



## Steering Committee Bylaws Working Meeting October 13<sup>th</sup>, 2023

### [Recording](#)

Password: yY=Mc2wv

### [Action Items](#)

### [Meeting Transcript](#)

### [Chatbox](#)

The meeting began with a discussion about members reading the original proposal and familiarizing themselves with the organization's structure. Concerns are raised about confusion and derailment in meetings due to lack of understanding of the proposal. It is suggested that orientation sessions or office hours be conducted for new or uninformed members. The importance of being prepared and making informed decisions is emphasized, along with the need to move forward even if some members haven't reviewed materials. Sharon emphasizes revisiting the original proposal for clarity and alignment with goals, suggesting an additional week be given to read it before reconvening.

The chair discusses the need for efficiency and not prolonging situations. They propose revisiting a meeting once they have received all the necessary documents. There is some confusion about scheduling meetings and delays, but it is agreed to review the current document and schedule a third meeting to discuss any changes. The speaker suggests sending reminders to keep everyone informed about upcoming meetings and topics.

There are suggestions for language edits in the bylaws document, including using "shall" instead of "will." It is also discussed how often different groups should convene reflective of the financial support they will receive for their work.

Summary: The transcript includes a discussion about the funding and treatment of historically disadvantaged communities in the Catalyst Program. There is concern that resources are being allocated to rural, smaller communities rather than larger populations. The use of "historically disinvested" language is debated due to potential legal implications but it is acknowledged that these communities should be prioritized for funding. Prop 209 and the California state constitution are mentioned as references for understanding the language used in contracts and funding decisions. Some formatting errors are identified and suggestions for clarification on the governance structure are made.

The members also discuss the importance of presenting data reports to the Affinity Hub partner leads and subregional tables for community engagement before bringing them to the steering committee. The group agrees to revise the language in this section accordingly. They also discuss their role in advocating or supporting capacity building initiatives and decide to keep the current wording. Finally, they address some revisions needed in other sections of the document based on comments from Tony and Sharon, ensuring that research data is shared with all relevant members and groups.

Since the members ran out of time they agreed to continue reviewing the document at the next bylaws meeting and the commitment to schedule a third meeting for additional review. The chair ensures that everyone's voice is heard and compliments the team on their collaboration. They finalize the dates for upcoming meetings and express gratitude before ending the conversation.

The next bylaws meeting will take place on Oct 27<sup>th</sup> from 9:30-11 am and Nov 3<sup>rd</sup> 10-11:30am.

### [Action Items:](#)

- Revise the language in the bylaws to ensure consistency and clarity, particularly regarding the proposed changes made by the state in their rebranding efforts. This includes revising the sections related to the Vision and mission of the Bylaws.
- Provide additional information and clarification to members who may not have fully understood the original proposal and contract. This can be done through scheduled office hours or separate orientation sessions to ensure everyone is up to date and on the same page.
- Create a mechanism, such as reminders or notifications, to keep members informed and updated about the bylaws and the overall goals and structure of the organization. This can be done through the website, emails, or other communication channels to ensure that members are aware of any changes or updates.
- Send out the revised bylaws and related documents to all members, along with a reminder to review and provide any additional comments or feedback. This will ensure that everyone has access to the most up-to-date version of the bylaws and can contribute to the discussion effectively.

#### Chat Box:

Rudy

01:42

R

Very special!!

Apologies team, I have to hop off at 10:40am

👍 1

Scarlet Peralta

08:03

SP

<https://lacerf.org/about>

Linda Kelly, FMWC

08:37

LK

Linda Kelly, Yes

Sharon Evans

08:49

SE

I would like allot an additional week for bylaws review/revision to provide the oppty for SC members to review the original proposal AND to get a copy of what these "proposed" state change

👍 1

Stella Ursua (She/Her) GRID Alternatives LA

10:42

SU

I like that suggestion Sharon.

Linda Kelly, FMWC

17:34

LK

Agree w/Sharon

Stella Ursua (She/Her) GRID Alternatives LA

18:48

SU

Agree.

Alan Cheam

20:27

AC

Steering Committee Bylaws:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/17jir64rMLSMPjFEYpBmEisx93O4UFwMk0Cwv9IngSHs/edit>

Alan Cheam

23:56

AC

HRTC Bylaws:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1L6wW6R82oN4Faft3U3xAVlsc9J4rSnsbKxQhq3wd3g/edit>

Linda Kelly, FMWC

27:04

LK

no

Brady Collins, KIWA

29:12

BC

I'm wondering why the sections on responsibilities of Table Partner leads and Sub-Regional Tables are nested underneath the affinity hub section. My understanding is these are separate groups.

Rudy

29:21

R

We had a convo about that yesterday 😊

@Scarlet Peralta are we keeping track of notes in a live notes document?

That might be helpful to keep us all together too

tunua

32:18

T

@brady- this is the discussion we should have. I think this needs to be clarified and defined accordingly. My understanding is that there would be nesting to encourage alignment.

Stella Ursua (She/Her) GRID Alternatives LA

37:34

SU

good catch Brady. Thank you.

Brady Collins, KIWA

37:36

BC

"Brady", like Tom Brady.

Everyone's favorite quarterback.

👍1 ❤️1

Stella Ursua (She/Her) GRID Alternatives LA

39:25

**SU**

I'll keep tabs on the Chat Kevin.

Sharon Evans

41:06

**SE**

Jessica. The census tract disparities get caught thru the EDD defined "AMI" classification and high unemployment area census tract definitions of "disinvested.

Sharon Evans

42:03

**SE**

Alan, can you share the 4 definitions of "Disinvested;" with the SFP?

[3 Replies](#)

Rudy

48:31

**R**

I agree with Luis, let's keep it.

Sharon Evans

48:40

**SE**

good point Luis

Cheyenne Capelo

48:47

**CC**

I agree to keep it

Rudy

56:45

**R**

Im fine with advocate

definition: a person who publicly supports or recommends a particular cause or policy.

Jessica Quintana, Centro CHA

57:06

**JQ**

Advocate

Cheyenne Capelo

57:07

**CC**

I agree

Alan Cheam

58:02

**AC**

Flagging 3 minutes until meeting ends.

Jessica Quintana, Centro CHA

59:32

**JQ**

in agreement

Brady Collins, KIWA

01:01:25

**BC**

I have to jump shortly

Stella Ursua (She/Her) GRID Alternatives LA

01:01:26

**SU**

Same here. Sorry.

Bobby Lee Davis III

01:02:11

**BL**

indeed

Jessica Quintana, Centro CHA

01:02:21

**JQ**

Yes better process

Brady Collins, KIWA

01:03:52

**BC**

I would like to propose the meeting start at 9:30am

Bobby Lee Davis III

01:04:57

**BL**

Sounds good to me

Cheyenne Capelo

01:05:09

**CC**

Thank you everyone!

Brady Collins, KIWA

01:05:13

**BC**

Thank you, team.

Bobby Lee Davis III

01:05:19

**BL**

Enjoy your weekends

### Meeting Transcript:

**00:40**

Hey, Rooting. Long time no see, sir.

**00:42**

I know. Crazy haunt. Twice in one week here my favorite call of the month here.

**00:48**

Surf. I think I need to put this role on my resume as a second job.

**00:55**

Yeah, I think that's appropriate. So I'd support that. And I'd give you one of those recommendations on LinkedIn. A little thumbs up right there.

**01:02**

Hey, I'm going to take you up on that.

**01:07**

Hello, everyone.

**01:09**

Hello. Stella. Saw you active in thank you.

**01:15**

Absolutely.

**01:17**

Absolutely.

**01:18**

Kevin.

**01:19**

Stella. I see you have a Stella or sue a actually, do you actually have a park in Long Beach?

**01:27**

I was Parks and RECs Commissioner for the City of Long Beach. And so that's a parting gift when I stepped down. So I thought it was kind of know.

**01:38**

That's awesome.

**01:39**

That's really cute.

**01:40**

It is, right?

**01:43**

Kevin Clark, I got your emails. Let's circle back Monday afternoon, if you have a minute. Yes, sir.

**01:57**

So we'll go ahead and wait about a minute or so. How many folks do we have on here? I can't showing on my 1818. Okay. Michael. Yeah. We'll give it a minute and then we can go ahead and start. Seems like we're still remaining at 18. I think we should go ahead and get started, seeing that we do have a lot of work ahead of us when it comes to the bylaws. Alan, would you be able to share on your screen the bylaws, or would you like me to share?

**03:06**

You can go ahead and share. I have it pulled up right, so okay.

**03:09**

So before I hand it over to our chairs, whoever is present from our chair and vice chairs, I did kind of just

want to set the context. So what I have done after receiving the feedback, it was like one week worth of feedback that we gave an opportunity for our steering committee members. We received the feedback on what you all would like to see in the bylaws. We use that to expand on it. And so it's actually three documents that we have. They're all linked on this main one. So the first major document is our organization bylaws for the HRTC as a whole. So this is the guiding principles and structure for the HRTC. I then went ahead and broke it down through our supporting documents bylaws specifically that will guide the work of the steering committee and then Bylaws that will specifically guide the nature of our leadership, which is our chair and vice chairs.

**04:15**

What I would suggest with the help and facilitation of our chairs, we have received feedback through the comment function on the side. I hope you all have had the opportunity to go through these bylaws, but I would suggest that we go through it provision by provision in conjunction with the comments that have been left to take in. Whether you guys feel comfortable with the feedback or whether you guys think you don't want to include it. It's all to the discretion, I think, of our Steering Committee and those that are participating in this working meeting. But I do want to go ahead and make sure the chairs facilitate this. We can go ahead and just make our notes on this live document as we go through it, but I would suggest we start first with this main HRTC bylaws before we start hitting the Steering Committee and the Chair and Vice Chairs.

**05:16**

Does anyone have any questions? No?

**05:22**

I have a comment. One of the questions that I had is we have Steering Committee members, and I'd like a quick poll of our members. If our Steering Committee members have all read the original proposal. A lot of the content here is anchored in our original proposal and structure and objectives that we thought was critical to include in our structure. And what I heard in the meeting yesterday was some commentary and things going back and forth that were kind of misrepresentative. And I thought maybe people may or may not have had a chance to fully read that document. Can we get a gauge of where we stand on that? Because it does matter in terms of understanding what our founding beliefs and strategies that we put forth were.

**06:16**

Yeah. Thank you for your feedback. We don't have all Steering Committee members on here. And I would just like to also be sensitive to when the Serf team came on, we read the proposal, and were even still very much confused by a lot of the ambiguity behind some of the missing components to the proposal. And so I do just want to be sensitive to the fact that some of our members might have read the proposal. A lot of our HRTC members are still very much confused about what surf is, what our goals are, and a lot of the provisions within that proposal. I don't know how you would like, Mr. Chair, how you would like to gauge an understanding of our members, whether they understand the proposal, have read it, but I would go ahead and let that be your decision.

**07:08**

Well, first of all, I think it's important for everybody to make informed decisions. And so any information, supportive information that could be provided is always helpful just as a baseline or platform. So to Sharon's point, I understand that. The other point is the Steering Committee members have to allocate time and make a commitment to actually do it, because we can't continue to wait on them. We have to be able to get them the information they make, the professional commitment to review it, and then we move forward. If they don't review it, we can't hold things up. We got to move forward. So I'm trying to appease both, but I can't think of any other way to proceed forward.

**08:06**

Well, I do want to give a suggestion. Our website is extremely comprehensive compared to other regions. We have a lot of information. If you go to our about page and then also if you go to every page under our affinity and subregional tables, completely breaks down every part of the governance structure. So I do really encourage our steering committee members to look at our website, read through the governance

structure, read through every page of the different hub structure to get an understanding of the entirety of the surf program, which is a lot. So I do sympathize, but we do have Rudy's hand raised if you want to. Go ahead, Rudy.

**08:55**

Sure. Thank you, Scarlett. Mr. Chair, you know, one thought here. I think Sharon is bringing up a really important point. Charles also made a comment to me, too, that I wasn't privy to everything in surf. All of us are volunteering here at this moment in trying to help move this and steward this in other coalitions that I'm part of.

**09:16**

Mr.

**09:17**

Chair, when there's a new member or someone that needs to be oriented, there's like a separate committee that gives them a quick brief, right? I agree with Scarlett that the website is awesome and has a lot of stuff there. And so I wonder if one thing that we could consider to bring in not only the steering committee, but actually the whole membership on board with us is that, hey, if you're new or if you have a question, we want to schedule some time with you separately. Some office hours, perhaps, to make sure that you're aware of everything that's going on before you engage in a meeting. What I've seen in some of the bigger meetings, Mr. Chair, is that folks haven't been participating and they call in and they have a ton of questions, and it derails everything. It might be helpful to have a system to orient some of the newer members or the members that are present but haven't been tracking all the changes.

**10:05**

I'm sure that, for example, most of the members do not know that this whole initiative is changing its name. How would they know? And so we're going to have to orient people to that too, as a small example.

**10:18**

So to that, I would say a couple things that I would like to respond to in regards to that. First of all, your points are well taken, and personally, I agree. I think in the previous meeting, in our HRTC meeting, I think it was stated that there will be some kind of provision that Chioma has been championing already to orient new members, not only to the HRTC, but even steering committee members that don't have a firm grasp on what we're trying to accomplish. Then, secondly, there needs to be an initiative that the steering committee members themselves have to take to review the website, as Scarlett said, and go over that information. And so I've seen comments that we need time for them to do that. The expectation is that just like with everybody else, that you go and do it and that you come in, the meeting is prepared so that we can do business.

**11:33**

If it turns out that the majority are not prepared and we need to postpone, that sets us back. So I'm in total agreement that information should be out there, accessible. We have to take the initiative to read that information and then if there's any clarification that's needed, we could either do a sidebar or it could be done via email. But to continually derail and pivot and have side discussions on things that are not understood, we won't ever get anything done, in my opinion. And me, I have a limited amount of time to be able to do these things because I have another job and as I'm sure all of you do. So I want to be sensitive to your concerns and do the things that we need to do, but do it in a reasonable way so that we can move our agenda forward. Sharon, first of all, Rudy, is that acceptable?

**12:38**

Does that answer your questions?

**12:41**

Yes, sir. What I'm hearing is that steering committee members on this call have to take responsibility to stay up to date with the website and separately, there's going to be some mechanism to bring other people along with the updates as changes happen.



**12:57**

Yeah, and I can talk to LADC about that in terms of any assets or processes that we can do to make that happen. Sharon, you had a question.

**13:08**

Thank you so much. Yeah, here's my comment again. I would encourage us again to go to the original, if you would be kind enough at LADC. Just send out the original proposal and the contract with the state that CCF signed. And the reason I want us to get back to that is because that was a year's worth of intentional design of this structure to accomplish goals so that our disinvested communities could align with the serf objectives. A lot of that dialogue, there are other documents on the website, some that contradict what our proposal and contracts say. And my understanding is those corrections were going to be made. So I don't want us going down a bunch of rabbit holes. I want us to go back to the essence of what we're trying to commit to and that will also help us see where within our current structure there are opportunities to simply expand upon existing places where we have industry, workforce.

**14:21**

It's already in the structure, it's embedded in the heart of the structure. I just think we need to be able to have a dialogue about how any of these new proposed changes might be integrated or might be clarified so that we can tell the state, hey, this is where this is. Sometimes we think linear and in order for us to figure out how to adapt or pivot, we need to know what we committed to in the first place. And that's what I heard. I heard some real discrepancies in our steering committee call yesterday about what roles were. And they're right there in the proposal. And it's very clear. And I know stella and I went downtown and did some whiteboarding to help onboard the staff to understand what some of those roles and duties were. So I just would like us all to take one.

**15:09**

I like to ask for one additional week to be added to the bylaw process and ask each of our members to read that document, that original document and the original contract this week so that when we reconvene again as a bylaw working committee, we will have that fresh in our mind.

**15:28**

My only question, Sharon, is that first of all, I understand the spirit of your comment and request. Since we have a rebranding and a potential refocus, in my mind, it's good to have that. But if there are changes in this refocus that might be different than the original proposal, how are we empowered to if we're not in agreement to that, how are we empowered to make any changes? My thing is, if there's going to be a reason why we delay this meeting, which I hate delays, right? But if the delay makes sense so that we don't have to spend more time down the road hold on a second. I'm not at my office, as I told you folks, I'm in back to back. So I'm in different offices trying to maintain what we're doing here. So if people keep walking so my point is that if we need a delay in order to save a lot more time down the road, then I think that might make sense, right?

**16:54**

But we have to make an agreement that going forward, we got to do the right thing, right? But let's do our best to be as efficient as possible and not continue to prolong these situations. So my question to the steering committee members, and maybe you can go into the chat and either agree or disagree with Sharon, and that includes LADC, do you agree that it makes sense to revisit this meeting once we get full.

**17:33**

Clarification for a delay? Mr. Chair, I am not asking for a delay.

**17:37**

Mr. Chair, by faith, provide us a maybe.

**17:39**

I'm misunderstanding what you're asking for.

**17:41**

I'm not asking for we have two meetings on scheduled today and another meeting scheduled to deal with the bylaws.

**17:49**

We had an earlier meeting and we got this one. This is the bylaws meeting.

**17:53**

No, there's a second meeting scheduled for the 27th on the bylaws. There's two meetings scheduled right.

**17:58**

This is the first one.

**17:59**

Yes, I understand. I'm not asking for a delay. What I'm asking for is for us to allot one additional week on the back end of that second meeting so that we can have read so I want all of our members to read the document, our original proposal this week. Continue with what we're doing right now. Add an additional week onto the back end and make sure that by we get to that end of that last week. We have already received a copy of these proposed changes so that we can factor it all in case we have to calibrate.

**18:33**

That makes sense. Okay. All right. Okay, thank you. I didn't understand that. Yeah.

**18:39**

I do have a suggestion, and I think this will help as far as giving some time for folks to be able to read through the proposal and get a grasp on just the purpose and goals of surf. We could start with the steering committee bylaws. That's more of not necessarily encompassing the surf program and its purpose. It's more of the operational needs and guidances needed for the steering committee. So we focus on that today. We can give time for folks to read the proposal and then focus on the bylaws for the HRTC. So I'd like to give that suggestion, but it's all up to the steering committee as how you wish to proceed.

**19:22**

What do we have in front of us right now?

**19:25**

So right now we have the HRTC bylaws.

**19:30**

You want to table this and then you're going to pull up the steering committee bylaws? Is that what you're saying?

**19:36**

Yeah. So the steering committee bylaws is more of the operational guidelines of the steering committee, which we really do need as well.

**19:45**

Scarlett, we haven't had a chance to review these either prior to this meeting, have we?

**19:51**

I did provide this. This was all provided in the period of feedback and comments. So it was included in the original. If everything's linked, everyone can comment. So I'm not sure if members just did not catch it, but everything is there that we did provide.

**20:10**

Okay. Because I have not had a chance to review it. I'll be honest with you. I only reviewed the previous

document. I don't see anybody else's based on what I'm looking at right now, no one else has looked at it either.

**20:28**

Zahira did.

**20:30**

Okay.

**20:35**

Yeah.

**20:37**

Stella, I see that your hand is raised. Yeah.

**20:40**

I was just going to say, great comments here, conversation. And like Kevin said, we all have our day job, so we have to try and find this time. Right. And I'm just thinking if there's a way that not only the steering committee but as well to onboard folks about the bylaws for both the steering committee and the that and it might be a little bit more work, but if La EDC could help us just with reminders, like, hey, did you know this? And this about the HRTC, right? So it's kind of like a reminder before our meetings or on a weekly basis so that people see this constantly, the purpose of the steering committee, et cetera.

**21:37**

Right.

**21:38**

And so just like reminders, because, again, we have so much coming at us. But perhaps I'm just brainstorming here, perhaps that might be a way just to keep this information in front of folks so that they're prepared for the upcoming meetings.

**21:56**

Just yeah, I like know. Scarlett, let's do this. All right. Because I haven't had a chance to really analyze the steering committee, the bylaws. So why don't we go back to what were going to do when we convened this meeting, and let's get through this. Let's plan for the next meeting in two weeks. Let's get that third meeting that Sharon suggested on the books, and between now and two weeks from now, we can review this document in front of us. How's that?

**22:32**

Yeah, that works. Alan, do you mind going back to the steering committee HRTC bylaws, and just as a reminder, and I will go ahead and definitely send more reminders to our steering committee partners, everything you need is in this document and everything. Any additional supporting documents are linked here. So we do.

**22:52**

I see it right there in my face. For some reason, if I'm guilty of it, I bet a few, whether they want to admit it or not, did not see that or didn't pay attention to it. So, bottom line, I haven't read it. I don't want to work on something that I haven't had a chance or to read, review, think about. As you'll see in this document, I got comments throughout the 22 pages. So let's do this and get this work done, and then let's get the next set of work done on the steering committee bylaws. How's that? Is everybody in agreement? We all good with that? I see. Thumbs up. Okay. All right, let's say this. If anybody's in disagreement, put it in the chat. I'm looking. All right. I don't see anything. All right. And thank you for posting the bylaws, Alan. So now that I have them and everybody else does, if you could look in the chat, everyone, make sure you click on that so you can review and be ready to review the steering committee bylaws in two weeks.

**23:56**

Sharon and then, Scarlett or Alan, you'll schedule that third meeting so that once we get all the changes

from the California jobs first and see if we need to calibrate either of those bylaws sets of bylaws. Sharon, is that in the spirit of.

**24:16**

What you're trying to excellent.

**24:17**

Yeah, that's full information in order to.

**24:19**

Be able to all right, folks, let's jump in it. Let's jump in it. Scarlett, you want to lead us through this, or do you want me to I mean, we have recommendations here. Edits some substantive language. I don't see anything right now.

**24:38**

This part right here, the economic resilience fund part, obviously changed. This was taken directly from the proposal. So I would say maybe we hold off on this specific section simply because we might be getting some changes in, so might as well just hold off on that.

**24:56**

Okay.

**24:56**

Next section is the Vision and mission. Again, this is taken directly from the proposal.

**25:04**

So this is to Sharon's point and this is Jermaine's point. Once we get the new name and any focus, this could be something that I'm hoping that there's not comprehensive changes, but it sounds like, and we can go on through this, that third beating is going to come in handy because we don't know what to expect at this point. All right, let's keep moving, folks. All right, so we got the vision, key outcomes and metrics. Are there going to be any changes.

**25:41**

In that I would suggest I don't think so right off the bat, because this deals with our basic outcomes and projected deliverables that will be due at the end of phase one. So it's more of the regional work plan or regional roadmap that we have to create. So if you guys are okay going through this, we can kind of.

**26:11**

I've looked through this page. I made a few comments and suggestions. For example, like replacing white as a description of race with Caucasian, replacing black with African American to be consistent because there are a couple of areas where African Americans were identified that way, racially. And then a couple of lines down, were identified as black. So let's just be consistent. That's it. And then some of these other areas, personally, I don't have a problem with, but does anyone else have a problem with any of the suggestions on this page? There are some questions here that need to be clarified. One by Tony Simons. Are the metrics that the HRTC is committing to or description of what it will be when completed, your choice changes the tense of the sentence. For example, blah, each affinity hub will convene versus each affinity hub convenes.

**27:33**

I made a change on I don't know where this language is right here, but I know that in the paragraph four I addressed, I attempted to put some changes in there because I thought it should be each affinity hub. It should be shall. It's a bylaw document. This is what you shall do. And I assume that will make it into the that will be represented that way.

**27:56**

I'm okay with that language. I'm okay with that language.

**28:00**

You shall do this. You either will or you shall. But it's contractual.

**28:04**

Yeah. For those types of edits, I can go ahead and take note of that because those are kind of just simple language things that we can kind of go through the document as a team offline to make edits on. But I'll take note of that. To replace Will with shall. I think that's a good idea, Alan, because at the end of the day, I don't see anything in the edits that would alter the intent of the document or the language. I think it just clarifies and sharpens it.

**28:36**

One area I'd like to get some clarification on or maybe somebody can help me understand is we say that each affinity hub lead is going to convene sub regional stakeholders and CBO micro grantees on a monthly basis at least once a month. I know that each affinity hub lead is also getting a \$50,000 grant to help with that work. Then it says each Table partner lead will convene stakeholders once a month. Stable partner holders, at least my understanding, don't appear to be getting any kind of financial support. Does it make sense to require the same amount of work from them as well?

**29:07**

Table partners are getting 50,000.

**29:10**

The Table partners getting 50,000, too as well.

**29:12**

Yes, absolutely.

**29:14**

When are those being selected?

**29:15**

That's the discussion.

**29:16**

We're in the process. Okay. Yeah. And one of the things who was speaking for San Gabriel Valley?

**29:27**

Luis.

**29:28**

That's what so, Luis, you know, one of the things that if I recall correctly in this language, we didn't specify how often they're going to convene. Right. So I applaud that. We sharpened it in that regard. And you made a good point, because if people are doing work, then they need their organizations compensated or funded for that work. And in this case, they're going to get it. Let's move on in the interest of time. Any other questions? Rudy? I just see Rudy asking if no.

**30:06**

I took it down. Back to you, Chair.

**30:09**

All right, let's move on to the next page, if we could, because if you notice in the previous page, I had over what period of time, by the way? So I think everybody was probably thinking the same thing. All right, so no comments on the top half, on the bottom half. And then as we go into section A, name of the organization. So that's going to remain the same. Nothing's going to impact that area section and B, admission. Again, some.

**30:48**

This might be my bitterness over the Catalyst Program funding, the way the state decided that, but is the mission reflective of how the state is treating this program? Because it seemed like they were trying to make it more of instead of trying to address historically disadvantaged and excluded communities, it was more almost like trying to help communities that didn't have an infrastructure built in. So oftentimes you had more rural, smaller communities getting a lot more resources than some of those with larger populations.

**31:16**

Was that Luis? Luis, is that you?

**31:19**

Yeah.

**31:19**

Yes.

**31:19**

Okay.

**31:20**

Interesting.

**31:21**

I made edits to this section this morning after our dialogue, because historically disinvested has never been in the SFP. Disinvested is defined in the SFP, but I actually added language to try and make this align to what we're being told is going to be the new focus. High roads, jobs.

**31:41**

Yeah, I completely agree, and that's what I hope they would be. But it seems like the state was taking a different approach when they started getting Eastern. Sierra gets the same as much as La County. That does not make sense.

**31:52**

So, Louise, I'm going to tell you something with the digital divide. If you've been in that conversation I've seen how this looks. And to your point, I have a pet peeve on this, like you. So we got to make sure, in my opinion, that when you have a highly densely populated municipality versus a rural, less populated geography, there's no way that they should get a commensurate amount of funding. Right? And or know. Sharon, to your point, when we talk about historically black and brown communities, are the historically disinvested communities. So you don't feel we should keep that in there?

**32:45**

No, the SFE was very specific, and I think it's one of the areas where we stand the potential to get ourselves into very the definition of disinvested is built into the program documentation. We've got some good language in here around black, brown, and native communities because the disparities are clear, but the definition is a four factor defined, and I think we seem to stay to the disinvested language because everything is governed by it. And every month, Edd puts out a statistical report that defines which counties are qualified as this as high poverty area, as two of those factors. So I don't want us to focus on a historically ethnic class and then end up not meeting a criteria that is clearly defined and published monthly. So I would rather, if we can.

**33:43**

Sharon, I get what you're saying. I'll interrupt you. I'm sorry. But so what you're saying is we don't need to overstate it because we could get ourselves trapped. As long as the concern that I shared and I'm assuming is shared by other committee members is addressed, then we're good. I think that there were

some other comments. Let me ask, do any of the other steering committee members feel the same, or does anyone have a dissenting opinion?

**34:14**

Kevin, this is Robert Ciseto. Pardon me for being on my iPhone. I've got an unstable Internet connection today. Good morning. To Sharon's point, the state constitution disallows contracting based on because of Prop 209.

**34:36**

Okay, I'm very familiar with it. I get it.

**34:40**

That's why it's written this way.

**34:42**

No, I get it. I get it completely, 100%, because I dealt with that being past president, UCLA Black Alumni, and Prop 209 killed us in terms I get it. I also get how it applies to business. So point. Well taken, Robert. Sharon wise and sage advice.

**35:02**

Now, Kevin, let me just say this last point. With that said, though, if there's one penny of federal money involved, then it defaults to the federal standard.

**35:14**

Okay. All right, we're good with this? Just to move the meeting forward. So we're good with this language. I haven't heard anybody disagree, so let's just move forward with this page. I think we've discussed it enough. Anybody have any other comments or concerns?

**35:32**

I think Brady had a comment that I don't fully understand in the chat.

**35:36**

Who?

**35:37**

Brady?

**35:38**

Brady. Brady, you want to speak up?

**35:40**

Yeah, I was just wondering. This is just a little bit of a. Formatting question, but it also speaks to, I think, some of the confusion that others have had about these different layers of the governance structure. So under four there's an A and B, right? The table partner leads and the subregional tables responsibilities are nested underneath the affinity hub. And I had understood that those are completely separate layers of the structure of surf. And so I'm wondering why they're kind of sub bulleted within the affinity hub, which for me implies that they are somehow beneath or part of the affinity hub. So I just was wondering about that.

**36:29**

Yeah, that was more, I think, of just a formatting error so I can go ahead and just take note of that and give its own, I guess, section below. Some of these parts will go more in depth into each hub as well, and those are formatted correctly, but this one's just more of a formatting issue that wasn't caught.

**36:51**

Great. I would also suggest, in addition to just fixing that formatting error, that we find space to really articulate the relationships between these different layers.

**37:04**

Yeah, so that's a little bit more down in the HRTC bylaws we do go through each specific hub and define but we can go through that a little later as we get more towards that area and see what other suggestions might come of that.

**37:22**

Thank you for that, Bradley, because that's also probably part of the concern about understanding how this is structured and the interrelationships. Okay. Anybody else? All right, let's move to page four, please. Also, just to clarify before we keep moving forward, if there's nobody who is contesting on a page, can we all just be in agreement that means that I should accept these edits that are on the side on these comments? Yeah, Alan, that's what I stated earlier. Exactly. All right. Because now is the opportunity to either contest or make a better recommendation. And to be clear, we encourage everyone to speak up, but just because you speak up doesn't mean that your point gets adopted. We are going to reach consensus, and even if we got to go to Roberts Rules the way we run this, we can do that. But I think we're doing okay right now.

**38:27**

But I'm going to extend everybody's professional courtesy to make sure their voices are heard. Could somebody also continue to monitor the chat while we're going through this? It's hard to do both.

**38:44**

Hi, Kevin, this is Jessica Kintana. I do have an issue also with historically disinvested that continues to be the same community census tracks that we're talking about in this initiative throughout the region. And so those are the Black Brown API communities, immigrant communities. And so I don't understand the whole prop thing, but I know that this funding is historic. And so when we do see funding that comes out like this, when we don't have a priority of historical or historically disinvested communities, we see the same funding, going into the same community, business areas, into the same working populations. And so those same underserved groups, immigrants, Latino, black do not see these investments. So I don't want to hold this process up, but I think as a region, locally, we need to make sure we are focusing on those historical disinvested communities.

**39:57**

Your point is well taken, obviously mirrored my very first comment because I had the same feeling. Mr. Salcedo, dr. Salcedo made a good point as well, Sharon, as a why we're not using that language right now because it could disqualify us because of existing laws and there's other language that protects us from being impacted in that way. Based on those comments of which I know to be true, unless I'm missing something here, thank you for bringing that up. It's the same point that I brought up, but I'm not going to call it a rebuttal, but the clarification by Sharon Evans and Robert Salcedo satisfied my concern. Hopefully it will yours as well.

**40:58**

Well, not really, but for the sake of moving forward, I don't know those would rebuttal or be any type of law, but I think as we move in our region, we know this. So folks who are entrenched in doing this work and understanding these folks that historically have been living in poverty generation after generation, if there's not a preference in working to uplift those communities in those areas, then I don't know what we're doing.

**41:28**

Jessica, I would suggest that you read in the chat and you go back to Prop 209 and if you need further clarification that assures you that the points you are making, we share in concern and that they are covered in other areas of this process.

**41:48**

Sure, okay.

**41:49**



We can all right. And Sharon, if you want to plant something and chat or reach out to Jessica directly, that might be helpful. And Prop 209 is there for everybody. You can Google that.

**42:01**

Okay. So all I'm saying is, as we're moving forward and we start seeing funding allocated to the same places and spaces, I'm going to remind everybody we'll move back to this disinvested, historically disinvested communities that are not getting funded.

**42:16**

Well, I will probably be there with you as a second voice, Jessica.

**42:20**

Okay, perfect.

**42:21**

All right. I'm sharing this thing, so I don't know what else to say.

**42:26**

All right, since we're accepting the changes right now on this document, is it possible to maybe as we go through them, since I guess we're looking at what's been commented on, if we're accepting or rejecting that message, like, Tony has a number of comments on there, as we go through them, instead of hiding that, it's kind of go through. Yeah, this is accepted or this is rejected type of thing.

**42:48**

Okay. All right.

**42:49**

Let me make sure that all those comments are closed off. That way everybody's on the same page, whether that comment was looked at and was acted upon, sure.

**42:56**

So everyone go ahead and read Tony's comments. I don't need to read it to you. Everyone read it, please.

**43:03**

Hey, Kevin. To the previous speaker, I just want to encourage her to take a look at the California state constitution, which will give a clearer message of why than Prop 209 does.

**43:16**

Jessica, did you hear that?

**43:23**

No, I didn't hear I apologize. No.

**43:26**

Okay.

**43:27**

Again, I'm sorry.

**43:32**

Go ahead, Robert.

**43:34**

The recommendation I'm making to you, Jessica, is pull up the California state constitution, particularly around contracting and funding, and it will be far clearer than it incorporates 209 language, but the 209 language is what the constitution is based on, and this will clarify to you why we have to have the language the way that we do.

**43:56**

Okay, perfect. Can we bring that up as a link and send it to all the members?

**43:59**

That would be great.

**44:03**

Please feel free to grab it. I'm on an iPhone today. But just pull up the California state constitution.

**44:12**

Are we on point one on page four? Just to I'm lost.

**44:17**

Yeah. Thank you.

**44:18**

Scarlett.

**44:19**

.2 is what's on the screen.

**44:21**

Okay, so there you go. Part one.

**44:25**

All right, Tony Simon, give feedback on this. She's just asking if the HRTC will be a regional policy advisor, separate from its specific role of drafting a regional plan and facilitating implementation. I would say no. My thought process behind adding this was more internal, so you know how the HRTC was advocating on more funding based on just bigger disparities and barriers in La. It was more internal advocacy on ensuring that our own policies and guidelines take into account inclusivity and address systemic barriers rather than external type of regional policy advising role. So would you guys like me to take this off? Reword or any suggestions or feedback that I can receive would be helpful.

**45:21**

Yeah, I think this is a hard call to put this on the HRTC because it's not definitive on which element of the so okay, so I can.

**45:33**

Go ahead and I'll just leave a comment here for my notes saying we.

**45:38**

Will can we revise that? Look at re amending that, rewriting that, and we look at it next time.

**45:44**

Yeah.

**45:45**

Everybody in agreement? Are we in agreement with that before?

**45:50**

Can I make comment on this? Because I think we want to avoid kind of becoming simply an advisory group, but I think as we're looking to put some of our plans together, some of those plans may require legislation where we say, hey, here's what we want to do. And if you also allow us to do this, if you change this in state law, it will allow us to do this even further, so that one inherently requires some of that sharing its expertise. And so I think while that shouldn't be our primary goal, I think sometimes as part of the plans we come up with, that may be part of it.

**46:22**

I think it ends up happening by default, if you will.

**46:26**

Yeah, so that's what I'm saying. As long as we don't go overboard, it that becomes our primary goal. But it's part of what we're going to be doing and that may become part of the plans that we develop.

**46:38**

We're already acting in that capacity, and I don't think the language in there is necessary.

**46:44**

Okay, so just, I guess delete or take off on this section.

**46:53**

I don't want to just say it. We all got to reach consensus. Are we good on this? Everyone? Anyone have a concern or sending opinion?

**47:03**

I'd be inclined to just leave it in there because I think if it's in line with what we does, I don't think it's contrary to what it's just simply stating what we do already.

**47:12**

Well, I kind of like what Tony's alluding to. I wish she was on the call, but I know she's india. What she seems to be alluding to is that becoming this regional policy advisory is in addition to carrying out its roles, drafting a regional plan and facilitating its implementation. So I don't know how you get both incorporated.

**47:39**

I think she's asking if this was our intention, but this was not the intention, I guess is what my answer would be.

**47:46**

You know what I'm thinking, even though it happens by default, maybe by leaving it in there, gives us an opportunity to voice our opinion officially and our thoughts and our advice.

**48:06**

Yeah, because that's what we did when we chimed in on the callous program, that they thought their approach completely disadvantaged. Certain communities that have historically been excluded, that was us chiming and sharing our expertise, sharing our experiences with the state to help shape the policy. Well, we got some of what we wanted. We didn't get everything. And so it seems like but I'm like I would be inclined to leave it in, but if people want to take it out, it's not going to be the end of the world for me.

**48:33**

Let's keep it. I always reserve the right to change my mind. The thought just came to me. I think we should leave it in. It's not a bad idea to leave it in. So let's leave it in.

**48:46**

All right, so the next one is let's see. It's about research and data. So I think the specific part that her concern was and this was more of just not intentional on our end, it was more of understanding of how to go about this. But here we had written that the data research reports of the governance structure would be presented to the steering committee to identify disparities economic development. So and so she's stating that this is backward, that the data should be presented to the Affinity Hub partner leads and sub regional tables for them to basically get community engagement review the data reports, life experiences, and that this feeds to the steering committee, which she is very much correct. So we will go ahead and revise this part to include that the report will be shared with the different Hub regions and work its way up to the steering committee.

**49:53**

I think that also will address a lot of the concerns that have been expressed recently.

**49:59**

And the concern here on this particular point is this was one of the major concerns I had with the Phasing plan. The steering committee Affinity Hubs and partner tables review and compile the information from the subregional tables. They are not on the front lines. They are not the ones gathering up that data so that we can make decisions at steering committee level. She was on outreach, so she understands very her point is well taken, but somehow this is the steering committee's responsibilities and I think we need to when you says data research and reports of lived experiences from our subregional areas because the sub regional tables and community groups are feeding the Affinity Hubs and partner tables information. And it's the Affinity Hub and partner table's responsibility to share to bring that information forward as members of the steering committee. It was written backwards, but I don't know how you want if you can revise that because again, I'm concerned that our Affinity Hubs and Steering committee are going to step on the little guys.

**51:15**

And Benny, you've heard me say that 20 times.

**51:17**

So from what I'm understanding is there needs to be revision specifically in the first sentence that says from the governance structure, specifically highlighting the affinity table, partner leads and subregional tables.

**51:37**

You see what you're saying? It's just data researched and as she's saying, lived experience data that identifies disparities in equities and economic development from the subregional tables. Right. It's from the subregional tables, period. And then the role of the Affinity Hub, as in her second sentence, is to blah, blah, blah.

**51:57**

Okay, Sharon, you're making a great point. Tony obviously made it was a great catch. From my understanding, if you look at that sentence, it can be data research and reports from the subregional tables to identify disparities that could clear it up.

**52:12**

Does that seem yeah, that's where you're at. And again, what is our role as steering committee right, when we get that data? She was very clear in her second.

**52:23**

So Alan or Scarlett is literally just deleting governance structure should just be from the subregional tables.

**52:33**

Okay.

**52:34**

All right, very good, folks.

**52:38**

Okay, do we need to add anything in here about lived experience?

**52:43**

Well, yeah, you just deleted that. Yeah, that was right out of her.

**52:48**

I don't think yeah, she's still adjusting.

**52:52**

Yeah, give me sorry, give her a second.

**52:55**

Sorry, Scarlett.

**52:57**

No.

**52:57**

It's okay, Alan. I think you might have deleted it by accident, so I need to let.

**53:01**

Me see if I can undo it. Yeah, control Z.

**53:07**

Your age is showing. Kevin.

**53:11**

I'll just make a comment directly on her comment that we will revise. So we'll come back to that. And so we don't delete her comment. We'll just revise based on the suggestions that are being made.

**53:22**

Yeah, I think we should just do that moving forward. All right, number three. So contribute to hume do you mean Lahrtc members?

**53:41**

Sahara on the call?

**53:47**

No.

**53:48**

Okay. This is a really great I love this language, by the way, because this gives us a real opportunity to determine the effectiveness of the work we're doing. It allows us to come up with, as a steering committee, KPIs for success of our efforts.

**54:10**

So this is number three. Right. I am a little confused about her.

**54:17**

I'm trying to get through it myself.

**54:19**

Scarlett yeah. I mean, I guess more it's more of, like how you read it. For me, it was just more that our goal.

**54:30**

So I think if we put the Lahrtc members will actively contribute.

**54:36**

No, I think it's fine. If you look at with the section it's in, I think we're overthinking.

**54:43**

Yeah, I think we're overthinking because the Lahrdc is the members of the Lahrdc.

**54:48**

All right, well, that's fine. That's redundant, I guess, what you're saying.

**54:52**

Louise yeah, because it's just I mean.

**54:55**

Just may I resolve this one, then? Yeah.

**55:02**

Okay. This one is I would say that the St loans.

**55:13**

It says Abigail to whom?

**55:16**

No, we're not advocating. We're making investments that provide for training, education, and we're making a direct investment.

**55:33**

I mean, I guess this was more on the lines of, like, when we choose the three to five strategies and projects or pipelines. This is, like, our form of advocacy for these types of projects moving forward. So I don't know if that's an overthought of maybe Tony, the way she's thinking of it, but would you guys like me to change the word advocate?

**55:56**

I think you want to. I'd like you to see remove advocate for initiatives. We're really investing in capacity building.

**56:06**

Okay. So we can change to invest. We'll invest.

**56:11**

But this is kind of are we.

**56:12**

Advocating for she's saying advocating for capacity building.

**56:15**

I would say maybe advocate or support, but I think advocate still works fine. I guess the idea is she's like because this section is promote capacity building, which is we're going to be urging more to kind of increase more resource and services. So if she doesn't like the word advocate, I think she's like, are you advocating to the state? Are you advocating to local? It depends on who the issue is. Before it could be a state, it could be a local. But yeah. So I'm like, I'm fine with advocate or support, but I think again.

**56:45**

To your point, Louise, if we define it, then we lock ourselves in.

**56:50**

Yeah.

**56:51**

So I don't have a problem with the way it's worded now, personally.

**56:56**

Okay. So we will go ahead and resolve.

**56:59**

Well before we everybody in agreement. All right. I hear nothing. So let's move forward.

**57:08**

Okay. The next one is on page five, unless you guys still want to go through provisions that don't have comments. But the next provision, we're going to.

**57:22**

Assume that everyone read the provisions and the only area and they're accepted. If there are no comments, if there are comments, they need to be voiced now. But again, the whole idea behind you sending this out ahead of time was that we all read it. We all had an opportunity to put comments in there, as I did. But if for whatever reason something comes up now that you might have gotten by you, now is the time to do it so that we don't have to rework. This whole idea is not to double work. So let's just proceed. Scarlett, I'm sorry.

**58:03**

No, you're good. The next one is page six under section D research and Data Integration. The second point, steering committee members tony asked only the steering committee members. This is the same thing. Isn't the plan for finish? So we'll revise this.

**58:20**

Can you revise bullet one as well? I mean, this is where remember, in our structure we have outreach and engagement phase and then we have planning phase and our affinity hubs. We have funded planning group meetings, forums for every single spa and across. So the research data has to flow to the affinity hubs and to our sub regional groups. So it's every member and they convene in a planning forum where they get the data, they get our lived experience data, they get the formal research data and they have planning discussions both geographically and thematically. This kind of is written like only the steering committee gets that stuff for.

**59:08**

Point one or which part, sorry, it's zero.

**59:10**

One and .2 are both kind of both. They're both written kind of so before.

**59:15**

You make the changes, Scarlett, does everybody understand what Sharon said? And are you in agreement or should I say, are there dissenting opinions hearing? None. Let's move in and integrate those comments. I agree with Sharon.

**59:32**

So just question clarification. For the first point, we don't have the word steering committee. We have subregional planning discussions, which I.

**59:40**

Believe they're not only subregional, that's kind of saying research activities have to be coordinated with both affinity, right? You've got your Affinity thematic area forums and you've got your racial planning forums and you've got your subregional planning forums. The Racial are funded through marketing and the subregionals are funded directly.

**01:00:06**

Okay.

**01:00:17**

Sorry to jump in guys, but I did that part of the budget.

**01:00:22**

Okay? So I'll go ahead and while I'm revising alan, do you want to go to the next point?

**01:00:33**

That's just a comment. We move on.

**01:00:38**

Okay.

**01:00:41**

Another comment.

**01:00:50**

Okay, so this part is this is good. She says she sees this included below. So we're good there. Next one, page seven. I do want to just be sensitive on time. Would you guys like to continue on?

**01:01:18**

I have a meeting with an executive that I have to jump on. How much pages do you have?

**01:01:27**

There's 23 pages, but there's not review on everyone.

**01:01:31**

Can we reopen the document to finish reviewing and provide any feedback in the next give us three days?

**01:01:39**

Yeah, I can go ahead and just resend everyone, the document as well as.

**01:01:46**

The other, and then mark, maybe mark where we stopped and then we know pick it up.

**01:01:52**

Okay.

**01:01:53**

And by the way, let me just say this is a great way to review, to have people make and review comments, because, one, it guarantees that their comment was looked at. We examined it, we discussed it, moved on. It allows us to kind of really go through it. So great job to the team who put this together.

**01:02:08**

And Luis, to your point, we have strong personalities. We have some folks that are quieter, but I want everybody to know that I'm going to make sure that your voice is heard, that we're not going to railroad anything. No one has any more power than anybody else on this committee. So that's my job to make sure that everybody's in agreement so that once we do this, nobody's going to say, well, I didn't. So to your point, I think we have a working team and we are norming nicely in terms of how we work together. So I want to compliment all of you on that and thank you.

**01:02:51**

Thanks, everybody. Appreciate it.

**01:02:53**

So to just wrap this up, we will go ahead and send out a reminder that we are still taking comments from this specific document from Page Six down, as well as the other two documents, and that we will be



meeting. Our next meeting will be the 27th, and that we will also be scheduling an additional meeting to give us time.

**01:03:20**

Could you do it this time? Maybe? Hopefully everybody's okay with this. Maybe we need to throw an extra half hour on this next one just so we can get through this part.

**01:03:31**

Yeah.

**01:03:31**

Okay. Question. The next meeting is the 27th. Would you guys be okay with the 10th? Because the third, we will probably use that Friday meeting with the steering committee chairs to work on the agenda and the presentation for the next steering committee meeting. So does the November 10 work for everyone? I believe that's a holiday, Scarlett. That's a holiday. Okay.

**01:04:01**

We got November 9.

**01:04:04**

Yeah. So the next one is the 27th.

**01:04:06**

So how about the third then? How about the third? Let's knock it out. Let's knock it out, folks. Same time.

**01:04:14**

Are you going ten to 1130 now? Is that what you're proposing?

**01:04:18**

Well, ten to 1130, just so we don't have to keep going two weeks, you know what I mean? Let's get it out of the way and put it to bed, is my point.

**01:04:27**

I have a meeting at eleven, so I'd like to propose it start at 930.

**01:04:33**

Can't do 930 on the third.

**01:04:36**

Can we do that? On the 27th. Move it up to a half an hour on the 27th because we don't have a stakeholder meeting.

**01:04:44**

That works for me.

**01:04:46**

So the 27th, 930 to eleven, and then the third, November 3 from ten to 1130. Correct?

**01:04:55**

Yeah.

**01:04:56**

Okay, so we'll go ahead and send a calendar invite for the next change. Calendar invite and add an additional meeting and then send all these documents to your guys' way.

**01:05:07**

You guys have a great all right, thank you. Happy Friday, everybody. Have a great weekend. Great job. Right?

**01:05:18**

After some work.

**01:05:19**

Thank you.

**01:05:20**

All right, bye.