



## Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee

### Meeting Notes and Transcript

May 17<sup>th</sup>, 2023

[Meeting Recording](#)

Passcode: B=^86jaW

#### Meeting Summary:

The meeting began with introductions of new members and updates on outreach efforts. Demographic data was shared regarding the distribution and needs of HRTC members across different service planning areas and affinity hubs. Questions were answered about the May 1st deadline, SPA locations, and available materials for outreach. The newsletter was briefly mentioned as an important update on governance discussions.

The Steering Committee structure vote was coming up soon and there were ongoing discussions about it. A Planning Phase Plan document was filed with the state which outlined what needs to be done by when in regards to affinity hubs, affinity tables, milestone timeline commitments etc., but some items such as selecting Hub leads are still under development or not yet ready despite being outlined in the plan. Affinity Hubs need seats on the Steering Committee body according to the contract structure but none have been selected yet causing concern among members about how data will flow back between committees if this does not happen soon enough or at all due its effects on possible decision-making processes regarding budget allocation goals etc..

During the meeting, members discuss the representation and structure of the steering committee for an organization. They proposed that each SPA be allocated up to three seats to ensure geographic inclusivity and equity in voting.

There was concern about the timeline for selecting micro grantees and affinity hubs for outreach and engagement work. The committee voted to modify the Planning Phase Plan document to ensure that micro grantees are funded through the first tranche of funds as originally outlined in the proposal. There was also discussion about oversight and potential difficulties with seating a steering committee by July 6th due to travel during July 4th weekend.

#### Action items:

1. Circulate document with comments about grandfather issue before next meeting
2. Advocate for fair share allocation based on population through outreach to local elected officials and advocacy efforts supported by powerful constituencies within HRTC

#### Transcript:

**01:28**

Speaker 1

Hello.

**01:31**

Speaker 2

I'm going to start letting people in now.

**01:55**

Speaker 3

Morning.

**01:56**

Speaker 2

Good morning, Robert.

**01:58**

Speaker 1

Good morning, everyone. Morning.

**02:31**

Speaker 2

Darren. I see you speaking I don't know if you're speaking to us, but you're muted.

**02:36**

Speaker 1

Yeah, I was just talking away. Just talking forgive me. I wanted to just first call the meeting, the order. I want to thank you for being here. I want to thank you for the work that has been done over the last week or so, or two weeks. And so just continuing to build upon the list of who should be seated at our various tables. And that is critically important because every individual makes a selection of where they choose to sit. Calling out what those tables look like has been a very valuable proposition because it will help inform our membership on what role they want to play, where they can best fitted, best plugged into this process. I'm going to go ahead and bring up our draft agenda, but we're going to start by welcoming any new members that are here. Do we have any new people that haven't been here before?

**03:39**

Speaker 1

I'm looking at Douglas has got his hands going on. Good morning, Shamika. Thank you. Anyone new? Peter, thank you for being here. Wes, have you want to introduce yourself? I don't really know who you are and I'd love to. Hi.

**03:58**

Speaker 4

Good morning, Sharon.

**03:59**

Speaker 2

Yeah, I've been here not as often as I would like to.

**04:03**

Speaker 3

I'm with active Sangibio Valley based in Elmont.

**04:08**

Speaker 1

Well, wonderful. Thank you. We're happy to have Sangibo Valley in the house. Ariana, you want to introduce yourself? Hi. Good morning, everyone. My name is Ariana. I'm actually from Centrocha in Long Beach. Thank you. Great for being here. So if there's anyone else I'm going to defer over to for Chioma or Alan to give us a quick update on any administrative issues or before we go into demographics.

**04:47**

Speaker 2

All right, it sounds like that's all the new members we have, but in regards to administrative issues, I think we're all good on that. And Chioma, did you want to talk about maybe, I guess, how your outreach is going? Any notable items?

**05:04**

Speaker 4

Well, sure. Not much to update. As of today, we are over 300 partners now, and so the outreach continues. We constantly have partners who are engaging their networks and referring their partners to us. And so we're glad to onboard all the new partners we have, which they'll probably be on the Friday call. But, yeah, the outreach continues. Anyone who wants to introduce CERF to any of their partners, please send them.

**05:43**

Speaker 1

My way and that's it. Okay, thank you. Alan. Good morning, stella, welcome.

**05:53**

Speaker 2

Hi, Stella.

**05:54**

Speaker 4

Good morning. Sorry for joining late. Good morning.

**05:59**

Speaker 1

So I want to turn a moment over to Alan to give us a demographic update. We're having some dialogue on the back end with the LADC, and I do want to see which affinity hubs we have not covered in today's call. But I also want us to have a dialogue about the phasing plan and the timelines because it will impact our community partners based on what has been proposed. Go ahead, Alan.

**06:28**

Speaker 2

Thank you, Sharon. So as I mentioned last week, it seems after that May 1 deadline, we've

kind of slowed in regards to outreach, so we've passed the 300 mark. We're currently at 302 total members, but our increase has slowed. But this is still something to kind of give everyone a round of applause for because we've definitely come a long way. So moving towards our geographic breakdown of La HRTC members by spa by the member headquarters, so we're seeing the similar trends as last week, seemingly that there's not much of an increase anyways. So we have the most need in Spa seven East La. As well as Spa six B, southwest la. And again, we have Spa Four and Spa Eight up there at 73 and 65 HRTC members. I did want to note that Spa Five West La. Did have a notable increase. They're in the third highest ranking place in this chart here, which was previously held by Anela Valley.

**07:38**

Speaker 2

Although it's very close, as you can see, it's 272-625-2423. So it's pretty balanced in regards to this area here on the bar chart. Geographic breakdown of La HRTC members by primary service area. So again, the same trend. The majority of our HRTC members indicated that they serve all of La county. And so you can also see that in the smaller numbers here. So people who select all of La county, they did not select a specific spa. So these numbers might look a little bit smaller than we would like for it to display since we're not double counting. But I'd also like to note that our need here is Spa seven East La. We definitely need more HRTC members who are serving this service planning area here, and the second lowest being the Spa Five West area. We need more HRTC members that are serving that West La.

**08:43**

Speaker 2

Area there. I see people waiting in the waiting room. Chioma, if you could just keep checking the waiting room for me while I'm sharing. Thank you. And moving on towards our big table, the geographic diversity by organizational headquarters and affinity hub. So again, what we're looking for here are the blanks. So we can check out the blanks by spa. So it looks here we have a good spread in Spa One in regards to the variety of our affinity hub categories. And we can also look at this horizontally. So in regards to immigrants, it looks like we need a lot more HRTC members that are serving immigrants as well as it looks like underemployed adults seems to be concentrated in the Spa Four area. But we can use some work in Spa One and Spa Six B. And in regards to our spas that have the least HRTC members which are Spa Six B.

**09:46**

Speaker 2

Here you can see that we mostly have our civic engagement in place based coalitions, families, employers, and economic development. What we're really lacking when it comes to homeless veterans and seniors, immigrants, institution and government sustainability underemployed adults. And I believe spa, seven East La. Was the other service planning area that has a greater need of HRTC members or a more diverse need of HRTC members within these affinity hub categories. But with that said, does anyone have any questions regarding this week's demographics report?

**10:23**

Speaker 1

I have a quick question.

**10:24**

Speaker 2

In terms of the immigrants, could you.

**10:27**

Speaker 5

Tell me if IRC or JFS is in there?

**10:30**

Speaker 2

The International Rescue Committee and the Jewish Family Services.

**10:36**

Speaker 1

JVs is on the call because Mark has been on the call, but I believe Mark runs workforce development for JVs.

**10:45**

Speaker 2

I meant JFS. Peter, I actually am the one that handles that back end of the onboarding form, and I haven't seen either of those organizations. But if you have any direct connections, please feel free to just introduce Chioma or I through email, and then we'll make sure that we can get them under that membership for our immigrants category. Okay, yeah, let me reach out to them. Thank you, Peter. I appreciate it.

**11:14**

Speaker 1

Quick question. Alisa has a question, I should say.

**11:21**

Speaker 5

Where can we see what spa corresponds to what region?

**11:25**

Speaker 2

Yeah, so let me go ahead and stop sharing so I can find that link for you here. So we actually have a spa finder map that's on the onboarding form. Just let me go ahead and navigate to that onboarding form, and I'll share the link. But it's a pretty straightforward tool. Essentially all you do is put your address in, and then it will tell you exactly what service planning area that address is located in. So let me go ahead and share my screen so I could just quickly brief you on it. Are you able to see this?

**12:04**

Speaker 1

Luis.

**12:09**

Speaker 2

Are you all able to see this?

**12:11**

Speaker 4  
Yes, we can see it.

**12:12**

Speaker 2  
Okay. Yeah. So this is a spy Identifier app, and you can find it through here as well. So join our collaborative, and then it's included on the onboarding form right here. But I'll also drop the link. So you can go ahead and put your address, and then it'll go ahead and tell you here. Or you could just take a look at the map. You can see the boundaries here as well, geographically. Does that answer your question?

**12:35**

Speaker 1  
Luis.

**12:38**

Speaker 2  
Drop the chat link in the chat.

**12:40**

Speaker 5  
It does. Thank you.

**12:46**

Speaker 2  
Any other questions regarding our demographic support for the week?

**12:50**

Speaker 1  
I have a question. I am sorry. Okay, Spa Eight is showing up as South Bay, right?

**13:03**

Speaker 2  
Yes.

**13:04**

Speaker 1  
Got it. Just want to make sure, that's all. I wanted to make sure because I was looking at the numbers as it relates to okay.

**13:16**

Speaker 2  
Awesome. And I wanted to answer KENTA's question in the chat. So clarification for the May 1 deadline. Thank you for bringing that up. I should probably stop saying deadline, but really it was the end of a targeted outreach period. So that May 1 was the end of that targeted outreach where HRTC members were dedicating their energy and time towards targeted outreach. So there was no, I would say, end result regarding deadline for this or deadline for that or an end to this, especially for onboarding, because we're continuing to onboard throughout the planning phase. So don't worry about any deadlines. It was really just a

targeted outreach period. I hope that answers your question, Kenta. And it looks like we can move forward. But Sharon, sorry, just to clarify, Alan.

**14:13**

Speaker 3

So we are still doing targeted outreach, right?

**14:17**

Speaker 1

Yes, we are. Okay.

**14:19**

Speaker 3

So it really was just like an internal milestone or benchmark. But the goal, from what I understand, is that we're still trying to actively recruit additional HRTC members, right?

**14:39**

Speaker 2

That's exactly it. I believe the Outreach and Engagement Committee had just created that. It was originally a 45 day period where all our resources would kind of be devoted towards targeted outreach. However, it was extended to the May 1. And again, there's no for example, you're still onboarding after that May 1 date. And we continue to onboard today. And I see Luis is raising his hand.

**15:08**

Speaker 5

Yeah. Just one quick question. Do we have any materials that you kind of just have prepared that we can send to people so that who may not know what CERF is, who may not know it's about like, hey, this is just I don't have to reinvent the wheel. Let me just forward this like material. Hey, you should check this out. Join here's the link.

**15:27**

Speaker 2

Yeah, we do have a fact sheet. I believe it's on our website. But then we can also drop the link in the chat. Chioma, if you could drop that link in the chat, please.

**15:38**

Speaker 4

I'll add it to the chat.

**15:40**

Speaker 1

There's a really nice communication toolkit that includes not only a fact sheet, but also an email template for you to send out.

**15:46**

Speaker 5

Yes, thank you.

**15:47**

Speaker 4

I'll link them both in the chat for you.

**15:49**

Speaker 1

Thank you so much. Yama.

**15:55**

Speaker 2

And Sharon, in regards to the next item of the agenda, I know that we had previously discussed adding just quickly reviewing the newsletter that just released every week.

**16:05**

Speaker 1

Well, I would rather us we have some other things that have come up, but I think the committee needs to be aware of. Okay. The newsletter is the LEDC's way of sending out us an update of what's happening. And because we are in the process of trying to define our governance structure and having dialogues about that's an important part. I think you sent out the minutes yesterday and the notes from the last governance meetings. However, one of the things that if there are any other questions I want to pivot I think we have two or three more hubs to go through. What we have been doing is we set a pre advanced agenda to take 20 30 minutes out of every session and deep dive into one of our hubs so that we could define what types of entities should be at those hubs and who we should be inviting.

**17:01**

Speaker 1

So that when we get into the work and people ask that question, well, where do I plug in to the laser? Where do I sit? What table it aligns with what my old goals are and what my organization does. We have this pre formulated kind of a master list by affinity hub of the types of entities that should be at those tables and should be included. So we have gone from business to sustainability to workforce, academia. We looked at government institutions. We've been taking sessions weekly to try to take two or three of those and do a deep dive and have some brainstorming from our members, committee members, so that when it comes time, individual members are empowered with answers or a guide to say, oh, okay, this is where I plug in. And because it is self generated and.

**17:52**

Speaker 4

It is a churn, you're breaking off.

**17:55**

Speaker 1

They have so much stuff open. And so that is something that we have one or two more hubs left. Stella, you're muted.

**18:12**

Speaker 2

I think you muted yourself again. Stella. I think she's breaking up, it seems.

**18:21**

Speaker 1  
All right.

**18:24**

Speaker 4  
Do you hear me?

**18:28**

Speaker 1  
Yes, we can hear you now. Yeah. Economic development was we covered economic development last week. Yeah, I hosted economic development last week. There's a master sheet of the categories. Alan, where is that? Housed our table.

**18:52**

Speaker 2  
I actually shared it in the chat while you were speaking about it. So everyone's able to access that. But let me go ahead and share the document because I want to show everyone what we have so far. I think we covered all of the groups besides academia, from my understanding. I believe when we spoke about academia, you had mentioned that list that the committee had created a while back, I think last year. And it had a pretty comprehensive list of academia institutions. So you can see here we have a decent amount from each. And I guess we can kind of look here and identify what you want to focus on today. Civic engagement and place based coalitions was one of the ones we did last week. As well as sustainability, as well as economic development.

**19:40**

Speaker 1  
Yeah, okay. Workforce and union has been covered because there's quite a bit of list. I've been working on some stuff on the sidebar on immigrants and workforce. Again. Now, in this instance, I want to be very clear. This is real interesting because in this instance, we have the names. What's being put forth are names of organizations, which is valuable. But the idea is to give types of organizations so that people that plug in to the list can say, oh, yeah, I'm one of those. For example, in academia, I know one of the things that came up was our vocational schools, our prison based schools, all 80 of the school districts. Not just La, USD, and just our community colleges. So it became a much broader list of types of organizations that we would look to be included in that academia category. And again, not just individual organizations names, which are very valuable because that allows the team to dive in and do immediate outreach.

**20:53**

Speaker 1  
But I do want to see that, like, in the family area that we have our family service organizations. And so we're going to want to supplement this list. Again, it was a brainstorming exercise. I have the list for the initial list from academia, and I think there were 22 categories in there by the time I got done with it. So I'm more than happy to help build that out. But is this shareable somewhere on an outreach site or somewhere where people can link it? Because eventually we're going to be referring this available making this available to folks.

**21:28**

Speaker 2

Yeah. So the link that I shared, I believe you all should be able to share that link as well. Yeah. So anyone with this link should be able to edit this document. So feel free to send it to someone that might have something to contribute to this document.

**21:43**

Speaker 1

Can we create an outreach resource folder so all of the outreach stuff that we need, I know there's the communication can be in one place. Just so folks, because, again, there are only so many people on this call, but as we look at getting other people on, hey, go to the outreach folder and you can get these resources. That would be helpful.

**22:00**

Speaker 2

Yeah, sounds good.

**22:01**

Speaker 1

All right. Anything else before we move on? All right, couple of things. We had a discussion last week around preparing. One of the discussions we had last week was about how we're structured. We're getting ready for the governance structure vote. There's still some ongoing discussions about that, but I felt compelled that I wanted to bring to the members attention the planning phase document that was filed with the state and the potential implications that could have on community organizations and their participation, their expectations around participation in serve. And so I'm going to bring that up on the screen and just highlight a few items. I thought I had it so much stuff open on my computer that so if I go in and out, it's because there's too much open. And I know I'm not the only one. I'm just terrible at it. Okay, so on May 1, the LEDC on behalf of the HRTC had to submit a regional phase plan.

**23:12**

Speaker 1

And this is an important document. It just kind of outlines what we have to do and when this is supposed to be done. Now, the proposal itself had a milestone timeline as well as details of what we had committed to and then they took phrases of that and put it in the contract. I want to call your attention to a couple of things. One is the definition of our Affinity Hubs affinity tables, which is why we've been doing this work. They're listed, they're identified. We know that there are twelve planning affinity Hubs and eight planning tables. I want to scroll down to the timeline. There is in our contract a commitment to contract with twelve affinity Hub leads. And that was supposed to happen in our first quarter, in the fourth month of our operations and we contracted on March, therefore it should have happened by July.

**24:21**

Speaker 1

Understand, that scorecard for selecting Hub leads I'm told is still under development. However, currently according to this plan, hub leads would be selected somewhere between July and September. So I want to roll through and have you be aware of that because our contract said it was month four, which would be July. Our Steering Committee, according to our contract and this document is supposed to be a subset of our affinity and subregional table reps. Our Hub leads, affinity leads and community based organizations and community leaders would make up the Steering Committee. I have voiced the concern and will continue

to voice the concern that based on our contract and our structure, we are supposed to have within our Steering Committee body twelve seats for our affinity Hub leads. That is how data is supposed to flow back and forth between the committee and the sub and the Steering Committee.

**25:30**

Speaker 1

And then we engage the additional community based leaders, residents, community organizations so that we have a selected Steering Committee. At this moment, I do not believe we are prepared to select those affinity Hub leads who are supposed to be having seats on the Steering Committee. So that is a concern and we have to figure out how we're going to get affinity Hubs seated on our Steering Committee. I bring this up. The second issue that I want to make sure we have some dialogue around is we talked about requesting a grandfather clause. A grandfather clause would say that the things that the process, the structure that the outreach and engagement and governance and HRTC committees have all voted on collectively and decided that all of those decisions by the HRTC would be Grandfeathered in that they were made prior to the seating of the Steering Committee.

**26:37**

Speaker 1

We have asked for that. We have shared our comments with LAEDC and this request has been made into the Steering Committee, I mean the governance committee via the Jam board that was shared. I'm expecting that we'll have a pretty robust discussion. Because what this clause in the phase plan says is that all the key decision points regarding budget allocation goals, outreach and engagement strategy all of the phase one activities are subject to the decisions of the steering committee. And these are decisions that the HRTC has already made and it was agreed to, voted on, included in the proposal and then written into the contract. If we grant the steering committee the ability to overturn those decisions, we may not have the same structure going forward. And given that contracts need to be vet and I'm going to cover the timeline for things, I think this is an important clause that we push for.

**27:35**

Speaker 1

Not only grandfather clause for everything. The Ghrfcc has already decided on that it stays in place and that as Kelly from the county has recommended, that we implement what we call a conflict of interest clause into our steering committee. So that because phase two is going to be involved. The allocation of tens of millions of dollars that anyone who is in a heavy conflict or potential recipient partnership or anything tied to those funds would have to recuse themselves from voting on that matter. That's just good public policy and it's good nonprofit policy. So we're asking for I think Kelly did bring that up, that we do need to have a conflict of interest policy. Here's where I want to draw our attention to as it relates to budget. In all of the documents that have been distributed, we've been pretty clear on the role of the steering committee and how it is structured.

**28:41**

Speaker 1

But what I want to bring up is a question about timeline. The current plan, when the budget was proposed. I'm scrolling and bear with me because I'm getting down to budget our current structure as it comes to dollars. LADC, I've been informed, has not received any funds from CCF yet. However, the work that was set up for outreach and engagement includes

outreaching to our constituents, gathering information on their needs, their barriers, their challenges, and bringing that information back to us so that we can have discussion forums and begin to craft and plan and have input into the overall economic regional plan that will be a ten year plan for our county. So each of our twelve hubs and all of our subgroups at all of our tables will ensure that the under captured voice of those 27 categories of undervoiced individuals and community members are heard in this process.

**29:51**

Speaker 1

In one of these three, what's on the screen right now are the three scope of works that will be defined in the research contracts. One of these has language that I was told, we're told be, as we mean, revised specifically so that the data that our community organizations bring back about the needs of our residents can be assimilated, aggregated and shared back to us for planning purposes. The aggregation of data both on a geographic basis and on a racial equity basis, on a racial basis, is part of our structure. The assimilation of that data was being written into one of these three research contracts. Charles, can you tell me which one of the three that's supposed to be in? I know there's been discussion on where it was being amended.

**30:51**

Speaker 3

So all three are going to be reauthored by Shannon Sedgwick, who's LAEDC's internal economist. So all three will be reauthored. And every aspect of what you were talking for, the racial planning, it'll probably be spread out throughout all three of these. So Matt from Milken Institute, his goal was to always have those research included in these three reports because in his estimation, there was no way that you could exclude it. It was just at the time that discussion that was happening, Shannon was not privy to those conversations, which is why the three summaries that you're seeing side by side right now are not reflecting the information from the racial planning events, but as she reauthorizes them. And we should be expecting that pretty soon all of that will be included somewhere within one of them.

**32:03**

Speaker 1

Okay, wonderful. Thank you for that. So would we be expecting the planning document to be amended at some point? Do we have to amend this back with the state?

**32:15**

Speaker 3

Yeah, with any changes, we always update the state with it. And so just so everyone on this call knows that there are monthly reports that we send to the state giving them updates, lessons learned, challenges that we're facing. So even what you were talking about prior to this discussion, we can circle back to it if we need. But all of this is being reported back to the state, including the fact that we haven't received a penny.

**32:46**

Speaker 1

I get it. I totally get it. And I'm trying to be sensitive to that, given that I come to the table with high demand. So first I want to make sure, if anyone has questions, if you understand agreements, what is this question? Can you read the chat, Stella? I'm trying to get back there while I've got two other things.

**33:04**

Speaker 4

Yeah, Sharon had a comment or question. Sharon has identified some key issues. Also notice that the Affinity Hub leads do not appear on the documents describing the steering committee. Also previously noted that grandfather clauses need to be specific I e. Specific elements of the structure that are in writing. Also note that the partnership agreements and other documents state that it is recognized that the governance structure will evolve. These elements should be harmonized prior to voting.

**33:36**

Speaker 1

Thank you, Tony. That is right on. .1 of the reasons we're having. I wanted to make sure that you're informed the Affinity Hub. The language is concrete, not only in the contract, but in the proposal and in this document. This phase document that was submitted that the steering committee is comprised of the twelve Affinity Hubs plus other community representatives. And the governance committee has been fantastic. It's trying to brainstorm and vet out how many seats that go to their seats. For community based leaders, there are seats. For community based organizations, there are seats for workforce and the like, but there is very clear that there are seats. So one recommendation that's coming out of members of the Outreach Committee that have been in discussion is because we also have a mandate for geographic inclusivity and equity. Is there's a proposal discussion on the table of proposing that 33 seats get moved to 36 and that each spa be limited three or four seats.

**34:40**

Speaker 1

And the reasonable recommendation was that each spa be allocated up to three seats so that no spa, it would not be concentrated. Our steering committee could not be concentrated in any one area. But if we had three times nine puts us at 27. If we had four, that would put us at 36. But given the demographics and I want to put this before the group given the demographics that Alan has continuously shared about our geographic inclusivity, I want to throw out to you guys for consideration and get some feedback on proposing the idea that we structure or propose three of those seats during committee seats from each of the spas. Then that would leave six open seats. And those could be from organizations that are county wide because that is, I think, Alan, you said it was like 30% of our organizations are countywide. Is that what I read?

**35:40**

Speaker 2

Yes, that's correct. I think about 35% or so.

**35:43**

Speaker 1

So get some feedback. What are you guys feeling about that? I mean, understanding equity means we don't create a steering committee that 60% of the people come from one spa. We need to have geographic equity. It is in our contract, we have said that we would do that. So what do you think about the idea? Get some cross talk. If it should be three, four per spa or maybe three per spa and a set of seats that are open to organizations that are counting. Let's get some feedback and I'm going to open up my chat.

**36:15**

Speaker 4

Tony, you had your hand up. Did you want to respond to this question here or was it something else?

**36:23**

Speaker 6

Actually, this ends something else. I want to raise the issue that, of course, there is a difference between the steering committee and the HRTC in general. So should people want to I think you can talk about geographic diversity without necessarily saying within the steering committee, you're going to have that in thinking of the size of the steering committee, the having your affinity hub leads on there. I mean, you're starting to get quite a large structure. I would think the affinity hub leads just to me, are more important in getting on there. So if you have your 33, which may be 36, plus you have your affinity hubs, which are 912.

**37:12**

Speaker 1

Okay. Twelve.

**37:13**

Speaker 6

You kind of have a fairly large piece here. So anyways, I point out that the steering committee, you can do it separately. But the other piece I just wanted to raise is that it would be very helpful to have in writing prior to voting on Friday what it is literally that we're voting on. I spent a lot of time over the weekend preparing a memo for my organization so that I could send that back to the board and they could talk about it. And I found we had a lot of great documents, but I do not know what we're literally voting on.

**37:52**

Speaker 4

Thanks, Johnny.

**37:54**

Speaker 1

Thank you. Any other comments?

**37:56**

Speaker 4

Yes, Louise says this hand up.

**37:59**

Speaker 5

Yeah, I like the idea of having a little bit more equal representation throughout the different spas, but it does seem like a pretty significant divergence from what the current proposal is, which had based on community based organizations, things like that. It could be something that could be overlapped in it, but I just want to be cautious about I think we still have the freeway to implement something like that if we wanted to, but it's not something I think that it would be a pretty big significant divergence.

**38:27**

Speaker 1

I don't think it is, and I'm going to tell you why. If you had twelve seats that are your affinity hub seats or whatever, remember, 75% to 80% of the steering committee is going to be representatives of community based leaders or community based organizations. And then I believe the language and Kelly agreed with it, is that our workforce development that represent LMIS as well as if we have residents that represent disadvantaged communities, disinvested communities, those are also part of that 80%. And so we know, it seems to me that we basically would have to call for the 80% first and we would have to get that out of our affinity hubs or we would have to get that out of our CBOs. You either come in as an acute hub lead, you come in as a CBO, you come as a community based leader or resident, or you come in as Kelly languaged.

**39:30**

Speaker 1

It it is a grassroots equity or economic environmental justice organization. So there's these categories that are in the current plan that they're saying should be the 75% or 80%. I think what happens is that there has to be some structure to ensure that each of those categories kind of like a ballot. If you were doing a ballot for purposes of an La county election, you would have those candidates and they would be presented on a spa basis instead of a district. If you were Berkshire voting for city council districts, it would city councilmen and you would have District 123478, whatever. So I think it's within the structure, but we still have to keep to the existing structure. You still have your community based leaders, you still have your Cbls, you still have whatever. It's just the selecting the category, ensuring that they stay geographically balanced and the geographic equity and balance and inclusivity is in the contract.

**40:28**

Speaker 1

It's not even just in the proposal, it's in the contract.

**40:31**

Speaker 5

Makes sense to me. You did say one thing that I wasn't sure, because this is the first time I remember hearing is that the affinity hub leads have seats on the steering committee. I don't remember that.

**40:40**

Speaker 1

Well, that's what page 20 of the contract says.

**40:43**

Speaker 5

No, but I'm not saying that wasn't what was mentioned at last week's proposal.

**40:46**

Speaker 1

That's why I was like, yeah, it is exactly right. And so I'm going to scroll down because this is the planning document. The planning document that got submitted to the state says exactly

the same thing. It says very clearly that the steering committee is a subset of the affinity hubs. I'm concerned because I'm not seeing this show up where it is in the contract. It's even on the documents that are being sent out. So we have to address that issue. We have sent in commentary to the governance committee. I believe you're looking at 36 members down or 33 members minus twelve, which are affinity hub seats, and the others are your community representatives because that's the way our contract says it. And if you look on page 20 of the contract, it is section C, which defines our steering committee and that is exactly what it says.

**41:47**

Speaker 1

So I'm going to move on because there's one thing that does concern you. I don't want to take up all of your time, but there's one thing that we need to bring voice to and make some recommendation. This is the language right here on screen. Can you still see my screen where it says representation? This is the representation of steering committee as broken down as currently proposed. And it says a subset of the affinity and subregional table representatives and hub leads plus additional representatives to ensure that the votes. So that 70 or 80% would be the community based leaders or community and or community organizations. But the subset of affinity hubs is first. And so I don't know what pockets they come out of. That's a discussion that has to be still had, but it is not only in the documents that's being circulated, but it is also and I don't think we've talked about reversing that.

**42:45**

Speaker 1

Yes, Louise, it hasn't come to the floor, but we did submit a document after having it reviewed. I want to close out and not take more time, but I want to talk about budget concerns. This is from the planning document and this actually falls in line pretty much with the budget that was proposed. The proposal called for outreach and engagement to spend \$2.5 million of the 5 million that were allocated. And this money gets pushed through primarily to our community organizations.

**43:22**

Speaker 7

Where is that reflected? I don't see the 2.5. Where is it?

**43:26**

Speaker 1

It's all in the proposal. Now, this is kind of the question. The community engagement number here is showing up as 1.968, right? That's correct. And then the participant compensation we structured and we have line items and they're actually on the beautiful graphics that Scarlet has worked on. The \$295,000 is comprised of stipends for community organizations to participate in meetings, that is budgeted. We have childcare stipends for individual residents to be able to participate in community outreach meetings. That is budgeted. Right now these numbers add up to 2.3 million and I do am looking to find out where's the other \$200,000 because were assured original budget that we approved was 2.7 and we settled on 2.5 and then went to outreach and went to governance and market research in their \$900,000. That role that the community groups come back with the lived experience data, that \$135,000 that you see events and conferences, those are our Geographic Planning Hubs platforms.

**44:57**

Speaker 1

So that line item doesn't come down till later in the pike. It's not in advance but line G, line J and line K belong tile in addition to that, I'm sorry, so you said G which is those are the geographic planning forums.

**45:18**

Speaker 7

So that's part of the outreach then.

**45:20**

Speaker 1

That'S outreach budget, yes, got it. Second item is the actual dollars that we spend out to the actual and I thought it was \$2 million, but the actual dollars that we distribute to the planning hub tables, the affinity hubs, as well as the micro. Grant hubs that's line j and then the participant compensation is again we are now we agree to pay people to participate our organizations to give them a stipend for participating in the meetings so that we have full participation. The same thing happens where our residents, if they've got to not take off or whatever to do that and there's money for childcare budgeted in there as well. So those are the line items in month four, which is coming above ahead of us, there's a 25% advance on the contract and the 25% advance provides the only items that advances were asked for was for staff salaries, the research funding and the community engagement funding.

**46:27**

Speaker 1

So the first monies that CCF will receive from the state are to cover lines A, BH and our people J. And that's actually in the contract, in the way it's structured. We've looked at it, we got the budget and it is still there. What I want to bring to our attention is here's the breakdown what \$50,000 per affinity hub comes to \$1 million. That includes the twelve hubs and the eight planning. That is 1 million. As you can see. You see it is 52.5 million. The 900,000 is for the Micro grantees at \$10,000 each. And there's the community based organization or community based leader stipends. They will receive \$3,000 each for the 90 organizations. \$135,000 is for the Geographic Planning forums. The racial planning forums is being paid for separately. It is included in research's budget. It is an additional \$135,000. And that is why that section was being amended, because the research committee, we knew we couldn't go over 2.5.

**47:43**

Speaker 1

And when were missing two items that we did not have sufficient funds for, went to Outreach, went to research and said, can you pick up the cost of aggregating the data that all of our community groups come out with and get? It's called the lived experience. Data. Can you roll that in and pay for that in your budget? Matt agreed to it. We provided the language, it showed up on the timeline and they are reworking those proposals to make sure that gets included. \$75,000 we did not have for capacity building. CD tech pushed for it. Our committee agreed that many of our residents and community organizations would need capacity building training to understand how to do economic planning. And so went to Stewardship and Governance. That said, we're tapped out. Can you guys fund it? And that was allocated as a funding item. So that is really what's included.

**48:37**

Speaker 1

In addition, there's \$30,000 for an environmental justice event and 25,000 for the residents to have stipends.

**48:45**

Speaker 7

Sorry to ask clarify, I just want to confirm 75,000 for capacity building.

**48:52**

Speaker 1

Yes, that is training that will be conducted with community residents organizations to really follow through and understand how to participate and engage in the economic planning process. Okay, there is \$25,000 there's. That small stipend and that's for it was primarily for childcare. So I'm moving on because I want to get to one item that I am just concerned with the timeline. The timeline is in the original proposal and in the currently everything is doing a great job. We've looked at our subgroups, we're figuring out who we are. We did that in March, even before the contract. This phase plan, which is what you're looking at, was filed on May 1. The RFPs for the research are being modified. That was supposed to go out this week. We do have this commitment to have this governance structure done, but I want to be included. Our process is our original contract and timeline said we will engage with our researchers and we will engage with our Affinity Hubs.

**50:06**

Speaker 1

So we have to select them. And from what I'm told, that's going to be delayed. And I don't know how we see the steering committee when we haven't selected twelve of the folks that are supposed to be sitting on that steering committee. That's an issue that has to be raised. However, more importantly than that, our process is we have micro grantees that will engage with community, that will go out and meet people, that will gather community information data. That data will be aggregated. It will come together. They will meet at Affinity Hub tables, share out based on the Affinity Hubs that Affinity Hub lead will compile and share that information up to the steering committee. The way that this is structured is our CERF hub leads according to this, are supposed to be RFP by June 30 and the contracts before the RFPs. This says between July and September right behind it.

**51:10**

Speaker 1

It appears that the subgroup data is listed to be collected and compiled, but the subgroup data is collected and compiled by our micro grantees. And unfortunately, this report shows that our micro grantees are not contracted until 2024, which means our Affinity Hub leads and our steering committee are doing all of our live data experience, and that is not the way this was designed. We have to find a way to design the sub grantee and the Affinity Hub scope of work so they can be identified and selected before we begin the outreach and engagement data collection process. That's what their job is. So if you understand, if you're looking here where it says sub, regional and Steering Committee members review and analyze the research data, no. Our micro grantees, it's their job. It is your job as community groups to engage with your constituents. That's why we allocated \$10,000 for you to go sit with them, go meet with them.

**52:28**

Speaker 1

Some people say we meet with them at Fair, some people say we do. Forums, some people say we do. However you engage with them, bring back that lived experience data and allow that data to be aggregated so that we can have collective data that research can summarize. So from a timeline standpoint, I want to be sure that although we haven't received dollars yet, that our committee members know that there is something circulating on the table that may push their micro grant money out until 2024. And that was not our intent. We planned for those dollars to be in the advance. Remember, there's a 25% advance of that, almost \$2 million for this purpose, to make sure that the micro grantees, the research folks, and the Hub leads could get their money within the first tranche of funds so that we could get to work and begin to engaging with our community.

**53:25**

Speaker 1

I wanted to make sure you were aware that the timeline appears to be shifted. It may be unintentional, but I need us to please make sure that you are aware of it and if it has implications, if it needs to be altered and modified, that we manage that prior to the sit down of this committee. This committee is expected to after we see the steering committee, the outreach committee should, if contracted, would go away. But if that's the case, there's nobody to ensure that the micro grantees are handled. So any feedback I shared what that's really what I really wanted to share, that it's the timing or the outreach structure that we make sure. So any feedback from anyone? Are you informed, aware of it? Because, again, this could have implications.

**54:16**

Speaker 7

So I'm just wondering, are the other folks aware of the fact that the timing doesn't work already?

**54:25**

Speaker 1

I don't know what other folks? I quite frank. Thankfully, we had a meeting last week and it was brought up about the plan, saw it, went and read it. Scarlet shared it that it had been posted on the website. It is on the website. I went and read it we had already had some meetings with groups about their concerns on the steering structure. And when I saw this, I'm like, hey, guys, this means we can't get the work done, and that's not our objective.

**54:49**

Speaker 7

I'm kind of curious who ultimately.

**54:54**

Speaker 1

If.

**54:54**

Speaker 7

We agree and I want to know who the we is, since we don't have a steering committee or whatever, but do we then go to the state to get the approval of the reorder of the timing or.

**55:10**

Speaker 1

What's expected? Well, here's what I would like to do. I would like to move that this body because we are still a body, one of the three committees take a vote to restore our original timeline so that the affinity hubs and the micro grantees get funded out of. The first tranche of funds which they are allocated from so that our micro grantees can get their work done if they're funded in January, and that the base plan will have to be amended to comply with the original timeline shown in the proposal. Okay. And that's actually a timeline in the contract. Again, we haven't made this modification. I don't know that people have taken the time to read the fine print, but when I read it, I'm like, oh, January. The work will be done already in January. Right.

**56:01**

Speaker 7

So it doesn't make sense.

**56:02**

Speaker 1

No.

**56:06**

Speaker 5

So quick question on this. You pointed out a lot of different funds that are available and different groups that are supposed to go to we haven't selected the recipients of those funds yet, right?

**56:16**

Speaker 1

No, we haven't.

**56:18**

Speaker 5

Okay.

**56:20**

Speaker 1

We're supposed to select the affinity hubs and then sit a searing committee, and then later on and then we're supposed to select the microbenti. They have not been selected, but I.

**56:30**

Speaker 5

Think that Prostitute just outlined makes sense. The affinity hub. The affinity hub leads the steering committee and then let's approve out, because I think we're going to essentially put out requests for proposals. Who wants to get money for this so that it's open to everybody? So it's not just who has connections.

**56:46**

Speaker 1

That's exactly the way it's supposed to be. Yes. It needs to be fair and equitable and make it available to the entire HRCC. Kevin, you have your hand up.

**56:55**

Speaker 8

Thank you. Sharon. First of all, thank you for the detail and pointing out the things that come back to haunt us down the road. It's better to get clarity and build consensus by whatever structure means that the group approves. And also in dealing with state and local government, especially with small businesses, community based organizations, it's important for expectations to be set on any funding that's going to be in place to supplement their efforts. What we don't want is for people to start a task and then drop off because they don't have funding. So in order to have continuity, I think this is something that is reasonable to discuss, and I'm sure that we can reach collaboration and consensus on how to move forward. Thank you.

**57:57**

Speaker 1

Okay. Anyone else? So is there any other anybody else have any comments?

**58:16**

Speaker 4

I was just going to ask Sharon. Did you want to take that vote today?

**58:20**

Speaker 1

Yes, I do. Because if we're going to take this, because this is going to show up on our vote on tomorrow and on Friday, we have to make the recommendation to the HRTC as the Outreach Committee. If we're going to make a recommendation, because it's already in the contract, it's already in the milestones. The funds were already allocated for it. But change in our timing is going to affect the outreach and engagement process. Okay.

**58:53**

Speaker 3

I'm sorry. Charles Johnson here, the program director. It's important that you guys also keep in mind that there are deliverables to the state for the steering committee to be seated by not just La. The entire state to be seated by July 6 of this year. I requested an extension for Los Angeles because of July 4, people are going to be traveling. Whatnot? So it's a possibility that we can get an extra week there. But trying to get the affinity hubs completely in place before the steering committee will be extremely difficult without cutting some corners. And that is a concern that LADC has. There's absolutely no way that the state will reverse be able to I'm sorry, would be able to make it extend anything out. There's a time component that needs to be considered. I understand in the proposal on that page 20, where it states that the steering committee is a subset of the affinity hub.

**01:00:20**

Speaker 3

And it was brought to my attention a little bit earlier today, and I wanted to make sure since I was the last person to come across, come to the team. I wanted to make sure that there wasn't a history here that I wasn't aware of. So I spoke with the supervising program director, Jermaine, who you guys all know, and it seems that there was an oversight not just with writing this proposal, but also with the state. There's been a ton of oversights that the Serf team, myself included, have pointed out to the state. But in addition to just the funding

opportunities, we can just put the funding aside for right now. But in terms of the actual process of making sure that there is a nice equitable process of picking the members of the steering committee of the affinity hubs, we don't want to rush that process.

**01:01:21**

Speaker 3

So that's just something else to consider. There's a little bit more that goes into it, including that's dealing with the budget. But in order to preserve time for you guys, it's important that you know that.

**01:01:34**

Speaker 1

All right. I want to make sure I respond to Kay's response. No, there is no issue that the steering committee members can't be funded by the Infinity Hub. It was structured for that to happen. That is the way it was structured. So if that's on a document. It is absolutely incorrect. I'm going to call for one vote before we leave because we are at 11:00. I am asking for the planning phase document to be modified so that our micro grantees are funded through the first tranche of CCF funds as was outlined in the proposal. We cannot wait for our micro grant t's to be funded in January after our outreach and engagement work is done. I second that motion. Thank you.

**01:02:23**

Speaker 4

All in favor? Can you just raise your hand, everyone?

**01:02:32**

Speaker 1

Oh, there's a hand raising sure, isn't there?

**01:02:34**

Speaker 4

Oh, there you go. That's wonderful technology.

**01:02:40**

Speaker 1

Any oppositions? Yeah. That would mean you want the micro grantees to wait to be funded until January of 2024. Remove your hands first before if there's any oppositions, you can actually just put your name in the chat. Opposition. Phaedra. Blaine, you're opposing you sherry, you're wanting the micrograntees to so the micrograntees. We have three folks that voted for an opposition.

**01:03:09**

Speaker 8

Sharon blaine, there were some before you go too fast, there were some that couldn't lower their hand quickly enough.

**01:03:18**

Speaker 1

Okay.

**01:03:19**

Speaker 8

Some of these backgrounds don't complement brown hands, so.

**01:03:27**

Speaker 1

Thanks, Kevin. That's an equity issue. We have to take that up.

**01:03:32**

Speaker 4

Luisa, you had your hand up. Are you against funding the micro grantees?

**01:03:37**

Speaker 5

I was abstaining just because I don't quite understand the proposal enough to really speak intelligently of it. It was kind of brought on, like these kind of things where we're going to vote on. It'd be helpful if we at least get a heads up here's what's going to be voted on.

**01:03:51**

Speaker 1

The items are on the agenda. That's the good news. They are really being great about putting everything on the website now, but I understand advanced notice is so necessary.

**01:04:01**

Speaker 5

Yeah, I don't know enough about it to be able to say yes or no.

**01:04:04**

Speaker 1

Okay, so right now we have Luis, you're in opposed one opposition. Do you have a count?

**01:04:13**

Speaker 5

So I'm hoping that by the time it gets to the HRTC, we have a little bit more information as to what the implications are. To the extent that the LAEDC has some concerns about its workability, I reserve my right to be like, no, this is a bad idea.

**01:04:28**

Speaker 1

Of course. Absolutely.

**01:04:30**

Speaker 4

So, Sharon, the vote passes to fund micro grantees. Yes, in the first tranche. Thank you.

**01:04:40**

Speaker 1

Okay. And I think we're out of time. We did not get to vote on the grandfather issue. I will

circulate the document with the comments so that we make sure that stays front and center at the top of the meeting on Friday. Very good. Thank you.

**01:04:57**

Speaker 5

Can I make one last comment?

**01:04:59**

Speaker 1

Yes.

**01:04:59**

Speaker 4

Go ahead, Louise.

**01:05:01**

Speaker 5

I'm just getting concerned that the state is getting ready to make a determination how it's going to divvy up that \$500 million. And I think we had all expressed concern that they're going to do it equally amongst all regions and not by population. If we can start doing some outreach to our local elected state assembly, state senators, and really have them support, start reaching out to the state agency to say, hey, this needs to be divvied out by population, not by equal amounts. La county has a lot greater need than, let's say, Del Norte County.

**01:05:34**

Speaker 4

That's a great point, Louise.

**01:05:35**

Speaker 1

Thank you. You guys have been working on that, is that right?

**01:05:39**

Speaker 3

Yeah. So to answer your question, if politics rears his ugly head, then none of us has a say in any of this, but the decision of how much each region will get from that remaining 500 million will be determined on the strength of what we're doing right now. So if that plan goes out and is showing that two to five strategic projects that we're all trying to work towards is going to align with the goals and objectives of CERF, creating new jobs and XYZ, then I don't see why we shouldn't be able to get the lion's share of that. But however, we have been pushing the CERF team as much as we possibly can. And trust me, I'm on those community of practices meetings complaining about the fact that there has not been they're preaching equity. However, they only gave us 5 million, just like every other region.

**01:06:34**

Speaker 3

And some other regions are having problems spending their 5 million while we're trying to rob Peter to pay Paul in order to get some of our tasks done. So I'm preaching that message, just saying, hey, listen, when it comes to the implementation phase, please keep in consideration that we're struggling right now, so please give us our fair share. But absolutely

start encouraging everyone on this call to keep pushing that narrative forward so hopefully they'll hear it.

**01:07:03**

Speaker 7

And I think we should talk about some numbers too, because if they supposedly said yes, how much? We should have some kind of an argument for what that is.

**01:07:15**

Speaker 3

Yeah, that's what this planning phase is all about. So by the time you guys get done with all everyone collaborating, coming up with the two to five strategic projects, numbers will be attached to that. So they'll know once that proposal goes out, they'll know exactly how much money we're asking for.

**01:07:34**

Speaker 1

Thank you. Peter has a stand up. Hi, Peter.

**01:07:37**

Speaker 5

I got a quick question, Charles.

**01:07:39**

Speaker 2

I was wondering if any other organizations that may have a policy team that.

**01:07:44**

Speaker 5

Has direct connections into the capital, we might be able to put together efforts.

**01:07:51**

Speaker 2

To request the being up of fair share, so to speak, by population.

**01:07:59**

Speaker 3

I think this is almost kind of one of those things where you want to prove yourself on the court. So what we're doing right now, we do it right. We stay together as a team, Los Angeles, we create a really killer plan. We won't really have to say that, but we want to push that, keep pushing that narrative. So to answer your question, I don't know anyone any organizations that have that direct, we do.

**01:08:30**

Speaker 1

We know.

**01:08:34**

Speaker 2

Sharon has a personal touch of connection.

**01:08:37**

Speaker 1

Yeah, all of us do. And it's critical that we do because as we know, even LADC, as we applied for funds for Bill back, better faced the politics of Sacramento and those were federal funds and we had political powers lobbying against us in favor of other regions and that is California politics. And so we do have within the structure of the HRTC some very powerful constituencies that have voice in Sacramento and are seated on the governors in the various commissions. And so I think we are in a position and is going to take some advocacy to get those monies allocated based on population. So I believe that anyone is willing or capable to bring their bodies together and sign on and begin that to support LAEDC in that work. It can't happen alone with LAEDC doing it by itself. We know that. We know who the players are.

**01:09:52**

Speaker 6

So I would just say that in the statute there's nothing in the statute that says that each region is supposed to get X amount.

**01:10:02**

Speaker 1

Right.

**01:10:02**

Speaker 6

So we're starting really from a white blank piece of paper. And so that is, I think, really an important underpinning then the other, I think, as Charles said, the word is equity and equity is not equal. And you probably want to have a threshold so that your regions that have less population have something to work with. But there's no statutory framework that says each region is supposed to get it. So somebody's driving that train and it would be good to identify who that is and maybe attack that and address that directly.

**01:10:41**

Speaker 1

Tony, you know who that is. You know exactly who that is. So with that, I'm going to just shove my head, my mouth and not get myself in trouble because this was recorded. Right? Anyone else before we close the meeting? Thank you for your graciousness and going over time. Nothing else. Thank you. With that Pierce, that a hand up or is that a clap? It's a clap. I bid you a good day.

**01:11:10**

Speaker 2

Thank you, sheep.

**01:11:11**

Speaker 1

You guys adjourned. Thanks. Bye. Bye. Hey, the chat.