



LA HRTC Biweekly Partners Meeting

Meeting Notes and Transcript

July 14th, 2023

[Meeting Recording](#)

Passcode: kZbC5g\$7

Meeting Summary:

The meeting began with Martin Barrera introducing himself as the California Workforce Equity Coordinator at Jobs Move America and inviting everyone to attend a workshop. Chris Castorena announces that there is more flexibility in the CERF process and emphasizes the importance of regional equity. Shaun shared key points from the workshop about the Catalyst Program, including a shift towards implementation support and capacity building. Charles mentioned a unified letter expressing frustration with how funds will be distributed through the Catalyst program, but only Los Angeles has signed on so far.

Chioma provided updates on the process mapping, including securing a vendor and tentative start and finish dates. Alan discussed the research RFP timeline and upcoming meetings with CCF. Scarlet highlighted the deliverables, including the governance structure, steering committee, and selection process. The election process for the steering committee was explained in detail, including nomination deadlines and voting procedures. Feedback on the self-nomination application has been requested before it goes live.

Responsibilities and commitments of the Steering Committee include ensuring member commitment, recusal of voting for conflicted projects, and creating bylaws. The application process involves a form for candidates to express their qualifications. A decision approval process will be determined through a Survey Monkey poll, with options including majority voting or a supermajority. There was a discussion about granting labor additional seats on the committee, which required further consideration and input from all stakeholders. The issue of representation and inclusivity was debated among committee members. It is decided that a poll will be conducted to gather more opinions before making any final decisions.

The meeting also discussed the urgency of making decisions and meeting deadlines for a voting system. The state has granted two extensions, but there will be no more time given. Labor requested five additional seats, and it is being put to a vote whether to keep the seats at 33 or raise them to 38. There were different opinions on this matter, with some suggesting compromises such as adding the five seats while determining how they fit into the existing structure later. It was emphasized that time is running out and decisions need to be made promptly due to the impending deadline of August 1.

Action items:

1. Provide feedback regarding the nomination form before it goes live.
2. Provide feedback for the Affinity Hub Lead Questionnaire before the form goes live.
3. Self-nominations for interested candidates for the Steering Committee/Affinity Hub Leads.

Transcript:

04:32

Speaker 1

Alan, are you letting people in? Let me do that right now.

04:43

Speaker 2

I am.

05:58

Speaker 1

All right. Good morning, HRTC partners. We're going to give you a few more minutes to well, maybe just another minute. We got a jam packed agenda today. Just maybe another minute to start to let more people in. Then we're going to get started. All right? So again, good morning, HRTC partners, current partners, pending partners, new partners, jam pack agenda. If you can go to the next slide. I'm going to, in a moment, have any new partners quickly introduce themselves? We got some important dates. We have announcement from one of the HRTC partners that may benefit everyone. Updates from the Catalyst program, and then updates from process mapping, our research, our unified letter from the Catalyst program decision, and then a lot of important about the steering committee, the voting mechanism, and that process moving forward, as well as our usual updates if we have time.

07:44

Speaker 1

So we're going to ask today that you can hold your questions to the end or drop your questions in the chat so we can try to answer them, have team members answer them as we go along. We want to make sure that we get through as much as we possibly can today. So, really quickly, if there are any new partners on here, please don't be shy. Introduce yourself. No new partners? Okay, well, one partner that I do want to announce, who's probably not on the call is the La County Chief Sustainability Office. They signed up last Friday. That's a big win for La County. That should really strengthen the CERF program and really attract a lot of different philanthropists and organizations that could pair some of the CERF dollars to make our overall plan a lot stronger. So that is a big win for us.

08:56

Speaker 1

You can go to the next slide. So, again, important date. The most important date in a while, august 1. We have to have our steering committee set and sent to the state. So again, we'll be talking about that shortly. Let me get this out of my way. Blocking my view. There we go. And then, of course, August 31, the regional summary report is due, so we have a lot to do in one month and then, of course, by next year. June 30 is the final part two of the plan. Martin Barrera from Jobs to America. Are you on the call?

09:38

Speaker 3

Yes, I am.

09:39

Speaker 1

Okay, thank you. I almost called you. Marco Antonio Barrera. Who's? My favorite boxer. But if you can give a quick introduction of yourself and talk about your upcoming workshop, the floor is yours. Give you, like, two minutes.

09:55

Speaker 3

Perfect. Thank you so much. I'll be brief. So, morning, everyone. My name is Martin Barrera. I'm the California workforce equity coordinator at Jobs Move America. Again, since we're all CERF HRTC partners, we have a very shared vision for a more equitable landscape where workers and companies can come together to improve communities by providing quality worker training and good family sustaining jobs with benefits. So I wanted to informally invite everybody. There's going to be an upcoming two day workshop hosted by the Department of Energy, where you will have the opportunity to discuss how to create these types of working relationships and be able to witness some existing programs. Specifically where there's an electric bus manufacturing company that partners with the union and community based organizations to provide pre apprenticeship opportunities to disadvantaged workers such as people of color, women, formerly incarcerated veterans, and aged out foster youth in communities who are not traditionally hired in manufacturing.

10:51

Speaker 3

I'm going to go ahead and post in the chat the link to the workshop. So when you click on the link, you'll be able to see that they have different planned afternoon tours for high road model programs. One of the options that I would urge folks to attend would be the tour of the BYD facility, which is the partnership between US Jobs of America, the Sheet Metal, Air Rail and Transportation Workers Union Local 105. And that particular relationship was established from a community benefits agreement that we negotiated and is a very good example of what I'm speaking of in regards to a high road model. We would love to see everyone in attendance, and again, there will be opportunity to provide feedback. So I'm excited to be able to see some of you all and be able to hear some of the feedback that you have to be able to expand and improve these programs.

11:41

Speaker 3

And if you have any questions, I'll also post my email in the chat in case you want to reach out to me.

11:46

Speaker 1

Thank you. Thank you very much. Martin Chris from Chris Castrena. Are you here? Oh, I see. There you are. If you don't mind, he has announcement for us for HRTC briefly. And thank you very much, sir.

12:06

Speaker 3

Yeah. Thank you, Charles. Good morning, everyone. First, gratitude. Thank you all for being here. Meeting after meeting. You could be anywhere else, but you're here doing the CERF process. Not always the cleanest thing, but it's good work. As you see here on the screen, August 31, 2023 is coming up. The regional summary report, part one will be due. Our team

sent out an updated form, brief, two page explainer with additional guidance, some good announcements that are offering flexibility. A lot of flexibility, actually, because obviously we realize with all the changes going on, flexibility is needed. That's the nature of this whole process. So I think you all will be happy that we'll have a lot more time. So to December 31, when things will really have to be solidified in that regional plan, right, all the research backing our potential projects. With that said, I want to lean in on the flexibility part.

13:09

Speaker 3

As we all know, CERF has changed a lot from when it was first conceived and announced to now with the Catalyst Program and the change. I just spoke of too, with the.

13:22

Speaker 1

Regional plan.

13:25

Speaker 3

When the state announced CERF and we provided guidelines for how regents could do it, how La could do it. They were just that. They were just suggestions. They were suggested guidelines. And I just want to remind folks.

13:42

Speaker 1

To really lean on that.

13:44

Speaker 3

It being just a suggestion. Remind you all too to just and sure, you already know this. It's okay to reimagine these processes or our governance structures or the way we're doing outreach and engagement if something necessarily isn't working for us. Even though we decided on something months and months ago, it's okay to scrap it or be flexible and make changes. The state is a mere partner with.

14:16

Speaker 4

You all in this process.

14:17

Speaker 3

We're not here to dictate or anything of that nature.

14:21

Speaker 1

We're just here to help.

14:23

Speaker 3

I know it can be hard to trust historically states, but we have a lot of new, fresh folks that are being intentional in this work on our side. And we are trying to make sure we meet you all

halfway. So this process has the outcomes that we all want, right? Creating a future where folks are actually able to make the amount of money that they need to flourish all throughout our ADH cities. Anyway, yeah, if anybody has any questions on that, feel free.

14:55

Speaker 1

But thank you for the time, Charles.

14:56

Speaker 3

Appreciate it.

14:58

Speaker 1

Thank you for the clarification, Chris. It really helps out as so many things have changed. We have to make sure that we need to change our ways of doing things as well, so we'll keep moving forward. On July 5, the state held a workshop about the Catalyst Program.

Unfortunately, I was not on that call. I had some family obligations and it didn't pop up in my calendar, so I completely forgot about it. Anyway, however, Chioma from the CERF team and Sean Randolph from CCF were both on the call. Sean had a pretty interesting experience there. And Sean, if you're on the call, give you a couple minutes to share what you learned with the HRTC members. I think they really appreciate it.

15:50

Speaker 3

Yeah.

15:50

Speaker 1

Thanks, Charles.

15:51

Speaker 5

And I'll be really brief. I just want to share some of the key points and key questions that were answered or addressed in some way. Those key points being number one, a question was raised by a number of people related to the understanding of the equity component. As you all know, all of the Hrtcs across the state have been recruiting and building momentum behind the CERF Initiative based on an initial understanding that equity was the center of it. And perhaps there was an assumption that equity was referring to racial and economic equity, disenfranchised communities, et cetera. The response from some of the representatives at the state level was that the focus is now on regional equity. And perhaps that was always what was being referred to so making sure that smaller regions are getting the same amount of support as larger regions. Obviously there's a number of conversations happening on a strategy front to respond to that, but I wanted to share that was at least the response to the initial question around equity, that it's not racial or economic equity, but regional equity.

17:08

Speaker 5

The second piece was it being a strong shift from planning to implementation support to kind of general capacity building. CERF as a whole seems to be reframed as this is meant to

help you build capacity to go after other equally large pools of funding from other agencies, maybe from EDA, things like that. I'm still trying to get a better understanding of exactly how that impacts things, but those were the two kind of primary report outs from those representing the Governor's office. The last thing I'll say is this CCF did a little bit more of a deeper dive on the stats and numbers related to how this reframing and repackaging of CERF is going to have an impact on La County and on other areas in the state. The interesting thing that we called out and submitted to the Governor's office was that if you look at the regions that are going to benefit the most economically on a per capita basis from this new structure, that directly correlates with the three least diverse regions in the state.

18:22

Speaker 5

So just to recap, the three least diverse regions in the state, meaning they have minority populations of 2% or less, are the ones that are now going to have the highest per capita economic impact from this restructuring. So we wanted to highlight that to the Governor's office and say that there's a lot of people who may have issues with that. And again, there are other conversations and strategy conversations and advocacy conversations taking place to respond to this by July 21 and beyond. Feel free to reach out to me if you want to learn more about some of that stuff. Charles as well for LAEDC Front. So yeah, that's it.

19:00

Speaker 1

Thanks, Charles. Thank you, Sean. I kind of wish I would have put the unified letter to discuss right away because this was a nice segue, but I'll talk about it real quickly. LADC and Luis Portillo, and more particularly from the CERF team, Scarlett Peralta put together a unified letter on behalf of HRTC and were trying to get I'm not sorry, not Orange County Inland Empire, the Bay Area, and what's the third biggest region? Oh my gosh, I'm drawing a blank. Three other regions, the top three regions population to sign onto this letter to essentially explain our frustration with the Catalyst program, how they're going to divvy up the funds, but also with the solution, a potential solution. Unfortunately, Ie declined. The Bay Area, we're still waiting on oh, that's what we reached out to Orange County as well. Orange county declined to be involved. So at this point it looks like it's just Los Angeles from the unified letter that's already posted.

20:25

Speaker 1

No other region wants to sign onto it. Maybe they have their own agenda. They haven't really given reasons. OC did give a reason. They did not have an issue with the state's decision to how they're going to want to divvy up the Catalyst funds. However, we're still waiting on the Bay Area. We may just go ahead and send the letter to the state as is and also supply it to local officials so they may send on their behalf as well. But we'll keep you updated on any process with that. In addition, the community practice meetings that happen every couple of weeks, they take notes from every region and they forward those to the state to, quote, unquote, improve the program. So we'll see what happens with that regardless. So when we get to that part, we'll just skip that slide. But Alan, if you can go to the next one.

21:23

Speaker 1

Chioma has some updates dealing with the process mapping.

21:27

Speaker 6

Good morning, everyone. My update is very quick regarding process mapping. As you know, we have secured our vendor, which is the Mark USA. The tentative start date is next week. Next Monday, the project will go on for eight weeks. And the tentative finish date is sorry, not July, but September 20. Eighth. Sorry. And yes, the process mapping should really help us. It will really help illustrate the movement of the data and information between all of the different parts we have, from our micro grantees onto our Hub leads, table leads onto our steering committee. So we're really looking forward to starting to work with the Mark for the process mapping. So that is the entirety of my update. And y'all please put your comments in the chat or your questions in the chat if we can't get to them between each slide. Thank you.

22:23

Speaker 3

That's it.

22:25

Speaker 7

Thank you, Chioma, for that update. So I'll go ahead and provide an update where we're at in regards to the research RFPs. So we have been working with CCF in pushing this work forward. As of now, we are meeting with CCF on Tuesday to get everything ready for release, which I'll go into in the next slide, where we have a timeline. So as you can see here, we have a research RFP timeline, and this is a tentative timeline. These dates may change, but hopefully we'll stay on track here. So we're looking at a July 24 release for these RFPs, which would be the Monday after next week. From August 7 to August 11, which is a one week period. We'll be providing an evaluation period for us to go through those RFPs. On August 14 is when we are projecting to contract with the research partners.

23:23

Speaker 7

And from the 14th to the 9th is when we are projecting that the contractors will be able to conduct that work. And on October 20, is when we are projecting that the research partners will be able to present those research results to the affinity and subregional tables and hubs as well as the steering committee and the broad HRTC. Charles, I know you had already provided an update on the unified letter, so we can go ahead and move past this slide, and I believe I will be passing this over to Scarlett to elaborate on our deliverables.

24:02

Speaker 3

Yes.

24:04

Speaker 5

LEDC Team I don't know if you're seeing hands there. People are trying to ask questions, including myself.

24:09

Speaker 3

I just wanted to highlight that for you.

24:13

Speaker 8

Hi, Rudy.

24:14

Speaker 2

In the beginning of the meeting, we had asked that all questions to be posed in the chat or at the end of the meeting simply because we do have a lot of important items to discuss. And at times, questions interrupting the presentation can take up a lot of time, and we go over the time that is respected for our members. But if you drop your question in the chat, we do have Chioma, who's on there trying to answer all questions. And then at the end, we can also take questions, if that's okay.

24:47

Speaker 8

Scarlett on that. That's great for putting in there. But if we see timeline issues that are being proposed and presented that are not feasible based upon if we have conflicting information, are we providing a forum for that to be called out? I just don't want to see one of the proposed items sitting on the slide be implemented when they're conflicting. So, again, if it's about each individual slide, maybe we can push the slide deck out so that people can make specific reference. I mean, I just heard you present a timeline on the marketing and research contracts which cannot be accomplished based on what Chioma said for the process mapping deliverable. So if we can push that out and maybe we can then provide specific feedback where we see issues we just don't want to take us glossed over.

25:39

Speaker 2

If you'd like to go ahead and respond to that inquiry for right now.

25:45

Speaker 1

Let's get through the presentation, and if we have the time to deal with that after at the end of the presentation, we will. But we need to get through this presentation because there's a lot of extremely important decisions that need to be made. So please just bear with us. We'll get to everyone's any issues that everyone has, but we have to move forward with this presentation.

26:12

Speaker 2

So this slide is specifically detailing our deliverables, and we really want to highlight the fact that August 1, we do have a very tight deadline, seeing that the state has already been very generous to grant us two extensions to fulfill the following deliverables that will now be due August 1. We do want to emphasize that this August 1 deadline is crucial and that we don't want to be non compliant with our contract, which may jeopardize program funding. Again, we do ask of our partners to have patience in this process as we are trying our best to ensure we create and pivot to meet the deadlines that are being set by the state. So, the first deliverable is our governance structure. This is a deliverable that has been worked on for over a year. There has been consensus in regards to the structure of the tables, the hubs and the committees involved in the program.

27:08

Speaker 2

Throughout the past year, we have extensively discussed received feedback as well as provided fact sheets in regard to how this program structure will look like and how the program structure will work. Within the CERF program, we do have the second deliverable, which has three components. It's our steering committee. We have a proposed structure for the Steering Committee. We have a recommended allocation of help by the Governance Committee of 33 seats. We are almost finished finalizing this specific item. We do have an item within the structure that will be discussed later in the meeting that will help finalize this recommendation of the 33 seats for the Steering Committee. Now, these two last items are extremely crucial and will be the most, I think, time consuming in regards to ensuring that we have, I think we have two or so to a little more than two weeks to complete, but that is the entities that will be assigned and the selection process.

28:09

Speaker 2

So by August 1, our selection process must be completed and the names assigned to the seats must be delivered to the State. So it's essential that we move forward with the seating process, which again has to be finalized by August 1. During our last outreach, and I'm sorry, Governance Committee meeting, we did have two strategies that were presented as a path forward for meeting our deadline of August 1. We did have our election process and our hybrid selection process. Election process entailed that all HRTC members had one vote in this process to ensure inclusivity. In regards to the selection of the Steering Committee, the hybrid selection process was a little different. It entailed having caucuses that would represent the subgroups of the Steering Committee. They would review the applications and then move forward with choosing those that would be seated in their respected subgroups of the Steering Committee.

29:11

Speaker 2

The Governance Committee did vote with a 73.33% to move forward with an election process as the most inclusive and transparent pathway forward. We will be reviewing this election process shortly because the timeline begins Monday. So this Monday the process of nomination and how we fulfill this deliverable by August 1 will begin Monday. We do have also a third component which is identifying a decision approval process of the Steering Committee and we will be discussing this later in the presentation and taking a poll as well to ensure that we have that identified in order to complete our deliverables. That will be due August 1 if we can go ahead and go to the next slide. So we do have our Steering Committee and election voting process now fleshed out. It's going to be important for our partners to understand who will be allowed to vote. So all fully onboarded partners who have executed a partnership letter will be allowed one vote, ensuring that our voices are equitably heard in this decision process.

30:20

Speaker 2

We do have entities and stakeholders who have submitted the onboarding form, but the onboarding form also entails the partnership letter and we are working on reaching out to those that have not fully completed the partnership letter to ensure that they are allowed to participate in this process. The registered voter will be the point of contact that was listed in

the partnership letter and this afternoon we will be sending an email that will list all of the point of contacts per organization. We understand that sometimes point of contacts need to be updated, so if that registered voter, the credentials need to be updated. We do ask that the original point of contact that was listed in the partnership letter to please email us at CERF@laedc.org to make this request of changing the credentials aka the person that will be voting and representing the organization. We also have instances that original point of contacts that were listed in the partnership letter are no longer with an organization.

31:25

Speaker 2

So we just request that new point of contact for that organization to please reach out to us so that we can resubmit a new updated partnership letter and we can match that to the voter credentials that will allow that person to then participate in this election process. We also want to emphasize the importance of our members understanding who can be a candidate in this election process for the Steering Committee. Again, you must be a fully onboarded partner who has executed the Partnership agreement letter and we will also allow that those that submit the Partnership Agreement letter by Thursday, July 20 at 05:00 P.m., that's going to be the day the nomination closes. They will be allowed to participate in the Steering Committee election if they submit their partnership letter on board and submit their nomination form as well. Only one representative per organization can apply.

32:21

Speaker 2

So for example, LADC cannot participate in this, but for the example of if I am the representative of the organization, then I will be the only one that can apply, Charles cannot apply or Alan cannot apply for a seat. It's one representative per organization, the same as how that representative will be allowed to then vote. A candidate will only be allowed to run for one seat and members may serve on the Steering Committee and also apply for a grant opportunity in the Hub outreach structure that will be giving grants to our partners to do the outreach work so they can serve vice versa. In regards to our voting process mechanism, this will entail that all interested candidates will submit a south nomination application which they will be answering specific questions about their qualifications and area of representation. This information will then be fed to our election vendor who will be creating a splash webpage that will display all the candidates and their submitted information and create a virtual ballot in which this information will be displayed for our members to be able to understand who these candidates are, what entity groups they represent, what areas within the county they represent as well.

33:47

Speaker 2

During the election process, all registered voters will receive a unique token via email. This will secure that all voters will be allowed to vote on a virtual ballot that will be created. The token ensures that each vote that is cast will be secure and prevents the possibility of double voting and affecting the integrity of the election. Once all votes are cast, this token will automatically close and we will be able to then share the results after the voting window closes, if we move forward to the election voting timeline. So today we are introducing this process that was upheld by the governance committee last, I believe, Friday, July 17, which is this upcoming Monday. The south nomination application opens for candidates at 12:00 p.m. And closes July 20 at 05:00 p.m.. We will then take all the applications that we've received. We will work with our Engineer vendor to then upload this into their system, test the virtual

ballot and ensure that we're catching any mistakes and ensuring that the virtual ballot and splash page is completely finalized to then begin the voting process July 24.

35:05

Speaker 2

That is a Monday. The voting process begins at 09:00 A.m. And we'll be closing July 27 at 05:00 p.m.. Then we will have our results and the steering committee names presented to the HRTC on our next partners meeting, which will be the July 20 eighth. That day plus the 31st. Our CERF team will compile all the data, all the components that are required of us for the three sub deliverables for August 1 to then submit to the state by that day. We do have our Circ HRTC candidate self nomination application. We presented it in the past and have asked for feedback, but we still want to ensure we receive as much feedback prior to this going live on Monday, we do have a jamboard feedback portal that one of our members will be sharing in the chat. If you can, please test out the application, submit it.

36:06

Speaker 2

If there are any questions or criteria that might be missing that you think is appropriate, please send that for feedback for consideration. We are asking that all feedback be sent by 12:00 p.m. Today, as we need to work to prepare to have this go live by Monday. So Alan, if you are able to just quickly open up the Steering committee application south nomination just so our partners can view it, and again, we encourage you to test it out, submit the form to ensure that it's appropriate for the HRTC. So we do have a little bit of an explanation, again of who can be a candidate. We do have an explanation of the role of the Steering Committee and what the Steering Committee its responsibilities will encompass. We also have responsibilities and commitments that include ensuring that our members are committed to being active, attending meetings, committing to consensus building, also ensuring that there is recusal of voting for any conflicted projects or items.

37:21

Speaker 2

Then we do have the actual application, which is, I believe two pages long, where we ask questions in regards to the area of representation, the entity type that they are looking to represent, and then also questions about their qualification. So I believe it's a 250 word limit where candidates will be able to express why they should be on the Steering Committee and why members should vote for them in regards to their qualifications and their desires to create change within that subgroup. So if we can go back to the presentation and just to also while the presentation is being pulled up in regards to I do see some quick questions on here for the Steering Committee, in regards to how the Steering Committee will be operating, such as absences and so on. We are asking that once the Steering Committee is seated, that they meet to basically go over the ways that they will be operating, such as creating, for example, bylaws for them, for the way that they will be facilitating meetings moving forward.

38:40

Speaker 2

But right now, since our time is very limited, we have August 1, we want to ensure that we have the deliverables of the seating in place. And that leads me to the third component, which is identifying a decision approval process. So the August 1 mandated deliverable does include identifying a decision approval process. Options include majority voting, which we all know is a simple majority of whatever proposal or item receives the highest number of votes

compared to the other option will prevail, or a supermajority, which has a higher threshold than a simple majority. A proposal will need two thirds of a majority to be approved and this is normally used for significant decisions. Since we have time between now and August 1, we are giving the poll the closing window of July 21 at 05:00 p.m. And we will have Chioma drop the link in the chat.

39:37

Speaker 3

Thank you, Scarlett. Sorry, what was oh, no, go ahead. OK, perfect.

39:44

Speaker 7

So here we have our Affinity Hub lead questionnaire draft. So Jermaine actually took it into his own hands to create kind of a draft questionnaire to provide to the Affinity Hub leads to assess different aspects that we're looking for in the Affinity Hub leads. So this questionnaire we have shared with HRTC, I believe yesterday through a email blast and we are soliciting feedback or extra questions that you think would be relevant to help drive equity and provide balanced representation. So please, if you have the chance, take a look at this. Questionnaire and provide any feedback that you can. You should be given the comment function.

40:23

Speaker 3

On the Google Drive and I'll go.

40:27

Speaker 7

Ahead and pass it to Charles to elaborate on our labor representation in the steering committee.

40:32

Speaker 1

Thank you, alan and Scarlett. Great updates there for anyone new on this call who was not on the last HRTC call. The La Fed and their labor affiliates announced that they need five additional reserved steering committee seats to be comfortable remaining with the CERF program. So currently, if you look to the left, this is the breakdown. Of those 33 steering committee seats, 25 are reserved for CBOs resident workers and that's segmented by 20 being for CBOs, five reserved for resident workers and community partners, and then two seats are reserved for labor, two for business, two for education, two for municipal partners. Total 33 seats. Labor is proposing that they would like five seats from the CBO category, which would leave anyone else running for seats, 15 seats from CBOs and five from resident work or so forth and so on. However, that would give labor seven seats total, which is, I guess, a little over 20% of all the seats.

42:00

Speaker 1

It's totally everyone's in HRTC. We're going to conduct a poll to see if you would like to grant them those five additional reserve seats, just knowing that they could possibly walk away if they do not receive them. The decision is totally yours. Keep in mind that whatever decision you make, if you decide to accept their terms, that they still have a right to run for those additional 20 seats, meaning the 15 seats and CBOs and the five seats from the resident

workers and community partners. So we will conduct that poll shortly, but I wanted to give you context on that. This one I will take questions for right now only about this situation.

43:05

Speaker 8

Hi, this is Sharon, thank you so much and we are very much outreach and Engagement took a vote on this issue and was very supportive of having an increase in seats for labor. The conveyat became labor being classified as union labor and nonunion labor because 20% of the union of our employees in Los Angeles County are union. Of the 5.9 million employees, 1.2 million of those are union. The concern that outreach shared and discussed in its last meeting is taking seats away from the CBOs was a concern and therefore Outreach and Engagement members voted to make a recommendation to the HRTC that the steering committee be increased to accommodate additional seats for labor. So that vote came forward and we do not have decision making authority. But I am bringing forth the vote of the Outreach and Engagement Committee that we would support additional allocation for labor with a caveat that we increase the total steering committee seats to accommodate that request so that community organizations do not have to suffer lack of representation because of that.

44:26

Speaker 1

Thank you for that, Sharon and Jermaine's comment I think should be paired with what you just said. Please be mindful that this does not change the dynamics. Labor are community members as well, so this does not distort the equity component either. So please keep that in mind with what Sharon just stated. Are there any more comments, any more questions that anyone would like to speak on regarding this issue?

45:01

Speaker 3

Just to comment on this issue again, but I think the underlying issue is do they get additional five seats? Which means a total of seven seats, I think with the option is labor has seven seats and they're part of the HRTC, or they have two designated seats and they're not, and we have no labor participation. I think that's a non starter. I think we undermine everything we're trying to do and we will have no success in getting any funds from the state. So I think in the instance, I agree there, wish we could have done this earlier in the process, but let's just move forward. Give them the five seats. I'm fine with keeping it at 33 and having it as it's designated on the screen. I think 37 starts getting way too unwieldy.

45:52

Speaker 1

Tony, I see your hand up. You can go ahead.

45:54

Speaker 8

Yeah. We had talked previously about a different division of how the seats are, and this has a direct impact on labor. We're going to be voting in favor of adding labor in their seven seats, but it really impacts how this comes in. If you look at the structure that the Outreach and Engagement Committee has been working on, there are some seats and you can add the total amount that they want. The other thing I wanted to raise is the 33 vote. Yes, we took that, but that was prior to labor coming in and raising the issue that they didn't feel they had sufficient

representation. So there's two different pieces coming into this vote that maybe need to get clarified and at least harmonized.

46:43

Speaker 1

Thank you for that. Any more comments, questions?

46:50

Speaker 3

Yes.

46:51

Speaker 8

Charles? Can we vote on both raising the number of seats to accommodate labor?

46:59

Speaker 6

Charles, I think we should clarify that between the Governance Committee and the working group that took place May 31, the decisions that came out of both of those was to keep it at 33. So the increase of additional five seats from labor and their ability to still go for more seats would be with 33 seats.

47:26

Speaker 8

Because this wasn't on the table.

47:29

Speaker 6

It would be with 33.

47:32

Speaker 8

This was not on the table for consideration at that time. This request from labor came after the entire HRTC working, where the working group considered the 33 count. And so CBOs, at least the ones on the Outreach Committee, are concerned that they do not want to have to lose five seats to give to labor. We want labor at the table. Yes. Agreed. I totally agree with Sean, with Sharon on this. They were not at the table. So I think we need to vote to raise the seats to accommodate labor.

48:10

Speaker 1

Guys, is labor part of the community or not? Because this seems to be the issue. Los Angeles is very divisive. It doesn't matter what I think. It doesn't matter what I feel. The issue is that labor is part of the community. By raising the seats from 33 to 37, what you're saying is labor is not part of the community, so we need something else additional in there to keep everything even more divided.

48:53

Speaker 3

Charles, that's a false narrative.

48:57

Speaker 1
Okay?

48:57

Speaker 8
Absolutely a false narrative.

49:01

Speaker 3
Why is it you're defining community within a socially constructed number of 33? There's nothing to prohibit us from expanding that number and expanding the inclusivity of the definition of community.

49:20

Speaker 6
It's also a far more organized base versus the CBOs.

49:27

Speaker 1
Okay, let's take a vote right now. Alan, can you pull up a poll? Can you put together a quick poll to see how many people on the call would like to increase from 33 seats to 37? And if they increase to 37, then we'll have okay, how will we do this? If they increase to 37, then no, we will have to do the vote first to see if they even want to.

49:54

Speaker 7
Charles, I think I saw Jermaine have his hand up. If Jermaine, you want to kind of chime in before we move forward with.

50:00

Speaker 4
Anything, I have no comment. I was just going to just acknowledge.

50:04

Speaker 3
The fact that.

50:07

Speaker 4
First of all, the entire HRC is not part of this HRTC is not part of this call. There's about 104 individuals on this call. Some are from the same organization. There are over 400 individual stakeholders in 300 plus organizations. There are open governance meetings that have been happening for quite some time now, over a year at this point. And so I just want to be mindful that we can't make decisions in a vacuum on this call. So while we can certainly get a pulse and kind of get an idea of, hey, raising the seats or not raising the seats, this will have to be taken back to governance, because that's kind of the model we have right now until we have a steering committee. And so that poses several challenges, as we know, given the timeline that we have by the state. So we can certainly take a pulse on this.

50:55

Speaker 4

And if there's a resounding number of folks that think that raising the total number of seats to 37 makes sense, then we'll have to take that into account and give that back to those governance subcommittee leads. So I just want to put that on record for everyone that is not on the call.

51:16

Speaker 3

Actually, I don't agree. I don't think it does.

51:18

Speaker 8

I don't agree with that either, because.

51:22

Speaker 4

Real quick, Sharon, you're misunderstanding what I'm saying. I'm not saying that the decision is for the governance subcommittee. What I'm saying is we have to take this back to governance and open it up to other HRTC partners. We only have 104 folks on the call is what I'm sharing. So how is that fair to folks that are not on the call to.

51:42

Speaker 3

Not have a voice in this decision.

51:43

Speaker 4

Is all I'm simply saying. So I just want to put that out there so we can certainly take a pulse and vote on it if you want to utilize that word. But we still have to make sure that we are including other members that are not on the call today.

51:57

Speaker 3

So, Jermaine, at the governance, do we get 104?

52:00

Speaker 4

No, that's exactly it. We do not get 104 at the governance committee meeting. But we can also send out a poll that is going to go out into the newsletter that will provide an opportunity for others to weigh in. Oh yeah, just say that. Yeah, I'm saying both need to happen.

52:19

Speaker 3

We're locking this down now.

52:20

Speaker 4

We're locking back the governance. And then we also need to ensure that we're including

other people's voices because others may not agree or others may agree. So we just have to make sure that we're being inclusive and recognize that everyone has a voice in this process. So when we make these types of decisions, it can't just be on Friday calls is all, I'm simply saying.

52:38

Speaker 8

Thank you. The other issue then, it sounds like if that's the case, it sounds like we can't vote on either issue within this meeting.

52:48

Speaker 6

Then a poll needs to be sent.

52:49

Speaker 8

Out to address both. That's what it sounds like.

52:52

Speaker 1

So here's your other issue. August 1.

52:57

Speaker 8

You guys.

52:57

Speaker 1

August 1. This needs to be to the state by August 1. And there's no way that you can certainly not use the voting mechanism that's in place. You'll wind up doing a poll in order to make your final decisions. Unfortunately, time is just not on our side. The state has granted us two extensions. They're not going to give us any more. We have to have this done by August 1. And starting Monday, we have to start getting everything in order for the engineers, in order to upload, in order to have a voting system, in order to keep moving forward.

53:38

Speaker 3

Can we just say, I think there seems to be a consensus, not universal, but consensus to give labor additional five seats. The only thing that's debating now is do we make that with an exclusive of the 33 or add an additional five to 38? Can we just put that second item to a vote? Do we want to keep it at 33 or raise it to 38? And then I think we block that issue down and move on.

54:00

Speaker 6

But I mean, Charles, is it going to be this easy for people to just come in and ask for more seats and we just accommodate.

54:09

Speaker 3
Stop.

54:10

Speaker 1
Let's stop there. Nothing is easy. All of these are tough decisions and a lot of them should have been made way before this meeting.

54:16

Speaker 6
Exactly.

54:18

Speaker 1
The fact that it hasn't been is mind blowing, but that's where we are. We need to move forward. This is what I'm trying to explain to everyone on this call. We have until August 1. What are we going to tell the state if we're not ready by August.

54:32

Speaker 3
1 and labor is out?

54:34

Speaker 1
What is that state?

54:34

Speaker 8
Five extra seats.

54:36

Speaker 1
I'm sorry?

54:37

Speaker 6
Labor is out. If we don't give them five extra.

54:39

Speaker 1
Seats, is that how this that's completely Labor's decision. Not mine, not yours. That's completely their decision. That's why you're having the vote. You have a voice. Okay, labor. You can walk or give labor what they want and we move forward.

54:53

Speaker 8
Clarification, please. I thought labor was asking for five total seats. They had compromised to that instead of seven total seats. Can we get clarification on that?

55:04

Speaker 1

That was the clarification. I can show you the emails.

55:07

Speaker 8

This is no, we have representatives on the call. And I remember saying I did have a call with Jermaine a few days ago where we thought five was the compromise. And so I understood we represented the request as they made it.

55:20

Speaker 1

Crystal Romero, are you on the call? Kristen, crystal Romero, are you on the call?

55:26

Speaker 9

Yes, I am.

55:27

Speaker 8

Thank you, Charles.

55:28

Speaker 9

I just put into the chat, no, we did not compromise that Sharon. I said that we are open to seeing anything in writing and I would bring it back to my affiliates to consider, but this is the number that my affiliates consider. Now, I do see a lot of comments, very disheartening to see from the HRTC, a lot of comments of labor holding this whole process hostage. A lot of people not considering us, our members, the value and dignity of their work, part of this process. And again, that is the reason as to why we as a labor group said, enough is enough. We need to raise our voices. This process in Los Angeles is completely dysfunctional. It is a banana republic, and we know what it takes in order to do good. Job creation, emphasis on good. And we feel that in order to get that process done in Los Angeles, we need to have more.

56:28

Speaker 9

So, no, we did not compromise. Again, it's up to the HRTC to decide based on whatever comes out of that decision. Our affiliates and I will come back to the table, decide, and move forward from there. Thank you again to Charles and the LAEDC team for taking time and all of this. Again, for all the people asking, well, why are you doing this now? We were never brought to the table. We were never asked to engage in this process. People keep saying longevity. We've been working on this for years. We were not invited to this process. So if you guys want to continue yammering on about how you think this is equitable and is going to work, go ahead. But this is what we are proposing in order to try and make this work. If you guys decide, awesome. If not, awesome. Thank you so much, Charles.

57:14

Speaker 9

I yield the floor.

57:15

Speaker 1

Thank you, Crystal. Thank you, Crystal. Guys, we have to move forward. These are tough decisions. A lot of decisions weren't made before now. We have to move forward. We have until August 1. What is the solution, a reasonable solution to make sure by August 1.

57:32

Speaker 8

Charles, if I may.

57:33

Speaker 6

My name is Annalisa Lukes. I'm wondering if it might be possible since August 1 is just a little over two weeks from now and it seems as though there is interest and we have to weigh what the cost of losing this partner would be to the entire region. Might there be a compromise where we move forward with the notion of adding the requested five and then have a contingency as to how that goes about is it within the 33 or is it adding the five? But I think conceptually, can there be some level of consensus on this call as to yay or nay relative to adding the five? And then how we do it is something that perhaps can be litigated at a different time. Because I think the big picture is get the five, not get the five. The how is something else that might.

58:28

Speaker 8

Be determined in time to meet the deadline. What do you think?

58:32

Speaker 6

So, Charles, can I state I have the link for the labor question. So I will put that in the poll now and then we can go from there. But it is the poll saying yay or nay to the additional seats that labor is requesting. So I'll put that in the chat now and then we can move forward. Charles, we can lead that conversation on how to move forward to whether we will increase the 33 seats or not.

59:02

Speaker 3

Thank you.

59:03

Speaker 1

Thank you for that chioma. Annalisa, to answer your question, it goes right back to the same issue. We don't have the time. We don't have the time. And we're talking about going back to the committee. We're talking going back to the HRTC. We don't have the time.

59:22

Speaker 3

The question is for the poll is weird. It says it doesn't ask the question whether we want to keep it at 33 or raise it at 38.

59:31

Speaker 8

Separate question.

59:33

Speaker 6

No, that is separate. Luis, the poll is about increasing labor seats. It's not about the 33.

59:40

Speaker 3

Because we had consensus on that.

59:42

Speaker 6

Yes, it was thought we had consensus on the 33.

59:45

Speaker 3

No, on the giving labor additional seats. Oh, no.

59:49

Speaker 6

So that is in the poll. It's in the chat.

59:53

Speaker 4

So everyone can click that real quick. Charles and team, real quick, let me just chime in real quick. Hey, guys, look, I understand points. What I would say and what it seems to be the consensus on this call is let's just have a vote. We'll go ahead and raise the question. It sounds like 37. Do we raise it to 37 or do we keep it at the 33 with the seven labor seats? It looks like those are the two options on the table. That being said, Caroline says 30. Let's just do a poll. Say again?

01:00:26

Speaker 8

Mr caroline just chimed in. She's saying 38.

01:00:31

Speaker 4

So do we have a vote to ask for 33? Keeping the seven here? That's on the page then 37 and 38. So maybe we have three different options because all three have come up. And then what we can do is let's just execute a poll on this call right now and then we can also open that poll up to HRTC members not on the call through Eblast. So let's just do it that way. That's the only way that we're going to get through this, guys.

01:00:58

Speaker 8

Jermaine.

01:00:59

Speaker 6

We just want to make sure we clarify. So you understand if we add five additional seats to the existing 33, that makes 38. There is no 37 that should be considered here. Just to make sure we're all clear.

01:01:09

Speaker 8

The 37 is at one point what governance had asked for is that there be an odd number. That was what was on the table.

01:01:17

Speaker 4

That's exactly it. So Sharon, to that point, are we saying 33, 37 and 38 or just 33 and 30?

01:01:24

Speaker 8

Not my call. Let's just have them as long as.

01:01:27

Speaker 4

There's been discussions about the 37. So let's just have the 33 option, the 37 option, and the 38 option. A very simple poll. We can do it right now.

01:01:37

Speaker 1

It would have to be out to.

01:01:39

Speaker 4

The HRTC as well.

01:01:42

Speaker 1

It would have to be 38 or 33 if they're trying to make it where all the seats are still remaining the same at 25.

01:01:51

Speaker 3

Also, we don't need to do a poll to the email. We have to lock this down today like the engineers need to start working. The nominations go live Monday. We don't have time to go out. If people knew this meeting was happening, if they didn't want to participate, I.

01:02:03

Speaker 8

Understand the key is that the labor vote we just did and it's seven, regardless of where that comes from. So the seven has been voted on. You just do have a poll on that and it's in the chat, so we're able to do that right now.

01:02:21

Speaker 4

So team, do you guys have that?

01:02:23

Speaker 7

Can you there's just a lot of people talking right now. I need clarification on what exactly the poll options need to be.

01:02:31

Speaker 4

Are we increasing 38 is what I'm.

01:02:33

Speaker 1

33 and 38 or crease to 38.

01:02:42

Speaker 8

Clarification?

01:02:43

Speaker 6

Do we need an OD number?

01:02:52

Speaker 7

Okay, so I'm going to go ahead and read out if everyone can just please listen to the question. So the poll is, are you in favor of raising the number of steering committee seats to 38 to accommodate for labor and the options are keep the seat at 33 or increase to 38 seats. Does that sound okay with everyone before I launch the poll?

01:03:11

Speaker 8

Yes.

01:03:13

Speaker 7

Okay, so I'm going to go ahead and launch the poll now. Can someone please oh, never mind. Everyone's taking the poll.

01:03:27

Speaker 3

Thank you all.

01:03:28

Speaker 4

This is challenging. We get it. Everyone has different opinions, different things going on. I just want everyone to kind of understand that our communities are in crisis. We have a lot

going on. I kind of quote this all the time, that 51% of our folks live in a disadvantaged community and CERF is here to address those community needs and help us move into that carbon neutral economy and create high road jobs. And so the quicker that we can come together and kind of make things work and get through these processes and create the two to five strategies for our region, the quicker that we can help our people that really need to help the most. And so I just want to make sure that we uplift that and keep that at the center of everything that we're doing here today. But thank you all. I get that this is a challenge.

01:04:15

Speaker 4

We're kind of at a critical moment, but once we get over this hurdle, I think that we'll have a lot of clarity and we'll be able to begin that hub and table model that outreach and engagement put together and really begin to get into the weeds of this work.

01:04:29

Speaker 1

This looks like that is overwhelmingly increased to 38 seats. So then the next poll, which I'm assuming will probably be in favor of labor, if you can just throw that one up, alan, that one was done.

01:04:42

Speaker 6

By SurveyMonkey and it was already placed in the chat, so I don't know if Alan can pull up the responses thus far.

01:04:49

Speaker 7

Just give me 1 second because the poll is still open. Are we okay with closing it? Because we only have 76% of attendees have responded to the poll.

01:05:00

Speaker 2

Can you put the poll again in the chat?

01:05:03

Speaker 7

It's currently active. Are you talking about the survey monkey?

01:05:08

Speaker 6

Yes.

01:05:09

Speaker 7

If you could please just yes.

01:05:13

Speaker 4

And thank you guys. We're a minute over. And thank you guys that are able to stay on a little bit longer for this process. Team, I am going to have to jump off. I have an EDA meeting.

But I just want to say thank you all again, all the HRTC members on the call. Thank you to the LADC team for these efforts today. We know it's a challenge, but we'll get through this, guys. It's okay.

01:05:38

Speaker 1
Thank you.

01:05:38

Speaker 3
Jermaine, do we need to approve the final full HRTC approval voting process or what do we need to do now?

01:05:48

Speaker 2
Question for clarification. The SurveyMonkey poll still takes into consideration that we are at 33 seats, so it's asking if we reserve the five additional seats for labor within the community based seat category. If we've already voted to increase to 38, then this doesn't the poll should.

01:06:12

Speaker 3
Be insignificant at this point because we've already voted majority to give five additional seats of labor. It should not be taken out of the CBO area and so that means this poll is insignificant.

01:06:24

Speaker 8
Agreed.

01:06:25

Speaker 4
I agree with Benny team. Let's move forward. It looks like 38.

01:06:29

Speaker 3
Is it?

01:06:30

Speaker 4
This accommodates our labor partners. It keeps a lens on what we have been trying to achieve as an HRTC. Let's just move forward with the 38. We can announce that and send that out. Obviously, things are going to kind of mirror this if this is the 75 25%. Yeah, absolutely. This isn't even close enough to even continue debate on it.

01:06:59

Speaker 1
There you have it.

01:07:01

Speaker 3

Do we need to vote on the final thing? Go ahead.

01:07:04

Speaker 1

No, there's not going to be a vote on the next one. Louise, let me go ahead and advance.

01:07:12

Speaker 7

The slide so we can move forward.

01:07:13

Speaker 1

Yeah, I think if they're just updates, we can do that on the next meeting. But let's go to the next slide.

01:07:22

Speaker 7

Just to take note of the upcoming meeting. So we have Outreach and Engagement Committee next Wednesday on July 19 at 10:00 a.m. And the next HRTC Biweekly meeting two weeks from today at 09:00 a.m.. As usual.

01:07:35

Speaker 3

Why does governance not have a meeting set up?

01:07:40

Speaker 8

Question.

01:07:47

Speaker 1

I don't have answer for you on that one.

01:07:50

Speaker 3

So this brings to an issue that we don't have to add up vote on now. But I think it kind of relates to the same underlying issue is one, not just for the committees that exist right now, but for the steering committee. I think we should approve set a maximum limit as to how many meetings a person can meet before they give up their either seat as member of those committees or as chair. Because again, understand, people have a lot of stuff so they may not have time, but if you don't have time, it may better to give it to someone else who does have the time and resources to do that.

01:08:20

Speaker 1

Yeah, I'm not saying I agree with what you were saying. I agree that there should be some process in place for a replacement or a fill in if the co chairs have been too busy. But unfortunately, it doesn't seem like that was brought up. Put in the plan.

01:08:41

Speaker 4

Yeah. Real quick, Charles and Luis to kind.

01:08:44

Speaker 3

Of help you out here.

01:08:46

Speaker 4

If we're moving forward, this 38 and the steering committee nomination and election period is going to go ahead and begin Monday. There may be room for one more governance subcommittee meeting, but those committees actually dissolve once the steering committee comes into play. So we will no longer have that issue anymore. We'll have the electives now. What I will say is this, we could experience a similar challenge with those who are elected into the steering committee. And so we'll need to come up with some methodology for what that looks like in terms of replacing individuals so that we don't have a similar issue with time constraints and things of that nature. When you have CEOs and coos and directors and VPs involved in these types of processes and with major organizations in a region that has 10 million people, we know that folks get pretty busy, and so there may have to be some pivoting.

01:09:34

Speaker 1

I agree.

01:09:35

Speaker 3

I think we should just have a max. The other thing we should also clarify is the position. So let's say if a person leaves, let's say if I were to get one of those positions, I leave the partnership. The position doesn't belong to the partnership. It belongs to the combination of the person and the organization they're with. So that if somebody were to leave those organizations, then that opens it up again. It doesn't automatically say, hey, this person was a member of La Chamber. So therefore the La Chamber just has to appoint someone new. No, it should open up the process. Again, they belong to the organization.

01:10:08

Speaker 8

Unless you run as a resident CBL.

01:10:11

Speaker 1

That's correct. Unfortunately. Luis Sharon's correct. It's the organization who wins the seat, not the person who is the representative for the organization.

01:10:23

Speaker 3

But kind of, though, because the person you're not just voting for the organization because otherwise you would just be nominating the organization. You're also nominating the person

because theoretically, the organization could appoint someone who hasn't been involved with this at all. And so now we have someone getting involved in here, and I think if we opened it up, it simply allows the membership to say, do we want that organization can put forward someone else again. Or we may want to say, we want to give another organization a chance to participate on there because they've been more actively involved. So that's a change I would recommend going forward.

01:10:55

Speaker 1
Duly noted. Okay.

01:10:58

Speaker 6
I want to ask Don if she still has a question.

01:11:01

Speaker 1
Yeah, I was about to do the same thing. I see your hand's been up for a while, Don.

01:11:05

Speaker 6
Do you still have a question or was it answered in the chat? It wasn't a question. It was just someone already kind of spoke to this. It's like, we don't need that. Someone mentioned something about divisiveness. Like, we all know that we're all representative of all the needs of all of our communities. Labor is labor. Community based organizations represents underserved communities in a slightly different way, and labor is far more greatly organized. And so I was like, we don't have to have the divisive tone and language. We all want labor here, and we just resolved this.

01:11:38

Speaker 3
So I'm good. Thank you.

01:11:42

Speaker 1
I'm going to go to Libby since, Sean, you spoke earlier.

01:11:45

Speaker 6
Thanks. I just want to get the clarification that I put in the chat and that Sharon also followed up with to confirm whether the election includes. The affinity hub leads and the steering committee member because I thought we had just clarified for me, I thought the affinity hub leads were supposed to be part of or be members of the steering committee automatically and that's what made the original \$33.

01:12:18

Speaker 1
Okay, I understand what you say, okay. Right now I think all of that can be mapped out later on. I mean, not to say that it's not, but just discussed later on because right now we just need to focus on locking down this steering committee.

01:12:32

Speaker 6

That is the steering committee. Yeah. If those members were supposed to be members or the hub leads are supposed to be the automatically part of the steering committee. That is the 33 we're discussing. So it's not to be discussed afterwards and we just need to have clarification if that's the case. Otherwise it's going to be unclear as to who is running for what.

01:12:55

Speaker 3

Correct.

01:12:56

Speaker 1

Oh, I see your point in terms for the nomination seats coming up.

01:13:06

Speaker 3

Can you say that? Is there somebody from governance committee who can provide clarity for this?

01:13:14

Speaker 8

Doesn't even need clarity, it's straight in the contract.

01:13:17

Speaker 6

Can we pull up that image that shows the layers that you guys have that shows whatever you call them, the affinities, the tables, the hub leads. I did put the link to that in the chat referencing a couple of questions. So that link is in the chat for everyone to see. And we should be noted that the steering committee members will be eligible to apply to be a hub lead or a table lead or micro guarantee like either one when we get to that point.

01:13:47

Speaker 8

But how's that possible? They are a subset. They are twelve designated seats of the steering committee. Unless we're only electing them and we elect them later, it is not possible to adhere to what we have committed to unless we include this election of our affinity hubs. It has to be them all together. You can't come back later and elect somebody to have a seat that a seat is already filled for. We defined it in our proposal, it came back in our contract and we've talked about this at our meetings. I think we just have to open nominations for both affinity hub leads and steering committee members and do it all at once and therefore we'll be compliant.

01:14:37

Speaker 3

Aren't the affinity hub leads supposed to be elected by the affinity hubs?

01:14:41

Speaker 8

No, they're elected by the HRTC.

01:14:44

Speaker 1

Exactly. The affinity hub process is certainly more of a selection process and it's very detailed. There's a lot of money at stake connected to it. I don't suggest that you rush that process. I understand the conflict of what you're saying, Sharon. There's got to be another way to do it.

01:15:11

Speaker 8

I personally think this is just procrastination and avoidance and definitive hub. They're not an election process, they're an election process. I will challenge this issue on the state contract because it is a contractual issue. I know, I sat there and worked on that language with Bill.

01:15:30

Speaker 6

So can I just get clarification?

01:15:32

Speaker 8

No.

01:15:32

Speaker 6

I opened up the link that she sent that has the configuration, the nice little canva, and I swear I thought that it was told to us or we had agreed that all of the twelve affinity hub leads would be members of the steering committee. If I'm wrong about that's fine. And that's what the problem is holding up. We can move on, but please tell me whether I am imagining things or not.

01:15:58

Speaker 1

Jermaine, if you're on the call, can you pop back on? So there's a deeper history here, because my understanding from the very beginning of how this was run was the steering committee was supposed to be chosen first before the affinity hubs and the clarification came later on.

01:16:20

Speaker 7

I think Jim Ray said he had.

01:16:22

Speaker 1

To take that's right.

01:16:23

Speaker 8

Unfortunately, Charles, you are it's exactly the opposite. And this has come through

governance consistently. This came from the working group, as we discussed. This this has never been an issue. It has always been very clear, actually.

01:16:36

Speaker 3

No, but does somebody have the chart as to what the positions are? The excel sheet we had before and just bringing that up.

01:16:41

Speaker 1

Alan, can you pull up the Scarlet chart, as I call it?

01:16:52

Speaker 7

You're referring to the roles and responsibilities?

01:16:55

Speaker 1

No. Yeah, just the structure with the twelve affinity hubs and eight tables.

01:17:12

Speaker 3

Steering committee.

01:17:19

Speaker 1

Luis, is this what you're referring to?

01:17:21

Speaker 8

The one that Scarlett did?

01:17:23

Speaker 3

The one that shows the positions that are up for chart?

01:17:25

Speaker 1

The chart. Oh, the graphic, yeah.

01:17:28

Speaker 6

Alan, they're referring to the one.

01:17:32

Speaker 3

I.

01:17:32

Speaker 2

Think Jermaine is jumping on now, if he can help provide some clarity.

01:17:47

Speaker 3

No, not that one.

01:17:48

Speaker 6

Oh, not that one. Which one?

01:17:50

Speaker 3

The excel one that has list, like how many seats are who's on the HRTC.

01:17:55

Speaker 7

You're talking about the steering committee fact sheet?

01:17:57

Speaker 3

Yeah, sorry, the steering committee.

01:18:00

Speaker 7

Give me one moment.

01:18:08

Speaker 2

So, Jermaine, there is, I think, just a discussion in regards to the affinity hub being a subset of the steering committee and kind of how to go about that, seeing that we are focusing on the steering committee at the moment. But there's issues in regards to whether we have to first elect the affinity hub leads to then be a part of the steering.

01:18:40

Speaker 4

I get it. So the issue here really is the state deadline, August 1. And so I think Sharon submitted a potential alternative earlier this week, I think it was Thursday, of how we could potentially pivot and still meet the August 1 deadline. So, team, I don't know if you want to bring that up. I mean, it looks like there's 62 people still on the call, so maybe we just bring that up and just go through that to see if that's feasible. Because right now that's the only other alternative timeline that we can utilize to meet what we put in our proposal. If for some reason we're not able to move forward with that alternative suggestion, it puts us in a position where we're going to have to pivot from what we put in our proposal. The state is perfectly fine with that. It's just going to be, again, a tough challenge because it's going to be different than what we obviously put in our proposal.

01:19:34

Speaker 4

So we'll have to figure out a way to pivot which is going to be challenging based upon how we wrote it. So that's kind of the issue on the table right now.

01:19:42

Speaker 1

Jermaine, was there a solution that you saw of choosing the steering committee before the affinity hub?

01:19:51

Speaker 4

There is no solution that is going to meet what we put in the proposal. The only suggestion that I could maybe uplift is we say that we put a notation on there that if you are nominating yourself and organization obviously to be a steering committee in one of those steering committee seats that you also ensure that you have the bandwidth and capacity potentially to be an affinity hub partner as well. Or basically those that are elected to the steering committee also have the ability to go into that affinity hub process as well. The problem is that still doesn't meet what we put in our proposal. It doesn't change anything. We're still going to have to pivot no matter what the suggestion is.

01:20:42

Speaker 1

I'm providing Sharon or Libby what Jermaine just said is that reasonable to use that.

01:20:55

Speaker 8

And I'm going to tell you because it means that our HRTC does not elect its affinity hubs and that's a problem. So the alternative that I put forward is it's not a shift in timeline at all and I'm happy to bring that up on the screen. It does exactly what we intended to do. We just open nominations for all 38 seats and that allows folks to get the affinity hubs voted upon and get the other steering committee seats voted upon. It does not require any change. I just think we're creating unnecessary delays and I would hate to see us default or have to be forced to abandon the principles of our contract and force a contract amendment just because we're delaying. There is no reason why we cannot dominate affinity hub leads.

01:21:51

Speaker 4

Charles, Rook, one of you guys, can you bring up what Sharon's suggestion is? Let's just see if we can unpack it and just make it happen. I mean, at this point we got to move forward. There's really no alternative.

01:22:00

Speaker 8

I have it on my screen if somebody wants to give me but again.

01:22:03

Speaker 4

There was just a why don't you bring it then let's just go through it. I mean, if it's something feasible, we got to make it happen.

01:22:11

Speaker 8

I don't know. You guys are going to open up nominations, but the idea was can you see the screen?

01:22:17

Speaker 3

Yes.

01:22:19

Speaker 8

So the idea was whatever your voting list. See, I thought your voting list would close on the 18th. You're saying on the 20th, that's perfectly fine. But whatever. You open your nomination period, it's for both. It covers all of them, and then you're going to have your election period. My recommendation was that you had two election days, a 48 hours period for hubs, a 48 hours period for steering committees, and then you publish and summarize those winners and the HRTC ratifies it. It all happens on the same I don't understand why there's a challenge, because the important thing, from my perspective and what we have been building on all along is that our HRTC selects its steering committee and that includes affinity hubs. So I don't know if this is possible. If it's reasonable.

01:23:10

Speaker 4

For our election, can.

01:23:13

Speaker 3

Someone bring up a Excel list that allows that list? Every position, not the 20 number count, but broken down individually, what seats are on the steering committee?

01:23:22

Speaker 4

Right.

01:23:23

Speaker 2

I have a question. Would the engineer have time to do a whole other election splash page and ballot for the affinity hub leads by Wednesday?

01:23:35

Speaker 1

Doubt it. I need to see the original time. I don't have that slide in front of me to see what the original timeline is for the steering committee. So I compare it with what Sharon has here. From what I recall, when I looked at it before this meeting, it didn't look like it lined up, which is why I was pushing to move forward with steering committee going first. But let's look at that again. I hate to do this to you, Alan, but can you go back to that slide, the timeline slide for the voting?

01:24:06

Speaker 7

Yeah, just give me 1 second.

01:24:09

Speaker 3

Yeah. Alan, as you're doing that, I think one of the questions that was raised, Charles, was our hub leads part of the steering committee? And I think that's people are trying to get clarity one. And then the second thing is this voting process timeline. But the first thing is, are we clear that hub leads are part of the steering committee? So when you vote for hub lead, you're basically voting for the steering committee member as well.

01:24:34

Speaker 1

But I understand in the proposal that is correct.

01:24:39

Speaker 3

Okay. They are part of the steering committee.

01:24:42

Speaker 4

Yeah, that's the issue right now is that if we don't do that process.

01:24:47

Speaker 3

Then they just list show every position on the steering committee. Does somebody have that document?

01:24:53

Speaker 2

I posted it in the.

01:24:57

Speaker 3

Let me see that's.

01:24:59

Speaker 2

The one that Alan had showcased maybe like five minutes ago.

01:25:02

Speaker 8

No, there was a different there's a different one. Hold on.

01:25:05

Speaker 6

Yeah, it's an Excel spreadsheet that breaks down literally what group they represent. If they're a hub lead, if they're.

01:25:12

Speaker 8

All of that the equity versus a non equity sheet that the working group came back with.

01:25:16

Speaker 2

I know what you're talking about. That must be Sharon's. Yeah. Because this is.

01:25:22

Speaker 8

Libby worked on that hard too. Thank you, Libby. Equity. There we go. I just found it. Okay, I'm going to bring that forward. Do you want me to put that in the chat or how do you want me to actually have access to that document?

01:25:43

Speaker 7

Sharon, feel free to share the screen.

01:25:46

Speaker 8

Okay? I don't have screen sharing.

01:25:54

Speaker 3

Can you give it a shot now?

01:25:56

Speaker 8

Okay, yeah, absolutely. Okay, this is the document.

01:26:03

Speaker 3

Okay. Which ones are the Affinity hubs?

01:26:09

Speaker 8

These twelve on the top are your Affinity Hubs.

01:26:13

Speaker 3

Okay.

01:26:14

Speaker 8

And this was around 33. And when we presented this to the working group, we did an alternative for 33 or 37. And I guess we're at 38. So some seats would get added, but the Affinity Hub seats don't change. Those were in our proposal and those are in our contract.

01:26:30

Speaker 3

Also. Can we make sure that the folks who are kind of doing all the back end work have this document because you guys don't have it. Scarlett or Alan?

01:26:39

Speaker 8

Yeah, they have it.

01:26:41

Speaker 7

We have it. I just wasn't sure what you're referring to.

01:26:44

Speaker 3

Okay, I'm sorry about that.

01:26:45

Speaker 8

They have it, but because we had voted to stay at 33, they went and shared it. But it does not change except for now we're at 38. So the remaining seats are going to be 25.

01:26:57

Speaker 3

So you're saying those are supposed to be populated based on the Affinity Hub. So how are the Affinity Hubs being filled and how are they being the leads being selected? What's your understanding, Sharon?

01:27:07

Speaker 8

It's coming straight out of the election. We were supposed to have elected these prior to CD and the rest of our steering committee. So if we didn't, it has to happen together.

01:27:16

Speaker 3

Well, no, but let's assume that. Just walk, explain to everybody how you think it's supposed to work.

01:27:22

Speaker 8

Nominations open. These are all the 37 now will be 38 seats. Folks are nominated into suppositions a vote occurs no.

01:27:32

Speaker 3

How the Affinity Hubs are supposed to work.

01:27:34

Speaker 8

It's the same way the Affinity Hubs get nominated and they get elected by the HRTC members.

01:27:41

Speaker 3

Where are they getting nominated?

01:27:44

Speaker 8

We're going to open nominations next week. These become twelve of the positions that are open for nominations. So you want to do a voting?

01:27:51

Speaker 1

I'm sorry Sharon, I didn't mean to cut you off.

01:27:53

Speaker 8

Typically identified here are your twelve Affinity Hub seats that you're seeking to elect. You list them, people vote for them. Here are the remaining steering committee seats that you are seeking to elect. And that's going to be 25 of course now because we just added one. And you're going to elect 38 steering committee members. But it doesn't make sense. There's no reason why you can't do them at the same time.

01:28:17

Speaker 3

Yeah, no, I think we definitely can't do it now because I'm like first of all, you need to have the affinity hubs complied. So who makes up the youth affinity hub. And then I think it makes sense from those groups to they then select who their lead is and that lead.

01:28:30

Speaker 8

Automatically should not be it's not a Hub selection. The select Hub selects, the hubs select their sub regional table leads, but not the Affinity Hub leads. You got to go back to that contract. These are steering committee seats which are selected by the HRTC.

01:28:48

Speaker 3

This is all new stuff that I haven't discussed at any of the past meetings. And again, we're almost 30 minutes past our past deadline. So I would say let's leave that off of the vote for the steering committee because until we have some clarity.

01:29:03

Speaker 8

I'm going to be very clear about this. If we do not apply with this, I will challenge this grant at the state because this is in our contract and we have published nine documents from LAEDC. To the public and to our community groups stating that this is what were going to do if we had not been publishing this and saying this is what we're doing and we're using that document to engage people in this process. That is false representation. And you know what? Things change. But this is not change, this is delay and avoidance. So I'm going to be very clear, I will challenge sharon, can you explain.

01:29:44

Speaker 1

Why the Affinity Hub process has why it's taken this long to even get started?

01:29:51

Speaker 8

Delays. I mean, we've pushed the thing down the road to avoid, avoid. There was never any question as to whether or not Affinity Hubs were going to be steering committee. Everybody knew that Benji just put in the thing. We've been going along with this the whole time. I don't know what the pushback is coming back, but I sense that it's coming from LAEDC. It's not the members. The members?

01:30:14

Speaker 3

How are we supposed to elect these?

01:30:19

Speaker 1

For the record, there's been no pushback from LADC on any of the qualifications.

01:30:27

Speaker 3

Form that you fill out to nominate yourself or to be nominated. The group looks at that and makes the best decision based on their interests and who they think can get the job done. Based on your own self description of your experience. That's how this is everybody self nominates. And then you kind of vote for everybody can vote on all the steering committee positions and they can vote on all the Hub leads.

01:30:55

Speaker 8

Just like any other standard election. You see all the candidates, you vote for those positions. That's it.

01:31:03

Speaker 3

There were other forms of voting I recommended, but the governance committee took a straw poll of the people who showed up to that governance meeting that day and recommended to the HRTC that it's an open general election and that's what we're dealing with right now.

01:31:23

Speaker 1

So for clarification everyone, at least on this call, are you saying that you want a regular voting election for the Affinity Hub?

01:31:36

Speaker 6

Yes.

01:31:37

Speaker 2

So it would be one election where twelve out of the 38 would be reserved specifically for that

entity will have two positions, I guess, one, affinity hub lead and be a steering committee member. So they will be receiving funding. So there has to be, I think, some sort of detail about that on the ballot to ensure that people understand that these twelve reserve seats, whoever is voted into these twelve seats will be an affinity hub lead with the \$50,000 grant plus a steering committee member. The rest of the seats will then be broken down into whatever subgroups they might fall in. Is that what we're envisioning as one.

01:32:25

Speaker 8

Of those sounds just like when you're in a non. Everybody up here mostly runs nonprofits. This is almost the same thing of when you do on a board of a nonprofit. You elect your officers and then you have general directors. It's your affinity hub leads and then your general steering committee meets members.

01:32:41

Speaker 1

I don't have the contract. I'm sorry, Sharon, I didn't mean to cut you off, but I don't have the contract in front of me. But from what I recall from the affinity hubs, there was supposed to be a scoring rubric or ranking process for the affinity hubs and tables.

01:32:57

Speaker 8

That is not in our contract.

01:32:58

Speaker 7

The thing that I recall as well as LAEDC staff was onboarded around January or February. And as we were kind of going through these meetings and outreach and engagement meetings, the topic of what are the selection criteria for the affinity hub leads and the table partner leads, that was briefly talked about, but we never went in or that work was never done. Which is why Jermaine took it upon his own hands to create a draft questionnaire. Because if we're talking about electing an affinity hub lead to be a part of the steering committee, that's \$50,000. And we need to ensure that things like capacity, how do we know that these individuals are part of organizations that have capacity to do the work that an affinity hub has to do? There's just so much that goes into it that we haven't gone into. It just it's very unclear, which is why we're at where we are.

01:33:52

Speaker 8

Honestly. That goes to the questionnaire. If you recall, the HRTC did take a vote in terms of how we wanted our nominees to be presented, the entire did. And because there was a talk about doing videos for nominees and all that.

01:34:09

Speaker 1

Stuff, that was for voting for steering committee that had absolutely nothing to do with the affinity hubs.

01:34:13

Speaker 8

And Texas, again, you keep making this distinction that affinity hubs are different than steering committee. That is not in our documentation. That idea came forth as an idea and it came forth after you guys were hired. I'm saying, guys, this has been going on all along, right? Year and a half. There is no change other than in.

01:34:34

Speaker 1

Someone's mind, the issue is that after a year and a half as you say, with the timeline, nothing has been put in place that is not Ladc's fault. It's not our responsibility. We can make suggestions at the end of the day, governance, HRTC, outreach, engagement, you guys have know design something that is best for he certainly has not been holding up the process. We just have to figure out a way to move forward now.

01:35:07

Speaker 4

Hey, Charles, let me jump in real quick, guys. What I would say is this because the August 1 deliverable is not going to change. We've already advocated for as much time as possible. Can someone bring up the idea that Sharon put together in terms of the alternative timeline? Because I guess the bigger piece here is either it's feasible or it's not feasible.

01:35:32

Speaker 1

Exactly.

01:35:33

Speaker 8

That's where I'm mirrors the exact timeline.

01:35:36

Speaker 4

That HLA finalize the questionnaire. So the bigger piece is I put together about 15 questions. I haven't went back on there to see what HRTC has inputted. So we would need to finalize those questions by Monday, essentially. So if we can do that, it's possible that this timeline can work. But that's only if we can finalize that questionnaire.

01:36:01

Speaker 8

You guys are suggesting the 20th as our member list. I think that's the question is going to be when do you cut off members? I think you guys are suggesting the 20th, right? As your memberless member cut off.

01:36:16

Speaker 4

Isn't that what you I think so.

01:36:19

Speaker 7

I don't believe we suggested a member cut off.

01:36:21

Speaker 8

We had your timeline. That you I think she's referring to.

01:36:26

Speaker 1

The nomination process, Alan.

01:36:30

Speaker 2

It's just a nomination. Folks will have up until the day of the deadline to self nominate if.

01:36:36

Speaker 8

They'D like to participate.

01:36:38

Speaker 4

I mean, at the end of the day, guys, like I keep trying to say, August 1 is not going to change. So the best that we can do is try to make this happen. And it just is what it is at this point. I mean, we have the mechanism in place to kind of roll through this. So the other question is, Charles, can that team that is creating this mechanism, can they duplicate this mechanism for this other process this week, this upcoming week?

01:37:11

Speaker 1

We might need to ask I don't.

01:37:13

Speaker 4

Mean what I would say is let's just ask them and the worst they can say is no. If the answer is no. Now my question comes back to Sharon and team and others on the call. Let's just say that the vendor cannot pivot and cannot make this happen for us, for this other voting mechanism.

01:37:34

Speaker 8

Right.

01:37:36

Speaker 4

What can we do to pivot so that we can meet the August 1 delivery?

01:37:39

Speaker 8

We just leave all the 38 seats in one election. Either we separate the affinity hub as a one day election and then we have the rest of the remaining steering committee as a second day election. We do that. That's our option one. The timeline is not changing. We still get it done to Ratify by the 20 eighth. If that can't happen, then it all goes into one election and it still follows the same timeline that you've already proposed.

01:38:06

Speaker 6

Can I ask Jermaine or Charles, when people are doing their self nomination, can't we give them a list of these are the 38 seats that make up the steering committee? Did I cut out? And so when they do that, when they say, okay, this is the one I want to apply for and they're either choosing one of the twelve hubs or they're selecting one of the.

01:38:34

Speaker 8

They'Re.

01:38:34

Speaker 6

Going to have to know that, okay, I'm going to apply to be one of these seven labor.

01:38:38

Speaker 1

So they're knowing, sorry, you dropped out, so we lost a good 10 seconds, I'm sorry.

01:38:44

Speaker 8

So I was saying that so when.

01:38:45

Speaker 6

You put all 38 of them up there that they know they're going to be nominating themselves to either be an affinity hub lead, one of those twelve, or they are selecting to be one of the 26 remaining. And they'll know that if I'm labor, I know I'm applying to be one of those seven labor reps. And that way we only take those individuals up for voting based on which positions they nominated themselves for and we vote for all 38 at the same time. I don't see any other option. If you can't get the voting company to do two separate votes, one for the twelve and then one for the remaining 26, we have to do all 30 at the same time. Just make sure that person knows what they're applying for or what they're nominating themselves for. Absolutely.

01:39:29

Speaker 3

If we're compliant for the state purposes, all they're asking for a list of the HRTC by the August 1. So theoretically we could do election for all the positions but those twelve and just send the RTC names with those 26 names up, say, hey, here's our RTC or our steering committee, and then knowing that, hey, these other will be the affinity hub leads and they'll be pulled out later.

01:39:53

Speaker 4

They want the entire seated governance. They want everyone's name and organization, period.

01:39:58

Speaker 2
Steering committee, not governance.

01:39:59

Speaker 3
Then just put them all up for a vote in all at one time? Yeah, and just specify that these twelve are paid \$50,000.

01:40:08

Speaker 4
Charles, can you just check with the voting company to see what they can because they may be able to do it. I mean, at this point they're mean let's just see if they can do it. And then if the answer is yes, then we have a method of how to move forward. If the answer is no, it sounds like we have two options of how to move forward and we can just check in later today essentially, or first thing Monday morning at the latest.

01:40:33

Speaker 1
Yeah, I can certainly scramble to get them on the phone and see if we can do it, but it has to be certainly mapped out and detailed engineers, they think a little bit differently than the concept. So what's feasible, what's really realistic in their world may not work for us. But I'll find out for some of.

01:40:59

Speaker 3
The points for someone spoke if someone can bring up that document that listed all the specific positions, again, so I want to do a quick kind of just example of what it would look like when it comes to nominating and voting. We may have some positions.

01:41:18

Speaker 8
This is the positions.

01:41:21

Speaker 3
So again the rule says you can only run for one position. So if somebody says, let's say I were to decide I'm running for we have a bunch of people running, a lot of people running for the twelve positions because those are the ones that are paid and then we only have.

01:41:35

Speaker 6
Let'S say seven CBO leaders left.

01:41:39

Speaker 3
Yeah. So say of the other ones we have at least two or three that don't have anybody run for them just because everybody wants to pay positions. So there is a possibility we will get at the end of this and we won't have all 38 seats filled. There may be some that nobody ran for because again, people were trying to pick what they thought they had their best chance of getting elected for.

01:42:01

Speaker 8

Louise in that regard, that's why I recommended the two different election dates. The two different election dates would give you a tally at the end of the Affinity Hub lead. You can nominate, I think you should be able to nominate for more than one seat because that would give you we have one election date, we do all nominations at the same time, but we have one election date for the Affinity Hubs we tally, we then know which remaining seats are open. If someone chose to run for the youth seat in an Affinity Hub and did not secure that seat, they should still be able to be on the list to be considered as a CBO seat on the steering committee. That's why I think there should be allowed more than one nomination. It doesn't mean they're going to win it just means the vote is then going to take place and they're not going to be completely eliminated and of course it's going to be seated based on the majority vote for that particular seat.

01:42:59

Speaker 8

So I think that's why I suggested the two. That gives us a one day in between to close out Finiti Hub. We know what those total are, here's what's remaining and here's our remaining nominees.

01:43:10

Speaker 6

That's a good point, Sharon. That's a really good point, Sharon. I'm just wondering logistically, would the LADC selected vendor be able to turn around and update the list for the remaining 26? That quick to then put it out for a vote. And also that person, that example that you use say that youth rep didn't get selected to be the Affinity Hub lead there, but now they. Want to run for the full now they have to go back and select and put their name in the hat. If we do we logistically can we do it that quick?

01:43:42

Speaker 8

I think they should nominate for both. I think when you go into nominations you should have the option of nominating of being considered for affinity hub seat as well as one of the other seats. It doesn't matter that you're going to win it because it's going to come down to votes anyway. But I think okay, all at once.

01:43:58

Speaker 6

So if we did the votes separately like you said, we did the affinity hubs vote first and that youth person didn't win and they put their name in the hat to be on both either affinity hub lead or one the other 26, then we would automatically say, okay, well now we're going to vote. You get to stay on this list for the 26th remaining because you didn't win for the youth affinity hub or if they did win their name would be taken off of the list of voters absolutely. For their main 26.

01:44:23

Speaker 8

That's why I suggested the one day between staff would tally that not the agency. All they're doing is uploading the list. The people are already there, their profiles are already present.

01:44:36

Speaker 3

That makes sense. Real quick, so actual voting wise, what the ballot is going to look like, I'm assuming one through twelve are going to be their own individual list with where we can pick from on residents. There's three slots. I'm assuming we're not going to have three resident voting. We're going to have one and that the top three vote getters in that space will get those seats. Is that correct or am I guys have something different in mind?

01:45:00

Speaker 2

Yeah. So you can choose up so you'll have the resident sublist or subgroup. You'll have all your choices and you can only choose up to three within.

01:45:11

Speaker 3

Okay, but it's just going to be one list. It's not going to be so the twelve are going to be each one list. The residents could be one list. The workers, resident workers can be one list. So essentially anything that has multiple is going to be one list.

01:45:26

Speaker 2

Yeah. I think the issue right now is just seeing with the vendor if they can do two separate elections or one and if it's one, how do we ensure that those running for the affinity hub lead, I guess they'll be allowed to then run for two seats. Either run for the affinity hub lead seat in case they don't make it, they can run for the remainder of the steering committee seats.

01:45:50

Speaker 3

I think that makes sense. I will least allow people to either.

01:45:52

Speaker 6

Based on the chat that Jermaine and.

01:45:55

Speaker 8

Team say no, only one entity can run for each seat. Yeah, but we're trying to override that.

01:46:01

Speaker 6

We don't know where that I want to say real quick, referring to Summa's question, her initial question. I think were all referring to just the steering committee, one person, one seat. So, yes, I just answered again your question. An organization can be a leader of an Affinity Hub and on a steering committee.

01:46:24

Speaker 4

Yeah, that's a different question. That's two separate questions.

01:46:27

Speaker 6

Right.

01:46:28

Speaker 4

I was only referring to the seat. You can't have more than one seat in any governance structure that I know of. So that's just not going to happen.

01:46:35

Speaker 6

Right.

01:46:36

Speaker 4

You can be an Affinity hub lead as well.

01:46:38

Speaker 3

Yes, but I think that makes sense. Assume there's no objection. I would say you should be able to run for an Affinity hub seat and a brain one of the remaining seats. But again, you don't have to. If you decide, I just want to run for the Affinity Hub or I'm not interested, you can do that. If you want to say, I want to run for the other seat, I would say the limitation would be you can't run for two Affinity hub seats and you can't run for two regular seats. You have to pick one or one and none.

01:47:06

Speaker 8

Well, essentially you can only be elected into one position. That's it?

01:47:09

Speaker 3

No. For ballot purposes.

01:47:13

Speaker 8

Can someone share, I think, what's going to be important on this and we're going to have to extend your deadlines till noon on the questionnaire. And I assume this is a nominations questionnaire. What's important is going to be on this, on the questionnaire. So what do people put forward? And I am still waiting to see that document. So I know that there was this questionnaire sent out and there's a discussion that there was a nomination form questionnaire coming out. Can you please share that in the chat? Because we really do need to be able to push in and make sure that addresses what we think members need to see in order to make an informed decision. Yes, I got it.

01:47:49

Speaker 2

But we'll go ahead and reput on the chat and then just understanding, are we having two nomination forms just because.

01:47:57

Speaker 8

It could one nomination. You do it all in one nomination. You just have to designate. And that's kind of why I'm looking for the can. You're running a board of directors. Some are running for officers, some are going to be general directors.

01:48:10

Speaker 7

I'll drop that in the chat.

01:48:11

Speaker 8

Scarlett can I get one more clarification.

01:48:13

Speaker 6

Though, because maybe I just got confused with these conversations just in the last couple of minutes as we're voting on the representative from the twelve affinity hubs. Are we saying that as you elect this individual, they will be the rep from your affinity hub to or part of the steering committee? We're not saying that you will be the lead of that hub, meaning you're not saying we're voting for you to be the one who gets the 50,000.

01:48:40

Speaker 8

These are the lead positions. Libby okay.

01:48:43

Speaker 6

Is that how everybody understands this? I just want to make sure I'm clear that everybody understands and knows that as they're voting for that youth affinity hub representative, they're also saying that this organization is going to be the lead for the youth affinity hub and receive the \$50,000 to do the work.

01:49:01

Speaker 8

Yes, I think that needs to be.

01:49:03

Speaker 2

Displayed in the ballot. Like, there needs to be an understanding that these affinity hub leads will be receiving a \$50,000 grant because I think it needs to be spelt out and.

01:49:13

Speaker 6

It needs to also be on the nomination form if they understand what they're signing up for. And just to say this is what Benny was referring to because I was part of that governance committee meeting where I didn't vote for the voting. We had a different process that would have allowed us to screen the organizations to make sure that they are qualified and have the experience to do what we're asking of these affinity hub leads. But with this process we've

somewhat removed that. All we can do at the most is ask them to be very clear and identify what their background experience is and how they feel that their experience in their organization can handle that role. And we're just going to base it off what their belief is as opposed to screening. We'd also talked about having only those people who are involved with youth organizations or work in that space to be the ones to actually vote on and nominate theirs.

01:50:01

Speaker 6

Again, we're not doing that now. We're doing everyone all at once. But we do need to make it clear the expectations of those individuals for the affinity hubs on the nomination process or the form and also on the voting instrument that we all see.

01:50:16

Speaker 8

Excellent. You're right on point, Libby. And I don't know if you know, but there's been two meetings where we've been discussing both came from governance, did the same thing as outreach did, what are those eligibility criteria and what do we need to do? And in outreach, we pivoted because we were trying to get away from this idea that there's this great group that's going to score us and evaluate us. But what they did come back with here's the necessary skills to accomplish the role. And I think that's important. And since the money is being designated to provide and carry out that role, we did not want any LEDC or any of the other to put a requirement on. They don't have 25 employees. It's like, look, we're giving you the money to designate a person to do this job. And so I think the skill necessary was important to be in all.

01:51:06

Speaker 8

Both groups talked about that.

01:51:08

Speaker 2

Alan dropped the nomination. The affinity hub lead questionnaire in the chat. Alan, do you have the south nomination for the steering committee, which was the one we presented today? Those are two separate ones. Maybe we can consolidate it and just some way specify the differences between affinity steering committee members and the remainder of the steering committee members.

01:51:34

Speaker 7

Yeah, I'll drop the form in the chat.

01:51:39

Speaker 3

Her hand up. I don't know if it's still but I've had her hand up for a while. I just wanted to see what she had to say before I jump in and make one comment.

01:51:47

Speaker 1

Magdalena, are you still on the call.

01:51:53

Speaker 3

She might have jumped on? No. I believe that of the 300 people here, that everyone's trying to do the right thing by our county and by our communities. But I will identify that it seemed like some people work in multiple county areas. So the issue to me is going to be too, like you're applying for a certain designation in that designated area or in that affinity hub. Your work should be focused around that affinity hub or designation using. My concern is that you might have a nonprofit who says, well, I work in Spa four, but my demographics are spot six. Or I'm just concerned about how we make sure that we have a tight process by which people's skill sets and their history of their work is directly tied to the area they're applying for to do the work in, as opposed to where the base of their organization might be situated.

01:52:47

Speaker 3

I just want to make sure we are clear about that, because I have seen people ask questions around people who serve multiple areas, which is obviously possible in the county. But just want to make sure that whatever people are applying for that they actually are clear to lay out their skill sets, their experience and the capacity to do that. Just real quick, I brought that up, that issue up. That can we verify that? If you say you're working for voting for the labor spot, you do work with labor. The response back, I think, at the governance committee was that, well, that's for the members to decide. We're not going to require any kind of verification. So theoretically, your organization may not have any presidents in Spa Four, but you can still say, I'm running for spa four seat. And if the members vote for you, then you vote.

01:53:29

Speaker 8

Well, Luis, the good thing about it is I think we discussed this both at governance and then we also discussed it in outreach is that people already registered and said where they're located. They already did, and they designated what their primary and secondary service constituents are. So the Laudc already knows who the youth organizations are, who the homeless organizations are, which spa you belong have. That's why that chart's been being brought up every single week to make sure we had representation in those categories. So you're going to be in that questionnaire again is absolutely critical where's your organization classified. I know where I'm classified, and I have a secondary. And then we also put forth where your spot, where you're headquartered and who you're serving. So I know 30% of our HRTC is serving countywide. So our hope was that, and it's not our call was that the spas get there.

01:54:25

Speaker 8

The people get elected based on their spas. But in addition that we had some seats left available for countywide organizations. There are organizations that work countywide, period. And those countywide seats, they should be able to do that. So I guess this nomination form, I can't seem to bring it up. Thank you, Alan. But I think this is where the form has to ask the right questions and I don't know how long we have to chime in on that, but I'm certainly going to be spending some time on that this afternoon.

01:54:55

Speaker 3

Yes.

01:54:57

Speaker 1

Give me 1 second, Scarlett, I'm waiting to hear back. I was communicating with the vendor and he's available at 1130, so I can get some clarification on that. But if there could be one election that has everything mapped out properly, the questions, the criteria, everything that's going to give the voters the reasonable choices, then I can't see him saying that it can't be done because it's an election. At the end of the day, how is the set up right now is only how the system is set up right now is just to do the steering committee, the 33 seats segmented into the 20 CBOs, five resident workers and the two seats for labor and so forth and so on. I'm not exactly sure if he can break it down the way that we're talking, but until we really literally map it out on paper and present it to them, we won't have answer.

01:56:08

Speaker 1

Regardless, there seems to be a huge pivot from the selection process for the affinity hubs versus the voting process for the steering committee. And we have to just figure out a being that there's a million dollars at stake for these affinity hubs and tables, we have to be careful and make sure we get it right. That should be everyone's big concern. The steering committee, we know that's volunteer, there is some quote unquote power connected to that. But the affinity hubs and tables being that there's a million dollars at stake, we have to make sure we get this right. See your hand up.

01:56:57

Speaker 6

Sorry, did you say me?

01:56:59

Speaker 1

I see your hand.

01:57:01

Speaker 6

So I just want to make sure that as what you just said, that it's not actually two completely different processes. I think it's really just that they have to answer more questions in the nomination form that verify their ability to serve as an affinity hub lead as opposed to just being a steering committee member. So maybe it's just that if you're applying to be a steering committee, I mean a affinity hub lead, you need to also answer these additional questions that give more background and information about their capacity and ability to serve in that role, is what I was going to say. But also when it comes to I know this might be a can of worms. But I think it needs to be addressed is what dawn brought up, her point that it's not just organized labor who represent labor. And now that we have seven positions for labor, and I know you're going to have that drop down, so you're voting for labor, vote for up to seven, maybe there are 15 different organizations listed there that are running.

01:58:05

Speaker 6

To be a member of the steering committee representing labor. We need to be clear on who we

are allowing to represent in that field. And so don's point that those beyond just what was spoken about earlier, those who are SIU or this, that, and the other. I think that needs to be clear as well because I don't know if I forgot her name, the woman who was speaking about labor earlier is clear on that as well. That we're not just saying those who are organized and Sci U's or the like are the only people organizations who can run to represent the labor category on the steering committee.

01:58:47

Speaker 2

Yes.

01:58:48

Speaker 6

To Libby's point, labor, we do have organizations that are signed up to the HRTC that are affiliates to the La Federation of labor. So we have the La Federation of labor, we have their affiliates, but we also have worker centers. Like I was replying to, don runs the black La worker hub. Black worker hub. So they are eligible under a labor seat as well. So it's not just La Federation and their affiliates. There are various types that are already fully onboarded partners on the HRTC. Great, thank you.

01:59:26

Speaker 2

So just to make sure that we get direction on our end from LADC, we currently have two separate questionnaires because of how the process started. So now we want to bring them together. Should we just showcase really quickly what we have and then get your suggestion and feedback? We do want to have this finalized by today, seeing that I still need to inform the HRTC through email all the changes and really try to clarify those changes since it really goes against everything we already presented for.

02:00:00

Speaker 8

So I think we need time to review this. I think you need to share this out for input and changes. Because the point is I haven't seen this before. That's why I was asking for it. I have not seen it. I know there was a questionnaire, but in the meeting we said we're going to give you until tomorrow weekend or whatever to make these changes. We need to be able to have everybody chime in, not just the 39 of us that are left. Deadline.

02:00:25

Speaker 2

Can we get direction in regards to a timeline? If we're not going to be able to meet the Monday timeline of having the nomination form go live, then can we come to a consensus of how this is going to affect the remaining of the timeline for the election process now? So by when do you all feel that we should finalize this. It was supposed to be today so it could go live on Monday.

02:00:54

Speaker 4

Darla, real quick, let me chime in real quick, guys. I think that it's. Friday at 11:00. The reality is none of this is going to get done today and we're probably going to at least need all of Monday. So I think we just need to pivot the whole entire timeline, whichever timeline we

go by, to start Tuesday at the earliest. There's no way we're going to get input unless folks are working through the weekend.

02:01:23

Speaker 3

Give a deadline of if that's going to be the case. I said give a deadline of Sunday night for feedback and then we'll have to defer to the LAEDC group as the convener to look at what the feedback is and if it's a way to be incorporated. But I think I'm saying we kind of just got to go. This should have been done. I don't want to focus on the past, but let's just Monday, this needs to go. Whatever time you guys need, I would say I'm fine with even giving people feedback till the end of the day, but Sunday, I mean, Sunday night, they have to provide their feedback and that way it gives you guys a full day to work with the I think.

02:01:57

Speaker 8

Monday is more reasonable. Folks are already gone for the weekend. I think Monday is reasonable. And based on that alternative timeline that I suggested, we still have the time.

02:02:07

Speaker 3

What is it we're asking for feedback on?

02:02:09

Speaker 8

I haven't seen the nomination forms. I also haven't seen the questionnaire. We're just seeing how it was shared previously.

02:02:18

Speaker 2

But how about what we do is LADC will combine both questionnaires in one Google Doc versus two, because that might be confusing. We'll share it out to the HRTC today. Have a deadline for Monday end of date or Monday. Well, we need time on our end to make this go live by Tuesday as well. So Monday, 02:00 P.m.. Is that okay?

02:02:40

Speaker 6

No, I say you do it by Sunday night. If you cut it off by Sunday night, that gives you guys the whole.

02:02:45

Speaker 8

Day to be able to launch. People don't know it's going to be cut off. And the problem is everybody doesn't check their business email on weekends. And that's the challenge we have. Right.

02:02:55

Speaker 3

And that was our mistake for not giving enough people enough time to get this thoroughly reviewed.

02:02:59

Speaker 8

Yeah, we'll have to own that as an HRTC. Yeah. Monday would give us we're still on point and we would have no problem with this going on Monday. Your nominations are going live. You're planning to go nomination live on Monday. You can't do that until you talk to your tech. You can move that to Tuesday. You're still within an election time frame. If you do elections on the 23rd and the 25th, as I was suggesting, with 48 hours for each, you're right in your same sweet spot and you still meet your deadline of having the HRTC ratify the results on the 20 Eighth. It doesn't change the timeline by allowing.

02:03:36

Speaker 2

Additional just clarification just because we need to communicate a consistent message to the HRTC after the fact that everything's now changed from the meeting we will give until Monday. Can I get a time or did we say Monday?

02:03:52

Speaker 8

Close the business.

02:03:53

Speaker 2

Feedback ends Monday. What time?

02:03:55

Speaker 8

Close the business.

02:03:56

Speaker 2

Close a business.

02:03:59

Speaker 3

This is Monday the 17th, correct?

02:04:01

Speaker 2

Yes. So then nomination goes live, the 11th P m.

02:04:12

Speaker 8

Clarify. Scarlett, the 11th is behind us.

02:04:15

Speaker 2

Oh, I'm sorry. The 18th. So Tuesday the 18th goes live at 12:00 P.m. For both the Affinity Hub lead questionnaire all in one. Right. The steering committee this closes on, we're

supposed to have it closed on Thursday the 20th to then have the engineer work through and submit all of this and create the ballot for Monday the 24th of voting.

02:04:42

Speaker 1

Alan, can you pull back up the slide again for the timeline? For the voting timeline?

02:04:48

Speaker 7

Yeah, just give me 1 second.

02:04:51

Speaker 2

So my question is 18 19 20 enough time? We don't have time. But to have everyone nominate themselves for all these positions.

02:05:06

Speaker 8

It's going to have to be okay. Yeah, it may not be, but that's where we are.

02:05:11

Speaker 3

Yeah.

02:05:11

Speaker 2

Okay.

02:05:11

Speaker 8

So can you close your nominations on the yeah, on the 18th, 19th, 20th.

02:05:16

Speaker 1

So instead of having three days for nominations, you have two. So the 18th through 20th can be the self nomination period. Assuming that the engineer can accommodate what we're trying to do, can we make.

02:05:32

Speaker 3

This contingent upon the engineer being able to do this? Because if all of a sudden you guys talked with them today and they said, no, I'm going to need at least a day or two days to do this, then this kind of throws it out the window. So I would say if they come back and say it's not possible, then we move forward. I'm fine. If they say, yeah, we can accommodate it, great, let's do it. But if they come back and say, hey, it's not possible, then I think we have to that's also something we need to be there's limits and Luis.

02:05:57

Speaker 6

When you say accommodate this, you mean accommodate two different voting segments.

02:06:02

Speaker 3

No, I think my understanding was doing one voting segment.

02:06:04

Speaker 8

I think so just your understanding is not what they just said they were going to go back and do. They're going back to verify if we're going to run with two Vic. That's what the next step is. That's what Charles reaching out to text about.

02:06:17

Speaker 2

I don't think you the self nomination, I think can be done one as a whole because what we can do is on the Google form, if you choose Affinity Hub lead, it'll take you to a section specifically for that questionnaire. If you choose steering committee member, regular steering committee member, then that will filter out and the questions will change for that specific application. So I don't think that changes us coming to a consensus on the timeline for the nomination form next week and going live. What would change depending on the Engineer, is the ballot being segmented in that way to then be live on the 24th. So I think we can come to a consensus about the self nomination form. We take comments up until Monday the 17th. It goes live on the 18th at 12:00 P.m.. People will have till the 20th, 05:00 P.m.

02:07:08

Speaker 2

End of day to self nominate for all these categories, affinity Hub lead, Steering Committee the 21st. That's when we'll have answer by then. But that's the day that the Engineer would then need to take all of this information, plug it into their ballot, virtual ballot, to then be ready for the 24th, to then have people the ability to vote 24th until the 27th, which is four days of voting for all of these positions.

02:07:41

Speaker 8

Whether or not it is a bifurcated or not, that timeline still works. You might need to add one day if you end up with a bifurcation. But regardless, by the 25th, you will have a way to have voted on everything.

02:07:57

Speaker 6

Yeah, because if we are able to bifurcate it and Engineer is able to do two, then we would do the voting for the Affinity Hubs on the 24th and 25th, take that beat, like you said, Sharon, on the 26th, and then have voting for the remaining 26 spots for the 27th and 20 Eighth.

02:08:14

Speaker 8

And I was suggesting we move it to the 23rd to give us the 23rd and 24th for the first one and then give us a day.

02:08:22

Speaker 6
Well, 23rd is Sunday.

02:08:25
Speaker 8
Sorry.

02:08:27
Speaker 6
Yeah, that's why I was saying to keep it in line with what they have down here, that Monday and Tuesday would be the affinity hub break on the 26th, and then 27 28 would be for the remaining 26 seats on.

02:08:39
Speaker 8
The steering committee here's, where the only challenge I have on that is our HRTC meets again on the 20 eighth. And we're supposed to be ratifying on the 20 Eighth.

02:08:49
Speaker 2
So I would say the best path forward, which I think the Engineer might be, I can't speak for him, is one election ballot with everything all in one versus.

02:09:00
Speaker 3
Yeah, what's the problem with that?

02:09:02
Speaker 8
Hey, we're not in favor of that because then we won't be able to have people be able to select for both. And so I just think you need to back up one day to the 23rd. I don't care if it's a Sunday.

02:09:12
Speaker 3
Why can't you select for both?

02:09:14
Speaker 8
We talked about it, conversation around that.

02:09:18
Speaker 6
Yeah, we gave the example that if you want to be an Affinity Hub lead, say for the youth and represent the youth section, and you apply and they vote and you don't get chosen. Now you're saying, okay, I didn't get to be selected as the Affinity Hub lead, but I still want to try to be on the steering committee for one of those other vacant spots representing a CBO. So now I want to be on the ballot for the remaining 26, and that still gives an opportunity to be on a steering committee. If we vote for everything at once, you're either putting all your eggs

in one basket, which 01:00 A.m., I going to go for. Am I going to try to be Affinity Hub lead or am I going to go for one of the open CBO positions on the remaining 26?

02:09:53

Speaker 4

One or the other?

02:09:53

Speaker 3

No, because when you're nominating, you're asking you do you want to nominate you could nominate yourself for both the Affinity Hub and one of the other positions.

02:10:00

Speaker 6

But you can only be on the ballot for one.

02:10:02

Speaker 3

No, were changing that. We're saying you can be on the ballot for one on the Affinity Hub and one on the rest of them. So you can pair it on the ballot twice. Yeah, they get voted twice.

02:10:15

Speaker 8

They can't. That's why I'm suggesting you have a day between because that stops that from happening.

02:10:23

Speaker 3

In the situation.

02:10:24

Speaker 8

And the 24th as your Affinity Hub election. The people that are winning those seats are removed from any other ballot seat. The engineer does that on the 25th and then you open the next day, the 26th to the 27th, a two day voting process for your remaining steering committee seat, and then you still can summarize and ratify on the 20 eighth. You just need that day for them.

02:10:53

Speaker 3

To somebody wins two positions, though. You could still have somebody wins the Infinity Hub seat and a regular seat, then just give them the Infinity Hub seat and then go with the next second deck's highest vote for the regular seat. It's done, it's finished.

02:11:06

Speaker 6

We could do that.

02:11:08

Speaker 8

Yeah, I think we could definitely do that. I think that makes it clean. It's one election. Let me put something back into your pocket for that and why that's an issue. You get one token to vote. Do you get to vote for multiple for both? That changes our voting mechanism. Am I understanding the way that Scarlett, you would explain the tokenism process? You got me because it's a technical thing and I don't have answer.

02:11:35

Speaker 3

Yes. You're essentially getting 30.

02:11:38

Speaker 2

There's too many voices all at once. If you can just repeat your question, please. What is your question, Sharon?

02:11:45

Speaker 8

So within the voting structure that you guys presented, you're giving each person a token to vote once. Right. So if they are voting on Affinity Hubs, they cast their one vote for all of those twelve categories. Right. Then.

02:12:03

Speaker 2

It would be two tokens. If we bifurcate, if it's two separate elections, two separate ballots, two separate web pages, it's two different tokens that they.

02:12:12

Speaker 8

Would use and they can't be used at the same time. It's not like I can use that one token to vote for two different that is what I was thinking. Because if you're doing it, whatever. I'm in a hush. I got my question answered.

02:12:26

Speaker 3

So I think there may be some misunderstanding. Here's how I understood it. Tell me if I understood it incorrectly. So I get my one token, I can vote my one time there's twelve Affinity Hub seats. My understanding was I get to vote for each of those twelve categories. Is that correct? Yeah, that's correct. Okay.

02:12:43

Speaker 6

Correct.

02:12:43

Speaker 3

So I get to each of those twelve. So I got twelve votes ready and then for the remaining 30 to 26 seats against, for those that are essentially I get 26 more votes. So there is no controversy about you get multiple essentially you get 38 votes and that is affected whether so you could still vote for Infinity Hubs and the other ones at the exact same time and it's clean.

02:13:11

Speaker 6

Correct. We agree with you that we could do that. And if the person who was the youth rep is on the ballot twice and they win affinity hub and that's the one they want, then it would just go down to the next one who got the highest number of votes, and that would be the rep for whatever that particular 26 one of those 26 positions that they applied for.

02:13:35

Speaker 3

And I suspect most people who nominate for the Affinity Hub are also going to nominate for the regular ones. So we're likely going to be multiple people are going to be there multiple times.

02:13:44

Speaker 6

Well, but I think we have to limit it to I really do think you can only apply for one Infinity Hub and one of the 26 spots.

02:13:54

Speaker 3

You can't oh, yeah, no, yeah, but I'm saying they'll be on there at least twice, but yeah.

02:13:59

Speaker 6

Or should say no more than twice.

02:14:01

Speaker 3

No more twice. Sorry. At most twice.

02:14:08

Speaker 8

I think we've made a tremendous amount of progress, guys, in terms of just kind of adhering to what our vision is. And I know that this has been challenging. I think we've got to move forward and put some feedback on the ballot. So if you could send those forms out I know Ellen, you sent me one, both of them. Because I would like to look at them again. There are some parameters that need to be laid out. I can be very clear. One of the things that we discussed is we need to put a limit on spas because we have two spas that have over 60 members they could select without our commitment to geographic equality, which is also in our contract. One spa could assume all seats and that would be completely against our whole concept of geographic equity. In our contract, it says equal geographic representation, not equity.

02:15:07

Speaker 6

Sharon that can't be accomplished with self nomination. If we do self nominations. We can't guarantee that it may not end up like it just may because only those people from those spas are the ones who applied the most.

02:15:20

Speaker 8

Yeah, but if we don't put limit on it, we will have a real problem. I can't imagine downtown La taking of our entire steering committee members because they have 65 members, they could fill up the entire steering committee and that would leave out everybody. So we have to put limitation and I think the discussion had come forward was to limit each spa to three and then leave some seats for countywide organizations.

02:15:45

Speaker 6

I don't know how you would do that in the nomination process. If you're allowing me to self nominate myself, how you're going to it's not.

02:15:51

Speaker 8

In nominations, it's in seating. I looked at it, I analyzed it. I certainly am going to put comments into the ballot. The ballot structure issue. I'll put comments on the ballot structure as to that.

02:16:03

Speaker 3

Yeah, I think that's a nomination. I like the idea of having balance among the spas, but I think that this is just too much to add.

02:16:12

Speaker 8

At this last minute. It's only in the ballot. I will certainly put the comments in it because again, our contract calls for geographic equality and that is something that we definitely have to do. It would be a sin.

02:16:25

Speaker 3

Then you should have mentioned this earlier.

02:16:27

Speaker 8

Not like no, it has been 2.

02:16:29

Speaker 3

Hours pass, like when everybody's gone, when there's like less than 25 people on the call or 30.

02:16:33

Speaker 8

This has been mentioned, discussed, proposed, way back. Again, it's not an issue. It's only in the ballot.

02:16:40

Speaker 6

I have to confirm her point. She has been consistent in bringing up that point about equity amongst the spas.

02:16:48

Speaker 3

Let's be clear, it's not equity, Libby. It's not equity. It's equality. If this was about equity, this would look very different.

02:16:58

Speaker 8

Very different, right. It is equality and the language of geographic representation made it into the proposal and was picked up in the contract. We committed to it and I have been consistent about it only because it's what our outreach team wanted to make sure our whole structure how would you.

02:17:19

Speaker 3

Recommend we accomplish it?

02:17:21

Speaker 8

It's just a ballot issue. It's a matter of how you run the ballot. It's no different than if you were trying to elect city council representatives. You would have a ballot that had representatives for your city council and all it does is it shows up on their profile. And you know what? You will seat the highest number of voted seats in that spot.

02:17:42

Speaker 3

You might have one spot that has seven people run for the seat to be the hub and another one that has 70 people. And all 300 people are going to vote and they get, like you said, one token per area. So it's just going to be an interesting situation there. But we're trying to limit the ability for the 70 people to be part of the six spa areas. So it's by district, basically by geographic district is all. But we don't have seats per spa, though. That has to be part of the ballot. If you go back to the list if you go back to the list of votes we're going to use, how does that look? Explain that.

02:18:23

Speaker 8

I think you just nailed it, Benny. So you might have 70 people nominate be nominated, I understand. And they're going to win the ballot.

02:18:31

Speaker 3

How does that work from an implementation point of view on the ballot? Show me. Walk me through about a sample.

02:18:36

Speaker 8

I actually suggest that's one of the driving forces of the recommendation of Bifurcation,

because if you end up with affinity hubs and your people get seated, they select whoever the winners are for the various affinity hubs, those twelve seats are going to come off of the 38.

02:18:54

Speaker 3
Right.

02:18:55

Speaker 8
So we have the 26 remaining seats. People are going to nominate who they nominate. They're going to run for what they have. But if you have, let's say you have five seats that are all coming from the South Bay district in your affinity hub, you're going to have people nominated that should not be allowed to take additional to be seated for additional seats on that steering committee. And that's why we need that one day to summarize and tally. Here's what happened.

02:19:26

Speaker 3
Yeah, Sharon, but by then it's too late to the nomination.

02:19:33

Speaker 8
It's in the nomination. It comes down to seating. Who gets the highest if you've only got three seats available, whoever gets the highest number of votes for those three seats is going to be seated. But they can't be seated if you can't seat someone in Antelope Valley if they've already got five seats on the steering committee. So you won't have it available, but.

02:19:57

Speaker 3
You won't be limited at that point. I think you have to do this as part of the requirement to be nominated.

02:20:04

Speaker 8
Right.

02:20:05

Speaker 3
You have to have a category that says you are running for this area and people will vote one time for that area and the majority of people that are in that area that are run get it. But I don't think you change the remainder of the steering committee one day later based on that. I don't think you could say, hey.

02:20:22

Speaker 8
And that's why I'm suggesting it's going to have to be in the not. That's why that nomination form is critical.

02:20:29

Speaker 3

Are you going to say certain people can't nominate can't be nominated? No, the idea is, I'm sorry, you're limited to what you be nominated for and you're voted in that block and the top election gets that person. It's not like I have no idea what someone just walking me through an example. Give me a sample of what this looks like. Explain. I'm trying to give an example. So if you're going to be nominating yourself to be a hub lead for youth, then you might have 20 people that apply for that. And those people, the majority of people might get elected for a youth seat might be from, let's say, East La. That's who we voted on. That'll be the rep. So you're trying to create categories to try and limit or to try and advance equity I'm sorry, equality across the region. So you're going to have to at least have some representation from the Antelope Valley.

02:21:34

Speaker 3

And so to do that, you got to protect for that. So you have to have a structure or process that allows for that to happen intentionally. So the spa areas, maybe that's the way we're going to do it. But it's got to be designed and it's in the nomination form, but it's also in the ballot.

02:21:50

Speaker 8

It's got to be on the nomination.

02:21:51

Speaker 3

Form at this point.

02:21:52

Speaker 8

And it's not complicated. It is no different than a general election. When you go in and vote, I don't care how many votes a person gets, they're only going to get one X number of seats on the city.

02:22:03

Speaker 3

Council, but no one's explaining how it's going to work. So let's say we do the vote for, let's say let's focus on the affinity hub. So let's say it's twelve. We have the votes, we have Luke, nominating Selves have the vote. And let's say nine of the seats end up being from organizations that designate that said, they represent spa. One can't happen. What can't happen?

02:22:22

Speaker 8

You cannot seat nine individuals.

02:22:24

Speaker 3

So how do you stop that from happening?

02:22:26

Speaker 8

You take the top three.

02:22:29

Speaker 3

So even though you ~~w~~9 the top vote getters in your categories, six of you are not going to be seated.

02:22:38

Speaker 8

You have to take the top three or whatever.

02:22:41

Speaker 6

This is not going over, Sharon.

02:22:46

Speaker 8

We got to figure it out. Steering committee members. So steering committee members again, do you want a steering committee of 38 and then turn around and have 25 of those be from one spot? Absolutely not. And with our GRR structure, that can happen. You have to say we're going to seat the top three from this spa based on vote count because you guys have chosen these people.

02:23:14

Speaker 3

No. Sharon, of the 38, you're saying that you're going to divide 38 by five county areas.

02:23:21

Speaker 8

Well, here's what was suggested and what it was suggested. And again, we chimed in on this. This went to governance. Governance chose not to deal with it because they didn't want to do any of this. They wanted a selection committee. The suggestion was to have three seats per spa, which would give you 27 seats guaranteed for each spa. And then we have 30% of our membership for countywide organizations and then leave the remaining for county wide organizations. Those nomination processes are already validated by the data and the categories that LAEDC has. And that's what Jermaine was saying. We already don't validate that because we already have all of that you did it on your profile. But if you have three times nine that gives you 27. Then you have ten remaining seats. Oh, I got a countywide organization I'm going to run for the countywide available seats, have at it.

02:24:15

Speaker 8

But the key issue is you must have some mechanism, whatever that comes to for equality.

02:24:22

Speaker 3

Yeah, I think this is a little bit down the road at this point. I don't think you're going to be able to figure that out, not the way it's set up with everybody voting across the board. I don't think you're going to have a way to really designate that affinity. Hubs are not tied to geographic spaces.

02:24:41

Speaker 8

No they're not.

02:24:42

Speaker 3

All those are gone. Hearing committee is not assigned to geographic area. It's based on your affinity of what you do in your area of work. Right. So there's the labor category, community based organization category. So I don't see how we're going to be then say, well everybody vote but then we're going to take the top votes and then we're going to make sure that the representation across the five areas or the entire spas and who's going to pick and choose that.

02:25:12

Speaker 8

I think that's going to be that's very complicated. Again, that's why I've been waiting for the form. I'll take a look at the form, I'm going to chime in and some feedback. Again, I think we have to have within our ballot, everybody's still going to get their vote within our ballot a mechanism to address the geographic equality because we have some spas that have 25 members only right now and we have some spas that have 80 members.

02:25:42

Speaker 3

Yeah, there's a lot of reasons for that too, but I'm sure it is the structure from the beginning should have been geographic if that's what were going to focus on. But the structure was about equity and that's the challenge is that we never addressed the equity issue in a real way to drive this process. Now we're talking about geography because I understand what you're saying. All parts of the county should be represented. I agree. But this is supposed to be an equity lens program and so it's hard for me not to figure out how you're going to create a balance of that at this point in the game when the whole structure is set up in a different the spirit of this was set up differently. The results, somebody could complain and say well why are there only two people from the Annarille Valley on the entire steering committee when there's a big issue in the Annal Valley related to hot climate justice issues?

02:26:34

Speaker 3

But we didn't set it up that way at this point I think it's kind of hard to do it. So yes, but we did take this.

02:26:40

Speaker 8

Up in the two hour working group. We did take this up and we came back with a proposed that equity versus non equity seat structure to be able to ensure that we had both. That's what came out of that two hour meeting.

02:26:57

Speaker 6

You are correct, Sharon, we did. But what you didn't do is determine how that could be accomplished via the ballot process.

02:27:04

Speaker 8

You are correct. No, we didn't get that far.

02:27:06

Speaker 6

So I would say for a second.

02:27:10

Speaker 2

I just want to make a recommendation.

02:27:11

Speaker 6

One recommendation I made to the team is that when we have the names and the spas that the different partners who are recommending themselves self nominating, we have the information of their name and spa. Either they provided or we have the information from when everyone signed up. We have that listed on the ballot. We can recommend to you all who are voting to take into consideration the spa where everyone is located unless one of you put into the recommendation form different options. I'm hearing the various dialogue and I like some of the recommendations, but at this point, what can we put on the ballot to ensure that the partners who are voted on for the steering committee and for the affinity hubs are in various locations? Because we don't know who all is going to self nominate. Like was mentioned before, we have a few partners in some area and we have a ton in certain spas and so we don't know exactly which all nominations will get, but we can list the name and the spot that they are from on the ballot and then everyone can take that into consideration when they are voting.

02:28:26

Speaker 3

As an additional consideration. If you could put all this in a ballot, it's got to be like a process, not just a simple ballot that you fill in the dot. I would also put some sort of data that shows the levels of challenges across the county. So that could help maybe people be a little bit more conscious of making sure that if they're going to vote for something, they're voting in a certain area because they see the data shows how bad things are or the data shows what projects are already being invested in. And so how would we leverage these resources? There has to be something that helps people consciously think outside their own space, right? Because in the traditional way, just being very right, people will be like, well, I'm working in South La, I'm working in San Gabriel Valley, I'm working in East La.

02:29:11

Speaker 3

So my concern is making sure resources come to our area. So unless we have these data points that help us be more conscious about, hey, yeah, let's make sure we get resources East La. But what about look at Anna Valley? Or look at the East Valley San Fernando area? Look at how bad things are. Then we're more consciously going to make a decision to make sure we have some of my votes go to some of those groups is what we're trying to do at this point is one thing. And then making sure that we have some way of categorizing in the groupings on the ballot and then making sure we put that in the nomination form to be conscious that we

want representation across the county. I mean, structurally, those are things we could do, Sharon, at this point, to be in compliance as best we can with the contract, but I don't think it's going to guarantee equal representation across the board, and I don't think you can mandate it at this point.

02:30:03

Speaker 8

We have to strive for what the language in the contract states and create for that. We can't make no guarantees.

02:30:10

Speaker 3

We can do a couple. Here's the two things I'd recommend. Just make for sure the questionnaires list. What spawns the individuals represent? And then two, let's look at what the results are. If all of a sudden we find out, hey, you know what? We were worried there was going to be one region dominated. Turns out, no, it was actually pretty diverse. Then it's a mood issue. If it turns out like, hey, anilo Vella has no representation, we added five seats to the steering committee. Now, we could directly say, hey, we're going to add three more seats for these specific regions. So that's an option.

02:30:38

Speaker 8

All right, so, guys, let's all work on this thing and see. Thank you for getting to it again. I apologize to make such a stink at the last minute, but I've been beating this drum for six months, the same drum, and our committee has been very active in voting on things that they want it to come forward. And because we're just getting to see the proposed nomination forms and ballot stuff today, I will make sure to reach out to committee members so they can chime in. It's not just I know Stella is waiting for me to call her right after this meeting so that our committee members can chime in. And we all do the best we can. We're committed. Remember, our hearts are in the right place, all of us.

02:31:20

Speaker 3

All right, folks. Thank you. I got to jump off. I got 1130.

02:31:23

Speaker 8

Thank you for the it's lunchtime, right?

02:31:25

Speaker 3

I got another meeting. Sarah.

02:31:27

Speaker 8

It I need some food. You guys have a good weekend.

02:31:30

Speaker 3

All right?

02:31:30

Speaker 6

Thanks, everyone.

02:31:31

Speaker 8

God bless.

02:31:34

Speaker 2

So it's Monday at five before I.

02:31:36

Speaker 3

Have to jump off too.

02:31:37

Speaker 6

Monday at five is the deadline to give feedback on the nomination form.

02:31:40

Speaker 3

Yes, I believe that's what we agreed to.

02:31:42

Speaker 6

Okay. All right. Thanks, guys.

02:31:45

Speaker 8

Have a great weekend. Thank you, everyone. Have a good week