

To account for those pieces?

01:19:40

Speaker 5

So I feel like everyone's kind of saying the same thing to some extent in terms of making sure that the representation is there. I do agree with Sharon in terms of the number of seats. Would be good to make sure we have each of the spots represented equally. I love that idea, but because there's a requirement in terms of the 80% for the CBOs, why can't we start with a different area and put the CBO with seats into each of those areas?

01:20:10

Speaker 2

Well, I think that's going to come up in ballot. We're going to end up there anyway. But I don't think that's something that we need to spend time discussing. It over. I kind of see it like, hey, when you run a city council election, you're voting for a district. Our districts are just spas. Right. Equity means you don't have folks that represent Nano Valley aren't voting on city council districts or they're not focused on city council districts in downtown La. Right. It's the same thing. You've got a seat for a spot, that's a seaport spot. All right, what are we doing, guys? You guys got to figure out I'm going to let the group I honestly.

01:20:47

Speaker 3

Thought we had decided we're going to go ahead and save it to 33 because it's going to be too much trouble and it's going to feel as if it's slap in the face of the others who feel like when did you guys change

that? In the last minute that we already agreed on 33. And if we're moving forward with 33, then what we need to be focused on is. What's going to be the selection process of those twelve Affinity Hubs first, since those are the ones that are automatically going to get seated on the steering committee, and then how we select the remaining seats for the steering committee. I thought that's where were. And one of the questions I saw in the chat was what's the criteria for an Affinity Hub lead so that we can ensure the right people or the right organizations are being nominated or nominating themselves to be those leads and understand what the role is of those leads?

01:21:32

Speaker 3

What are they supposed to do as part of having that title of lead?

01:21:42

Speaker 2

Are we clear on what the duty is?

01:21:48

Speaker 3

Can we bring that up? We know the twelve entity types that the hubs are, but can we bring up what the actual responsibility, funding, all that good stuff so that we can.

01:22:00

Speaker 2

Let me do something really ugly that I think can help us speed this along because we have a lot of.

01:22:05

Speaker 4

People in the chat saying that 33.

01:22:07

Speaker 3

Is fine, just so that okay.

01:22:09

Speaker 2

So can we just take a quick vote that we're going to go back to the general committee and recommend that because of those available in the call it's just a recommendation because we're not making a decision. We're going to make a recommendation to concur.

01:22:24

Speaker 1

Rather than doing up a poll from the tech that we have. How about a raise of hands just to speed it along or just put.

01:22:34

Speaker 2

In the chat yes or no on the count of 33 or whatever your number is. That way we have a written record. Peter has his hand up. Peter has his hand up.

01:22:48

Speaker 3

But didn't he ask us to put our hands up? Are we voting?

01:22:51

Speaker 2

Okay, Peter, are you on the phone? Is the yes a 33 yes.

01:23:11

Speaker 1

Or.

01:23:11

Speaker 3

Should we ask who is not in.

01:23:13

Speaker 2

Favor of the 33?

01:23:16

Speaker 1

It's working. It's working well. Everyone's putting their yes or no with the number next to it. That seems to be working well. Okay, yeah. If you could please use the chat because I'm not sure if it registers everyone's hand raising.

01:23:47

Speaker 2

All right, so we're done with that, aren't we?

01:23:59

Speaker 1

How many people on the call do we have?

01:24:05

Speaker 4  
28 minus the Leedc stuff.

01:24:13  
Speaker 2  
Should be 23 total.

01:24:15  
Speaker 1  
Right? And we have four for how many abstain?

01:24:19  
Speaker 2  
Yeah.

01:24:20  
Speaker 1  
So it looks like 33. Okay. 33 steering committee members it is.

01:24:30  
Speaker 2  
Thanks you. Okay.

01:24:36  
Speaker 4  
Now let's go over the criteria.

01:24:41  
Speaker 2  
Can I bring up a little something to kind of foster the criteria discussion? I know, don't forgive me later. And don't be mad at me, Scarlett, because you did such a beautiful job on your graphics. But to get to the bottom line on what does Affinity Hubs do, it is not pretty, but it's very clearly this is a summary of what they do in really easy, high level. I think Tony has her hand up.

01:25:08  
Speaker 6  
Yeah, it's actually on this topic.

01:25:12  
Speaker 2  
I.

01:25:12

Speaker 6

Would like for us to at least talk about the selection of the affinity hubs, be selected by those groups that are participating in the affinity hub. And part of that is as someone that goes back to a board to ask for recommendations and stuff on where to go forward. I am not an expert in labor and I'm not an expert in other categories. There areas that I might have some expertise. I just think it might be helpful if the affinity hub is supposed to be collecting thoughts around a particular group and then referring that up where it gets aggregated. I would at least like to talk about having people within the affinity hub make the selection.

01:26:01

Speaker 2

Actually, that's not their role and that's why I wanted to make sure that I brought this little kind of quick, make it quick and simple because that's not their role, that's not what they're there for. And that was something that showed up in our planning document. So this affinity hub's job in the short end of it is to host region wide meetings. That Lead will host lead a table that has nine funded community based organizations at that table, one from every spa. And they are thematic. So they sit on the steering committee, they gather information and collect and share information from the CBOs who are on the front line. They're the ones doing the community engagement, they're the ones on the front line, they're the ones, the little guys that are in with their constituents and they are convening the paid one, the funded ones and non funded ones at the table on youth.

01:27:11

Speaker 2

So you've got them from across at the affinity hub leads table on youth. And that affinity hub lead facilitates that dialogue, shares that information from those other groups and then passes that information on to the steering committee, which they sit on. Right, but that's by topic.

01:27:30

Speaker 6

However, the people that are participating in that affinity hub have a thematic connection.

01:27:39

Speaker 2

That is right.

01:27:40

Speaker 6

So the suggestion is to think about people that are because you probably should be a partner in order to vote on your representative to the steering committee. But essentially those people might have an idea about who or what organizations are grounded in the work so that they can accurately convey information. You could be the best intended, but it's not your stuff. It's hard to ask the right questions and convey rather than everyone making a vote on who might be the head of an affinity hub.



01:28:23

Speaker 1

Would it help everyone if there was? The way it was described to me by our CFO at La, DC Kendall Turner, was that there could be a scoring rubric or ranking rubric based on some questions.

01:28:41

Speaker 2

Well, isn't that what well, if you're going to do a selection committee, that's one way or an evaluation process. But that's the discussion right now. I wanted to get this discussion on what their job is clear, and then we could maybe have a good dialogue about what we understand what they are and are not there to do. If I were to say that if I were a youth organization and I wanted to nominate myself as an Affinity Hub lead, I would need to be as clearly in the criteria. The organization would have to have experience and expertise experience in serving that constituency. Right. Because it's an equity seat, having done grassroots engagement. But they're not the ones on the street doing the engagement. They're convening meetings of the folks who are on the street doing the engagement. I could see youth organizations wearing their hat out because they facilitate very well and they've been in youth for a very long time.

01:29:44

Speaker 2

But what they're going to be convening is at least ten other organizations who are on the street gathering that information. And that's the table that I really wanted to put my focus on because the community, the sub regional tables who sit at the Affinity Hub, they're the ones gathering. Those are the Jesse's Jesse was talking about. They're out there talking to their constituents about their unmet challenges, their workforce readiness, what are the carbon neutral readiness? What's the demographic data? What are your recovery needs? And then they bring that information back to the Affinity Hub lead. It is a facilitation role of thematic groups. So I'm saying that just so that we know. I think it's up to the organization to nominate themselves. I know there's this dialogue about wanting to appoint, but if we want to have community speak and play a role and be inclusive, which is what we keep saying, we're letting the voices come forward, then it's not for us to say, you are not qualified, but we're going to pick you.

01:30:44

Speaker 2

I think that is contrary to the whole process of inclusive participation. All right, I'm done.

01:31:00

Speaker 3

I dropped in the chat just for ease. I just copied the definition of Affinity Hub leads from our proposal just so people can see it.

01:31:12

Speaker 1

I think it's important to try to figure out very quickly if the roles and responsibilities is more important or the criteria for selecting the Affinity Hub leaders is more important. Right now, we still need to move forward on a few other items, and I'm not trying to rush it by any means, but I understand why you

brought that up, Sharon, and thank you for doing that. But I think it's important for the group to kind of figure out what's more important at this moment. Is it criteria for being selected or the duties so they can make a decision if they even want to be on that Infinity Hub.

01:31:58

Speaker 2

Writing. We put the duties out in public writing. Right? We have it. We've created documents on it. It's all out there. And when we do whatever nomination process, we're going to have to clearly clear that in that process. I think the selection is going to be the big discussion that's left on the table. Are we going to have a voting structure? Are we going to pick who's going to and then I think there still needs to be a dialogue about this platform and what the objections were to having a platform.

01:32:26

Speaker 1

Would you like to see the voting platform that was created for you guys so you can figure out if it works for you for the steering committee? Maybe it could work for you for the affinity hub as well. I'm not exactly sure, but would you like to see, like, for me to go over that?

01:32:46

Speaker 2

I don't know that we have time for that. I really would like to understand. I think we have to dive into the hard conversation is how are folks going to be selected? Are they going to be by community vote? Is it going to be by us creating a selection committee? I think that's the big kahuna that's on the table and I don't understand, but I certainly want to be quiet and listen what the objection is to having people have their right to vote in this process. Why are we looking to take away community members votes?

01:33:22

Speaker 1

Well, part of what I wanted to show you guys is that is a voting mechanism where each and every HRTC member will have one vote, if you like.

01:33:34

Speaker 5

It sounds like first we need to decide if we're going to vote because it sounds like that's still up in the air. There was some controversy in terms of should we vote or should we not vote. So can we make a decision about voting first and then we can view whatever platform is the option? Because it sounds like the criteria has been established. We need to decide are we going to vote, are we not going to vote? And then we can decide what platform needs to be used in order to do that.

01:34:01

Speaker 3

Right.

01:34:03

Speaker 2  
I have to agree with that.

01:34:05  
Speaker 1  
Okay, how do you guys want to do the vote? I'm assuming selection process versus voting process.

01:34:14  
Speaker 2  
Yes.

01:34:15  
Speaker 1  
Okay, so let's do it like how we did at the last one. Just put voting or selection next to your name.

01:34:24  
Speaker 3  
And this is just for the steering committee that we are should be both.

01:34:29  
Speaker 2  
We got to be affinity hubs and.

01:34:30  
Speaker 3  
It's both because that's what I just need clarified. What option are we selecting it's for?

01:34:35  
Speaker 1  
It's a very good question.

01:34:38  
Speaker 6  
And the other is when we say voting, are we saying everyone voting on everything or are we saying people within thematic groups voting? Because I would have a very different opinion of voting if everybody's going to vote on everything.

01:35:01  
Speaker 1  
I'm not exactly sure what that means, Tony, but it's voting for the steering voting or selecting the steering committee members voting or selecting the affinity hub leads.

01:35:16

Speaker 3

Yeah, but I believe Tony had brought up that her preference would be that the affinity hub leads are selected by the members of that hub because they know their group. For example, youth. The representatives who partake in and are involved with the youth affinity hub will be the ones who select who should represent them and be the lead. And then that person will also sit on the steering committee. Did I get that right, Tony? I shouldn't be putting words in your mouth.

01:35:47

Speaker 6

No, Libby, you are excellent at summarizing.

01:35:51

Speaker 3

Okay, so that's the question is how are we recommending or what are we recommending to the larger group on how we select the affinity hub leads?

01:36:02

Speaker 4

So Tony, from what I hear, it sounds like you're leaning towards a selection committee to help move the process.

01:36:10

Speaker 6

Actually a hybrid that the twelve seats that are affinity hubs are selected by the people that are participating in the affinity hubs. Very open for the other non affinity hub seats to have a discussion on how that's selected. I believe in voting, but I believe informed voting and I know for us, I am not an expert in some of these categories and would have a very difficult time presenting to the board. This is the excellent group versus non excellent group. I don't know what I would do.

01:36:41

Speaker 8

There if I could lean in real quick. Libby, what you're saying is entirely logical, the way my brain works. Right. However, a couple of things. So if we are able to vote and actually pick a winner means we'd have to have an odd number, right? And so we would need to have some kind of mechanism to break a tie, if you will. But it seems entirely logical to me that the individuals within that hub.

01:37:21

Speaker 1

You.

01:37:22

Speaker 8

Want to pick a leader. Because if they pick a leader, if the individuals in that hub pick leader, I think that sets the framework and platform for success within that hub. That means they'll all work together. In my mind. Hopefully there won't be a lot of division, but those are just my two cent. Thank you.

01:37:50

Speaker 2

I do have my hand up. Many organizations do more than one thing. I'm very loyal to election integrity. We are in a country where election deviation and fraud and gerrymandering is a pandemic. And when money's at the table, I don't care if a nonprofit or not, greed does have a way of swaying people's ethics and so there's always a gerrymandering to get votes and to make sure I get my people in. And I'm going to put this on the table because this is what hasn't been said. What is going on in the HRTC is an entire there is an undercurrent of mistrust and the pushback on having a selection committee from many of our members has been as a result of the undercurrent of mistrust. That when we started this process, there was certain groups that literally decided they were going to take over the process and even went so far as to threaten some folks that said if you don't vote with me, I'm going to cancel your contract.

01:39:06

Speaker 2

It was mafia tactics. And so we try to move we are all kumbayan. But to have anyone say I should be able to I trust you. I want your voice included. As long as I can decide who's running the show, I want your voice included, but I want your vote included. It is a sense of the sensation is it is a continuation of the mistrust. And we're not no longer distrusting the man. We're distrusting our own community members who are trying to take away our voice and our vote. And that's what our committee members have said about the importance of being able to cast a ballot and make a decision and ensure that the steering committee does not get stacked and staged by a group that has been trying to take control of the HRTC. That the HRTC is still the ultimate authority right now and members all get one vote.

01:40:03

Speaker 2

I happen to come from old, my family is old Arkansas. So I am a fourth generation descendant of slaves and three generations of those black women. Every summer I would stand in line in the heat soaring of Arkansas while those women stood in line for 6 hours to cast their vote because they removed the election boxes so black women couldn't vote. And that's kind of the concern is that every organization gets one vote and then we have some integrity around it. And so the hubs should be, I think, need to be selected by the HRTC. Everybody decides what they do. We already took a vote last on a whole poll of the HRTC that said people would put forth their profile and say this is why I'm good, these are my years of experience, this is my expertise. And folks make decisions on that just like they do city council members or commission.

01:40:58

Speaker 2

But on the other hand, we do have a process that's reserved. Tony, kind of like what you're suggesting as it relates to the subregional tables that could be implemented because the sub regional tables have to be selected locally. It's not appropriate for a person in Anlo Valley to be trying to select the sub regional table leads for Long Beach. Right? Because they're not part of Long Beach. But I do think that the folks on the steering committee, the folks that are affinity hubs and they're sitting on the steering committee,

should be elected by their peers based on what they represent. And we cannot commingle because like Faith, like Haypen's organization, they do six things where they're going to get a vote over on families and then they're going to get a vote on place based and then they're going to get it keeps things from being equal.

01:41:50

Speaker 6

I'm afraid that it becomes a popularity vote when people are voting on things that they're not familiar with organizations and so they go from oh, I read about them in the newspaper. Oh, I've never read about that organization, so I must not know them. And I also think that there are disinvested voices within their own community. And that's what we're trying to figure out is how to raise up that voice within its community so that we have voices that even in our own neighborhoods, we may be still too small or too quiet or too busy to work.

01:42:29

Speaker 2

Can't we do that? With a very effective questionnaire that asks each of the nominees to say who they are? Very simply, not only what have you done? How do you uplift community? What is your track record? Questions that give a profile that actually get to why this group organization or community based leader has value. Because I've seen some individuals pop up that have done some pretty amazing things, and there's five resident seats, and nobody would know that if they don't put it in the questionnaire, they say, oh, wow, you organized this. Norma ray was one person in labor. Nobody would have voted for her had she not, you know, had done what she did. But in a questionnaire, if there's three labor candidates, it could be a labor organization or the person tells their story.

01:43:24

Speaker 6

Or some people have access to people to assist them to do surveys. Some people are better at writing some people. I mean, coming out of 37 years in politics, I realize that it is the team behind you that can make you more attractive, but I'll leave it at that.

01:43:47

Speaker 3

Okay, I have my hand up. Can I just ask or at least add clarity? My understanding is, based on our proposal and our budget, that each of the affinity hub leads receives \$50,000 in order to do this work right. That I put in the chat that they are responsible for. Is that correct? Charles and Sharon? Okay. And it seems to be that's one of the concerns that some people have is understanding is the person or a group that's selected to be the affinity hub lead capable and have the capacity internally in the organization to be able to fulfill the role of affinity hub lead and be that organization that convener to bring together the groups within that theme of that affinity hub and bring that documentation that comes from the micro grantees and then share that information upwards towards to the governing committee because that's what I understand is their role.

01:44:47

Speaker 3

Right? So that has to be part of our consideration when we are selecting who is going to be that hub lead, is whether they have the experience, capacity, ability to do that. How do we do that? Well, we have to choose which one of these options is what we're going to have to choose. And I think we've got to do it by 1230. Are we going to recommend that it be somewhat, as Tony said, a popularity contest where maybe you do put a questionnaire in there that answers more specific questions. And that's the platform that everybody's going to read before they vote on you or we're going to do. It where we invite the Affinity hub members to have their own internal process where they self select who they think will be the best one to serve as that hub lead, get that 50,000 and be responsible for the convenience and the oversight within that theme.

01:45:38

Speaker 3

Those are the two options we need to vote on and recommend to the larger HRTC. And then of course, again, the same thing with the steering committee. We're already saying that twelve of those 33 are automatically going to be seated by the Affinity Hub leads and then the remaining 21, how are we going to select those? Are we going to do that as well by a vote or are we looking for a way in which we would have groups recommend this is who would best represent our second labor position because we already have one labor spot represented from the Affinity Hub. The second one, we recommend this one be our rep for steering committee or are we going to vote on it? So that's what I see is where we are right now and I'm not sure how we take it from there, but I turn it back over to you, Charles.

01:46:28

Speaker 1

Sharon, I see that your hand is up. We're getting tight on time.

01:46:32

Speaker 2

I'm just saying that maybe what you just said was a nomination process, that somehow committee folks are nominating folks for specific seats. That is a nomination process. It doesn't mean you nominate yourself. But I think we still have the issue of selection.

01:46:46

Speaker 1

I think it's important for you guys to make a decision on a selection versus voting. And the voting mechanism that is set up, just so you know, is where each again, every voter will have one vote. There be reports generated at the conclusion of the election, real time reports going throughout the election for security. Each election, the registered vote will have a unique token that's dedicated for each email or phone number for each HRTC member organization. You can't forward that to anyone. And what am I missing there, Scarlett?

01:47:46

Speaker 2

I think that basically.

01:47:51

Speaker 1

In terms of equity, and I think it was Tony who mentioned some organizations are better writers than others. But I want you guys to all keep in mind, even with what was the questionnaire, how you answer those questions still boil down to writing. How well do you write the answer to the question? So again, I don't want you guys to spend so much time on something that at the end of the day is going to wind up being a wash or a lateral move. There is again, the voting process is everyone will have 250 words, whatever decreed upon amount of words, where they can use to make themselves attractive. You guys voted to not have any videos you voted to not have any photos. So it's literally just words. So there's an example of the it looks like we're running short on time, so I can't show you a visual of what was done.

01:49:00

Speaker 1

But if you are deciding on a selection process, you need to come up with something extremely quickly, and that's effective and fair.

01:49:10

Speaker 2

Kevin has to stand up.

01:49:12

Speaker 8

Yes, I'll make it real quick. In a perfect world. Again, I'll go back. I still like what Libby had to say. But to Sharon's point, the world is not perfect and there are some issues, and the questionnaire idea is a good one. And then also, if it were selection, if it were just the groups voting within themselves, what happens if they're sore losers? How would that impact the dynamic within the group? So I always reserve the right to change my mind, and I think I'm backing out of that and going toward the HRTC voting process.

01:50:03

Speaker 2

Our tables are not assembled in order to choose their hubs. That means we really do have to postpone and assemble our tables first. Can we move to vote on selection versus vote? I think soma. Has her?

01:50:24

Speaker 4

Yeah. Thank you. We have 15 minutes. So I'm trying to think I know that there's a timeline, and I recall this conversation being a part of governance committee at some point and there wasn't a dive into it. And again, with not having the governance co chairs here and other governance committee members who were part of that long year, just the participation. Is it possible for this to go into a governance committee so that there's more discussion on it? I also think about, for example, if we do a voting mechanism, right, it's assuming that everyone has access to digital devices. It's assuming that people know how to write pieces into Google forms or whatever forms are going to be done and how to do that. And I'm thinking of people who are system impacted, who just came out of maybe reentering community. A few months ago, there was this conversation where Leedc went to go do a presentation in Long Beach, I think through Angela's group and these conversations with individuals who are system impacted just getting reentering community.



01:51:47

Speaker 4

And so how are we going to make things equitable and accessible to those people if we just do voting? That's why I think with the last ten minutes, can we just have another conversation or extend this conversation into governance and take all those into consideration? Because that's where I'm at in terms of equity and just voting. It's like, how are we incorporating smaller organizations or individuals who may not even know how to vote or how to use a computer or type a bio about themselves? If, for example, I was some impact there was in jail for 20 years, would people vote for me? Maybe not, right? But my experience would be able to give background as to how things can be Equitable. So those are just thoughts that I wanted to bring up to the group for you all to consider and hopefully, again, think about maybe having extending this conversation to another workshop with governance.

01:52:41

Speaker 1

I fear that we're running out of time because if you guys do land on a voting mechanism, the engineers need time to continue finishing and polishing I'm sorry, tailoring it towards what the HRTC has decided upon. And if you run out of time, you're probably going to be voting via poll. So unfortunately, that's why at the top of this call, it's a time sensitive matter. But I do think that you guys should the way I see it now, unless you guys have any objections, a vote on should you do selection versus voting for the steering committee, selection versus voting for the affinity hubs any differently? I'm sorry, Kimberly in the chat. I'm sorry.

01:53:44

Speaker 2

Charles, before we take the vote, can we separate the votes? So first we start with one item, which is the selection or voting with affinity. So let's do that first.

01:53:57

Speaker 1

That's correct. That's what I was doing. I was going before I thought that.

01:54:00

Speaker 2

Kimberly had a question, but that has to do with, I think, how are you going to vote on who's going to make that selection? Because Tony, I mean, the whole point I want to respect what Tony came up with in terms of being able to select affinity hubs. There was a great thinking logic there. But it's not possible because we do not have hub tables. We don't have hub tables convened. So if your hub tables can't convene are not convened, they cannot take cast a vote. It's not possible.

01:54:39

Speaker 1

So we still need to move forward, unfortunately, with the vote. So let's start with the affinity hub leads and just throw them in the chat to say affinity I'm sorry, your name and voting or selection, Charles, quickly.

01:55:04

Speaker 4

So then my proposal of having another meeting just dedicated to this so people.

01:55:09

Speaker 2

Can think about it.

01:55:13

Speaker 1

Jermaine, if you're still on the call, I think he jumped off. We're tight on time.

01:55:21

Speaker 7

Yeah. I guess the issue is here is the state's timeline. Are we still set on June 6 with the state, Charles?

01:55:31

Speaker 1

As of now, yes.

01:55:34

Speaker 7

And then the final governance structure, though, is July 14.

01:55:39

Speaker 1

Yeah.

01:55:40

Speaker 3

What's due on June 6?

01:55:41

Speaker 1

The governance structure.

01:55:44

Speaker 2

Now, we did ask that you push that back. We ask that you push that back because O and E will not be able to meet before then. And this was on E's meeting time.

01:55:58

Speaker 7

Charles, I think you guys already reached out and asked for an extension, right?

01:56:02

Speaker 1

Yes. I haven't heard back yet.

01:56:05

Speaker 7

We haven't heard back. So the issue is we don't run the process is the issue here. So we're always going to do what the HRTC suggests, which is if we need an extension, we're going to ask for the extension. But we also. Have to keep in mind that only so many extensions the state is going to grant is the only issue here. So that being said, we kind of have to have a plan B and C in the event that they come back and say, hey, we're not going to extend you.

01:56:33

Speaker 3

I thought were already agreed, though, on the governance model.

01:56:37

Speaker 4

Yeah, I'm with Libby.

01:56:38

Speaker 2

What we're debating is how to good.

01:56:41

Speaker 7

Right.

01:56:41

Speaker 2

Yeah.

01:56:41

Speaker 3

The color document that you guys created, all the little circles and all yeah. I thought we'd all agreed on at the HRT the last time.

01:56:49

Speaker 2

Well, that has never been voted on. It did come forward, but it did not come to the that's correct.

01:56:54

Speaker 1

It was never voted on. That's why we had this and that's.

01:56:56

Speaker 2

Why the discussion about how many seats because it was proposed, but it never went to hook.

01:57:00

Speaker 3

Okay. And so this group today has said we're good with 33. So we're taking the structure on Friday, and on Friday we'll vote and say this is what we want LADC to send to the state on June 6 or by June 6.

01:57:13

Speaker 2

Right.

01:57:14

Speaker 6

Well, with the modification that the charts clearly identify that the affinity Hub leads make up those components because right now it's not apparent.

01:57:26

Speaker 2

Are we also incorporating again the shift that we did discuss that would make sure that we have part business, part employer, and part whatever is represented as equity seats, so that will give us more equity seats.

01:57:43

Speaker 7

And then I guess the other piece is Charles and team. Will we be able to submit the updated governance structure without these additional components such as the selection versus voting mechanism, et cetera? Because that's all part of governance.

01:57:58

Speaker 2

I thought that was part required. That's why we're asking if that was due on June 6. That was today's meeting.

01:58:03

Speaker 7

Exactly. We can ask the state. I don't know if the team has answer for that. We'll ask the state if we can submit the governance structure minus how we're going to seat the actual governance steering committee and then the tables and hubs as well. Honestly. But I don't know what they're going to say is all I'm saying. I don't know if they're going to they've already given us the guidelines. They've already told us what we need to provide.

01:58:28

Speaker 2

Right.

01:58:29

Speaker 4

Because again, we have no governance co chairs here and at least they should be able to vote or give direction.

01:58:37

Speaker 7

Absolutely. So what I would suggest is maybe we have to convene them next week. So Alan, could you send an email when time permits to get at least to New or Kelly on their schedule? We thought we had at least tenUA available today, but unfortunately that didn't work out. And we'll just try to convene them the top of next week and just have a regular governance subcommittee meeting and then essentially just have it open for everyone. I don't see an issue with that per se. And then we can ask the state in terms of the June 6 deliverable, since we know how we're moving forward with the 33 seats, can we submit it minus the selection and or voting mechanism process as part of that so we can do that? Charles, what do you think? Do you think we're out of pocket here?

01:59:30

Speaker 1

Yeah, I think I've been on speed dial with Edd and GoBiz, so hopefully I can persuade them. Yeah, I think that the biggest thing is having those the steering committee seats. Hopefully I can get away with it. Let me work my magic a little bit. Mr. Brown, I see your hand is up. Please go ahead and ask your question.

01:59:57

Speaker 8

Actually, it's not a question, it's really response. I'm in agreement with what Germaine is proposing because right now I feel I'm being forced to make a decision.

02:00:10

Speaker 1

I'm aware of what we're looking at.

02:00:13

Speaker 8

But I'm not sure if we're ready to make that kind of selection now.

02:00:17

Speaker 1

Especially with this call being only a.

02:00:20

Speaker 8

Partial representation of all the individuals and groups that are represented in the project. So I think we need that time and I think that we can make that be part of the selection taken.

02:00:35

Speaker 1

At that next meeting that is proposed for next week. Yeah, I'll reach out to the state. Is there I'm sorry, but does.

02:00:54

Speaker 5

That mean we're moving forward with a vote or we're not voting?

02:00:58

Speaker 1

Apparently we're not moving forward with a vote until the state gives us a green light.

02:01:09

Speaker 2

What if they don't? Do we not have a representation of recommendation and just going into the next meeting or are we going to go through this again at governance because HRTC is this Friday and so we can bring it up but there's no decisioning mechanism.

02:01:24

Speaker 3

Well, we do have to vote though in HRTC, since you rightfully brought up Sharon, that we never actually voted on this governance model structure. So this Friday we should bring this governance model structure with the Tweaks that we talked about, that Tony brought up that we said the twelve affinity hubs will be part of and be seated steering committee and that groups. That represent the other four different committees can also be part of the or represent the equity part that needs to be added in so that we vote on that and we can send that forward for the 6th. But you're right, we're not going to be able to submit how our seeding or selection process by June 6. That's clearly not possible for us to do and all we can do is go back to the state and ask them and let them know we'll have that for you later.

02:02:11

Speaker 3

But we also have to have it done by, what is it? July 7 is the date we have to have the individuals or the governance committee seated and that's essentially when we're going to have it done by.

02:02:22

Speaker 2

Is it the 7th or you said the 12th now, Jeremy 14th.

02:02:30

Speaker 1

Connected to the seats. Yeah.

02:02:32

Speaker 7

And then the other piece that we'll need to bring up in that governance subcommittee meeting, hopefully Sonora Kelly can host that next week at some point is the whole conversation around the proposal in general as it pertains to the steering committee being a subset of the affinity hubs. If we move forward with how we have it in the proposal now, it's completely flipped from what the process is in terms of timelines from the state.

02:03:03

Speaker 1

Meaning due to some challenges with our.

02:03:07

Speaker 7

Fiscal agent, we're not going to be able to just seat that or fund, I would actually say the table and hub model as quickly as I think we wanted to essentially in the proposal. So that being said, we're now in a position where no matter how you look at it, best case scenario, we can probably get those hubs and tables funded sometime in late summer. That's best case scenario. Based upon what I'm looking at right now, we're already in June. So that being said, if we don't flip that around and just come up with some other ideas and kind of pivot a little bit, we're going to be basically asking the state to essentially let us seat our governance structure sometime. Not July 14 anymore, but sometime really probably in the fall. And I don't know that they're going to be open to that if we're funding our affinity hubs and getting those lined up prior to seating our governance structure.

02:04:09

Speaker 7

So something else to think about is all I'm saying.

02:04:12

Speaker 2

Can you do that? Hold on a second. I was on the call with Kendra and CCS, and I don't really agree with that. Here's the idea. Understand that we have to define our affinity hubs and our structure. We've got to elect them or select them, whatever that comes down to on July 14. We are then identifying who's being seated. The seating and selection and seating is different than funding and contracting. I mean, for that sake, you were selected as the convener, and you haven't got any money yet. So you just signed a contract this week. So you can still select and seat your people in July and issue their contracts in August if that's what it's going to take. Again, I think they can be bifurcated. They're just not one issue. And CCF was as long as Kendra we're talking about that. The affinity hub and the sub regional table, the CBO, Michael Grantees are vendors, and so their contract is a contract, right.

02:05:23

Speaker 2

And so it's a much simpler process. And even from a monitoring governing standpoint, it's a much easier process but doesn't have anything to do with funding. I think it's just two different delays, two different issues.

02:05:33

Speaker 7

Well, they kind of do, Sharon, because here's the issue. LADC cannot issue funding of any sorts when it comes to that process. We're not the fiscal agent. And so the issue is that while you might have been on that conversation, the reality is CCF is not in a position to issue any more than twelve contracts. Now, unless something changes, great. But if nothing changes, we still have to work through that process is all I'm saying. And I do not think by any means we're going to be able to have those Affinity Hubs and tables determined by July 14 in order to seat the governance structure is what I'm saying. You get what I'm getting at, right?

02:06:11

Speaker 2

No, I think you're still saying funding is the issue, getting them contracted and funding is the issue and that's going to hold up everything and I don't believe that holds up an election at all. I think you can select and fund.

02:06:22

Speaker 7

So you're saying that you think we'll still be able to finalize because what the state is asking for is this like we need to name who.

02:06:32

Speaker 2

Select or elect your folks. You submit this is who's been selected and elected. It may take you 60 days to issue their contracts and go through that process. But you still have met your selection and election.

02:06:44

Speaker 7

Yeah, but what I'm saying is how can we issue names if they're a subset of the Affinity and tables and the



Affinity and tables have not been determined yet. They're not going to be determined by July. There's no way. It's impossible. I'm telling you it's impossible. It's not going to happen. Not in the position is all I'm sharing.

02:07:02

Speaker 3

But CCF doesn't do that. You're talking about the affinity leads remain.

02:07:07

Speaker 7

No. When I say the Affinity Hubs and tables, those have to be if our folks that are going in the steering committee are a subset of that group has to be determined in some way. They may not have to be funded. I get what you're getting at. They may not have to be funded, but they have to be identified as what I'm getting at.

02:07:27

Speaker 2

And that's where we led the meeting with and we had a whole chart that's how we started this meeting is how do we fill those positions right.

02:07:35

Speaker 3

By the July 17 we all hear saying we can do that we can select the steering committee and the Affinity Hub leads can all be chosen and selected by July 17. It's just a mechanism by which we're going to do that is what we have not agreed upon yet. Which is why we need more time because we're not going to be able to give that to them on June 6. The most we can give them is the structure, but we can't tell them how we're going to do it. But our goal is to do it and have them selected and seated by the July 17 deadline. Regardless of whether CCF can actually issue a contract until August or whenever we still want to have that Affinity Hub lead has already been selected. So by the time CCF does get themselves up to speed and ready, then they can put that contract together for that affinity hub lead so they can get their \$50,000 and go forth.

02:08:24

Speaker 3

That's what we're saying.

02:08:28

Speaker 2

But you believe that we got a.

02:08:29

Speaker 7

Month here and we got holidays in between and everything. So I'm just trying to tread lightly with the deadlines is all I'm saying.

02:08:36

Speaker 3

But this is the thing that what's our alternative though, Jermaine? If we don't do that alternative is.

02:08:40

Speaker 7

Asking for an extension. And so because we're still trying to unpack certain parts of just even where we are today, much less actually permanent hubs and tables, I think it's a longer process is all I'm saying. So I just want to be mindful of the timeline, that's all. We'll do everything we can to get an extension. I'm just trying to uplift that as a potential challenge. We may be able to work through it and if we do, phenomenal. But if not, we do need a plan B or C is all I'm saying.

02:09:10

Speaker 6

Well, what if we cut it in half and in our presentation to the state and the non affinity hub seats, we have a clear method. We've got affinity hubs, they're going to be sitting. What if our goal is by that July date to try to seat the non affinity hub seats so that there's clear progress? I'm just thinking if you give half a baby, maybe that's more attractive.

02:09:38

Speaker 2

I don't know.

02:09:40

Speaker 7

It's possible. And then the flip side, I'll see.

02:09:44

Speaker 1

What I can do. I'll reach out and just talk about the challenges.

02:09:49

Speaker 2

I'll send over the chart that went over and move it back down to the 33 the categories that we moved over. And so at least we'll have that certainly helps Friday.

02:09:58

Speaker 1

That certainly helps is having that number steering committee members finalized. But the bottleneck seems to be a lot of misleadings with governance. So we have to get them on the same page and get them back involved so we can move this along. Otherwise we fear another bottleneck and it's only going to get tighter and tighter.

02:10:27

Speaker 6

If we're going to vote at whatever point, I really need something that says this is what we're voting on and a single link. You guys have done awesome on all of the different information. And I mean, Scarlett, she deserves triple stars, but for me to go back to my board, I need to say this is what you need to tell me if you're okay or not okay? Just one link and that would be super helpful. And if I'm supposed to get answer by Friday, then I need to know what that is pretty quick.

02:11:03

Speaker 2

And guys, we made some progress today, I got to tell you, because we merged the kind of the community breakdown categories that governments was competing with our contractual affinity hub stuff today we did that and honored the 75 80%. So I would say congratulations to the team. We didn't get over the selection versus election process done. But if you recall last meeting, was it last meeting, Charles, we actually took a vote at the HRTC level on whether or not candidates would how they would be represented, if they would do a profile questionnaire, or if they would do a video. Remember all that discussion?

02:11:49

Speaker 1

I think that was maybe two weeks.

02:11:51

Speaker 2

Ago or something like that. So we already know, and the HRTC has already agreed that every candidate will have this profile document that will have no pictures or no videos coming forward that will be part of that process. So we have already voted on that. The only other thing I want to make sure is that on Friday when we move forward, we also move forward on the grandfather's clause because that's coming out of outreach and it's been recommended. And we just need to decide if that's going to move forward to HRTC because what governance has asked for and Scarlett actually put in the draft and a lot of other people commented on it, is that decisions made there that HRT will be grandfathered in prior to the seating of the steering committee. So the steering committee just can't come in with an executive order and change everything.

02:12:36

Speaker 1

We're way over time, but can someone help me out with the date? I want to go back to the state and say, can we have an extension to.

02:12:49

Speaker 2

16 June?

02:12:50

Speaker 7

Yeah, definitely the June 6 one. What do you think? Two weeks extension? Just say the best that they can do. That'll probably give us enough time. And then it sounds like there may be a method to keep the July 14 date, but we'll have to kind of tweak what we're providing to them, essentially. So we'll just have to get some context of what around the actual deliverable that's due to them. You know what I mean?

02:13:18

Speaker 1

Yeah, well, the July 14, we may be okay with it's. The June 6 is the issue.

02:13:25

Speaker 2

Can we go to June somewhere between the 15th and the 18th? Because I actually believe that we still can do an affinity hub election. I believe we have the time to get it done. It is not that complex.

02:13:41

Speaker 1

Yes or no. There's technology that we have to make sure that the engineers implement well.

02:13:50

Speaker 2

That's one way to do it.

02:13:56

Speaker 4

Maybe there's another system to do the vote.

02:13:59

Speaker 2

Yeah, but Tony, I totally agree with you on the grandfather, but again, that's going to have to go through a year's worth of meetings. So if we agree to the grandfather, they'll figure out go by the videos and whatever, what actually got voted on.

02:14:11

Speaker 3

Yeah, and just bringing up I'm reading Tony's note. Totally agree with you, Tony. We need a list of those specific provisions and the grandfather, something written because I don't recall all those either, but.

02:14:20

Speaker 2

I'm saying that's something that is going to take some begging through stuff. But if we agree with the grandfather or we don't agree with the grandfather is just a protection.

02:14:31

Speaker 3

We're bringing that to Friday's meeting to vote on along with the structure that we've got here. Right. For the governance model. I'm just saying we need to have something in writing that needs to go out in the agenda for Friday's meeting so people have a chance to read it ahead of time.

02:14:44

Speaker 2

Okay, cool.

02:14:46

Speaker 3

All right, so I have time to eat and go on to the next meeting.

02:14:49

Speaker 2

Yeah.

02:14:49

Speaker 6

A general statement about where anything that was prior said is approved is problematic for us.

02:14:57

Speaker 2

No, not of said it's. That was actually voted. We take votes when we took votes on the HRTC, it's when we made a decision, for example, we voted on the affinity hub structure because we had two different structures. We came together, we meshed them out and we said, okay, we agree with this, we move forward. We even voted and approved the actual proposal because it came from two, three different committees. And then there was a meshing meeting. Right. And then approval to move forward on the proposal.

02:15:23

Speaker 6

But the proposal from the application going forward has been modified and which is why you submitted a modified work plan that had slight things.

02:15:33

Speaker 2

No, we did not submit that. And there's going to be some major discussion about that. There were some changes made in there that absolutely were not unapproved by anyone. And then when you say we didn't.

02:15:47

Speaker 3

You say when you say we didn't, you're meaning that the HRTC HRD did.

02:15:51

Speaker 2

Not review or hear about some of the changes that were made. If there's been contract modifications, we certainly need to know about it. And there is a point for contract modifications coming up. Right? I think Germaine right. But there has not been any modifications. There were some modifications made in the Phasing plan, but they were never approved. And so that was why we took a vote. It's like, wait a minute, this is not okay. Nobody knew about it, nobody approved it. And it has a major impact on our 90 funded organization.

02:16:19

Speaker 6

And Sharon, that's what I'm trying to.

02:16:21

Speaker 2

Say is that if were to.

02:16:24

Speaker 6

Say, yes, I agree with I'm grandfathering in all prior actions, it has the implications that if a document got turned in, it was included in a year from now, it would be difficult. So that's why I'm saying that now we have a good memory of it. You need to document what it is that we're locking in so that it doesn't not with ill intent, but things get meshed over time and that's the concern of a grandfather is what literally is grandfathered.

02:16:55

Speaker 2

I kind of agree with that. So leave it at that. I kind of agree with that. But I do know that it's going to take staff more than a week to go through every video for the last year and chronicleize all the decisions, because that's what really needs to happen.

02:17:14

Speaker 6

I know, but part of that I'm not suggesting magic can happen. But the point being is that maybe a group that either wasn't at that meeting or is a new partner. That if they knew that the vote that happened in, I don't know, July of 2022 did something that they don't agree with, or they might say, well, I don't want to agree to grandfather everything in, but they don't have actual knowledge of what the vote was in June of 2022.

02:17:48

Speaker 3

That's a valid point. So are you asking Charles and Germaine, is that process being undertaken now by staff to bring back to the co chairs or to HRTC at some point in the next several weeks? What's supposed to happen with that? Or was that just a Sharon bringing it up instead?

02:18:12

Speaker 2

No, we had a full on committee issue that came forward and is heading to the governance committee and to the floor on grandfathering.

02:18:21

Speaker 6

It has been brought up multiple times over a month.

02:18:24

Speaker 2

Okay.

02:18:25

Speaker 6

We just haven't seen anything back.

02:18:28

Speaker 2

Right.

02:18:29

Speaker 6

But it has been raised.

02:18:30

Speaker 2

It's a staff issue and it's going to take them I'm going to suggest it may take them up to two weeks to do it.

02:18:36

Speaker 3

Okay. And Charles, is that on your to do list with your team?

02:18:41

Speaker 1  
Well, it is now.

02:18:47  
Speaker 3  
Okey dokey. Now can we go eat lunch before I have to go to my 01:00?

02:18:52  
Speaker 7  
Sounds like a follow up governance committee meeting. Yes, it sounds like we do need to come to an agreement, a collective agreement on the grandfather piece, which could also be part of the governance meeting. And then, like I just said, selection, verse, voting mechanism, et cetera. So we will put those agenda items up for debate in the next committee meeting. We'll try to land a date that makes sense and then it'll be open to everyone essentially to get on that call. But at least we did arrive at the 33 seats with the understanding that we need to zero in and be laser focused on that criteria so that we have some equitable outcomes, which makes so I think we're in a good space.

02:19:34  
Speaker 2  
We are.

02:19:36  
Speaker 1  
We will make it happen.

02:19:37  
Speaker 7  
We're going to make it happen all as well. We will work through this together and make it happen.

02:19:42  
Speaker 2  
But thank you all.

02:19:43  
Speaker 3  
Thank you. This is a good meeting. Thank you, Charles and Jermaine. I really appreciate it and your whole team, really. Thank you. There's a lot.

02:19:50  
Speaker 1  
Thank you guys. Eat lunch.



02:19:53

Speaker 2

Take care.

02:19:54

Speaker 3

Bye bye. Bye.