



LA HRTC Biweekly Partners Meeting

Meeting Notes and Transcript

August 25th, 2023

[Meeting Recording](#)

Passcode: VDd2y@qY

Meeting Summary:

Charles Johnson, the Program Director for CERF, mentioned that they had a meeting to discuss challenges within the CERF program in LA. Labor issues were a major concern, but there has been no update on their engagement with the program yet. There were updates on upcoming elections for Affinity Hub Leads and vacant steering committee seats. Voting process details were explained for new partners. Information was shared about an extension of the deadline for proposals related to tribal-led economic development projects funded by CERF Tribal Funding Opportunity.

There were discussions about the involvement of labor in the decision-making process and the importance of having them at the table. Updates on research requests for proposals (RFPs) were provided, including information on deadlines and how potential bidders can participate. The need for bylaws for the steering committee was emphasized to prevent challenges faced in previous programs. A dedicated research analyst has been hired to work with vendors on three different reports. The Catalyst program proposal was presented by Matt Phillips from the Governor's Office of Planning and Research. Changes have been made based on feedback received, including decreasing funding amounts, and allowing more flexibility in funding categories. The goal is to bridge the gap between Planning and Implementation phases, maximize investment opportunities, support regional economic development, and create clean energy jobs.

California is receiving a significant amount of federal funding, including \$190 billion and an additional \$48 billion from the California Climate Commitment Funds. There is an opportunity to turn \$600 million from CERF into potentially billions of dollars for the state. The goal is for regions to match federal funds for implementation projects to expand spending. The Catalyst program aims to link up with additional federal funds and fund entire projects. There are discussions about equity-based decision-making and ensuring that historically disadvantaged communities receive support. Regions will have decision-making power on how funds are distributed within their areas.

Action items:

1. Keep moving forward and reserve the seats in the steering committee election for labor, and bring them up to speed once they reengage.
2. Members review the nomination tracker and candidate applications to make an informed decision during the elections.
3. Partners to review the Catalyst program information that will be shared through the newsletter and website.

4. Vacancy selection, completing the regional Plan part one, and the development of the steering committee bylaws and selection criteria for the sub-regional tables.

Transcript:

07:14

Speaker 2

Good morning, everyone. I'm going to just give another minute or so to allow more people to come in and then we'll get started. All right. Good morning, HRTC LA new, pending, and current. I am Charles Johnson, program Director for La CERF, and I always like to reference my favorite name and smile on the call. Rhonda love. I don't know if you're here, but welcome everyone.

08:21

Speaker 3

Good morning. Good morning, Charles. Good morning, everybody.

08:25

Speaker 2

All right.

08:26

Speaker 4

Good morning.

08:28

Speaker 2

Good morning, everyone. So here's our agenda. We're going to start off, as usual, having our new partners introduce themselves. We'll have some updates on the election and the next steps, some information about extension of the tribal funding, the info and the research RFPs. And we also actually have a research analyst for CERF Now. He just signed, but we'll go into that a little bit later on. Also a little information bylaw suggestions for us during committee members and then the Catalyst program updates. I'm sure a lot of people are waiting to hear about that process mapping and capacity building updates and then our usual stakeholder and next meeting steps. So before we really get started, I want to talk about this meeting that the state OPR, Go Biz, and a few member of the Laadc team, myself included, had last Thursday where we discussed some of the challenges within the CERF program in La, particularly dealing with bylaws capacity building.

09:55

Speaker 2

Labor obviously was the biggest one, and it's important that you guys know that. One question that I asked was, has labor indicated what it would take for them to come back and reengage with the CERF program? And they really didn't have answer. They're still negotiating and talking with them. So it's whatever discussions they have, it wasn't privy to. However, for now, let's just keep moving forward. We're going to keep those seats reserved in the steering committee election, keep those six seats reserved for them, and we're all going to move forward. And when they come back to reengage, we'll just have them bring them up to speed. So as we go through the election updates, you'll understand why those seats are still

vacant. For right now, let's have any new partners on the call introduce themselves. Please don't be shy. I'll give you the floor right now.

10:54

Speaker 2
Go for it.

11:07

Speaker 3
Hi, everyone. My name is Margarita Martinez and I'm here representing the South Central Fitness, Health and Arts. We are a nonprofit and what we do is what we specialize in, fitness and arts, or areas with low income they're in the low income areas, and specifically our target population has been the community that are overwhelmed by diabetes.

11:30

Speaker 2
Oh, wow. Thank you for joining. Thank you for saying that. Okay, that's very important. A friend of mine is a diabetes specialist and I'm very aware of that. That could turn into an epidemic. So it's a great thing what you're doing. Anyone else on the call. Okay, going once, going twice. All right, let's move on.

12:08

Speaker 3
Hey, good morning, everyone. Thank you all for being here. As you all know, for those that have been a part of this process with us, we've already had three elections that have currently sat what we have of the steering committee. Our affinity hub leads, as well as the previous election we had last week. That was to break a triple tie that we had. Now we are going to be moving forward with two more elections that are meant to seat vacant seats that did not move forward in the initial process because of lack of nominations that we had received. We did have nominations open this past week. They are now officially closed and we will be moving forward with two more elections. So the first election will be taking place August 20, Eighth 09:00, a.m. Monday morning until August. That will be for an affinity hub lead seat, one for academia and one for immigrants.

13:11

Speaker 3
We also will be moving forward the week after to finalize the vacant steering committee seats. So the week after, we will have five total resident seats as well as one municipal seat. As mentioned earlier by Charles, we currently do have vacant labor seats, and those seats will remain vacant until we receive more of an update in regards to labor's re engagement with the CERF program. We will be sharing in the chat the nomination tracker that we've created. This is similar to the past nomination trackers that we've displayed where it shows you who is running for what seat, shows you their candidate statement, as well as other additional questions such as where are they serving, what service planning area they're serving. So we do ask our members to please look at that, look at the affinity published applications. Since not all the questions in the questionnaire are on the ballot, due to limitation, we did publish the application so that our members can go ahead and look at those applications, see all the questions that were asked of.

14:25

Speaker 3

We do ask that you please study these applications and look at this nomination tracker so you are prepared to make an informed decision on who should be elected into these remaining vacant seats that will be up for election starting next Monday and the following Monday after that. So in the chat shortly, I will be sharing these two links. If we can go ahead and move forward with the next slide. We do have our voting process mechanism. This is more for new partners. We have had an uptick of some new partners that have joined us, so I did want to go ahead and cover how this process does work. Everyone that is a fully onboarded partner with the partnership letter will be allowed one vote. The registered voter is the point of contact that was listed in the partnership letter. If the registered voter needs to be updated, please have the original point of contact.

15:20

Speaker 3

Just reach out to us for this request. And I know that there are some organizations where their point of contact is no longer with the organization. Just please have someone within that organization resubmit a partnership letter and we will go ahead and update those voter credentials in regards to the voting process. At the beginning of each election, right at the beginning of the 09:00 A.m. Mark, you should receive a unique token via email. This unique token will allow you to have access to that virtual ballot that you will be voting on. Once all votes are submitted on the ballot, your vote will be cast and the token will be closed. And as usual, we do present all the results. At the end of the voting window closing, we do ask that you please check your spam folder. Sometimes the tokens go into the spam folder, so please check the spam folder.

16:16

Speaker 3

If you do not see it in your regular inbox, and if you don't see it in your spam folder, then please reach out to CERF@laedc.org. We will make sure that you do get your token. We do ask that you please reach out to us before the deadline of the voting window closes. Once that voting window closes, we don't have access to it automatically closes on the engineer's end. So we do ask that if you are intending to vote to please reach out to us if there are any issues prior to that deadline and if we can go ahead and move forward to the so, up next, we do have our CERF Tribal funding opportunity. This was presented in the last meeting. We just want to announce that there is a deadline extension. So the proposal application deadline will be for now, September 20 Eighth at 03:00 P.m..

17:09

Speaker 3

And this is specific CERF Tribal funding opportunity that will be up to 25 million for tribal led economic development, planning and implementation projects. So we will be sharing this slide on our website as well as through our next newsletter that will be coming up next week. So anyone that is interested in applying for this, please submit your proposals by September 20 Eighth at 03:00 P.m.. And lastly, I believe so this is actually Charles who will be speaking, so I'll go ahead and turn it over to him.

17:48

Speaker 2

Okay, before I see there's a couple of hands up Luis, and I can see the other name. Oh, Libby.

17:56

Speaker 5

I saw that the elections can be held for the Affinity Hub leads for the two remaining ones that are open. My understanding was that the Affinity Hubs will each have representation from each affinity Hub groups will have representation from each of the service areas. How will those be filled? Will they be an election? Or is that just appointment? How does that work?

18:19

Speaker 2

Louise, I'm not sure I understand your question. Can you repeat it?

18:24

Speaker 5

So the Affinity Hub lead is supposed to be the lead of a group that has a bunch of other groups that make up the affinity hub. I saw one of the slide decks a couple months ago at one of these meetings. How will those finish sheet hubs be filled out?

18:42

Speaker 3

So Luis, I think to clarify the understanding of the affinity hub lead, so the affinity hub lead will be convening entities, stakeholders within the different themes of that affinity hub lead, but those aren't going to be is and we'll be sharing more later along the lines of how affinity hub leads will be working. But they are basically a convener who will be reaching out and doing outreach into their specific service, into their specific thematic areas to bring those entities into the fold to be able to receive the feedback and the input that we need for our regional plan. So we will be sharing more, but they're not necessarily selected. It is the outreach work that the affinity hub lead must do to convene those specific entities for that feedback within their thematic area.

19:35

Speaker 5

Okay, just final question. So I guess my understanding was that those individuals participating in the affinity hubs would receive a grant as well. I guess we've talked about all these groups getting grants. Who is all getting grants and how are those being selected?

19:54

Speaker 3

I want to say Louise, I think it sounds like also you're referring to the micro grantees. The 90 upcoming, those haven't been decided like how those will be dispersed yet. I mean, right now we are on the affinity hub as Scarlet mentioned. So I'm wondering, is your question related also to the 90 micro grantees?

20:14

Speaker 5

I guess I assume that 90 micrograntees were part of the affinity hubs.

20:18

Speaker 3

Oh no. Okay. Those are separate. Yeah. So we still have the table partner leads and the 90

micro grantees that we have not processed yet. Right now it's just been affinity and steering committee. And after the steering committee is seated, then we'll move forward with table partner leads and the micro grantees. They're separate from the affinity hub leads.

20:48

Speaker 2

Ms. Libby? Libby Williams.

20:50

Speaker 3

Yeah, hi. Thanks. I just had a question about the labor positions that are open. I thought that one of our previous meetings we had said that it wasn't defined exclusively to be organized labor. But it sounds as if now we are saying that those six spots are going to be held specifically for organized labor. Is that what we are defining it as now?

21:16

Speaker 2

That's a good question, Libby. And it was definitely I actually had to go back and just do a little POW wow with the state about that. And if you remember back to the big frustrating meeting that we had when the seats were increased from 33 to 38, the reason it was increased was due to CBOs, the amount of CBOs in the steering committee. So to answer your question is yes, organized labor, so to speak, those seats are remained for them because we increase those seats for the CBOs. What we're trying to prevent is having more CBOs go into those labor seats, which theoretically could turn off the organized labor unions and not make them come back. So we earmarked those seats for them. So we want to leave those seats for them.

22:26

Speaker 3

Okay, just so I'm clear, we originally just had one, and we increased it with additional five to make it a total of six. Is that where we are now?

22:38

Speaker 2

Well, it was originally one, then it was two, but it was increased from two to seven. So it was five additional seats that was given to them. Keep in mind that when the Affinity League Kiwa, when they were elected, they automatically got a steering committee seat. That's why there's six.

22:59

Speaker 3

Okay. Gotcha.

23:00

Speaker 6

Okay.

23:00

Speaker 3

Thank you.

23:03

Speaker 2

Any other questions before we move on?

23:06

Speaker 1

Charles.

23:07

Speaker 7

I would just add one thing real quick. And for the record, to be quite honest, and for those on the call that may not realize that are new labor is a partner that is mandated by the state as an entity to be involved in this process particularly in a decision making or validating body role which would be the steering committee. So we're in a position where, one, we have a deliverable we have to meet as HRTC, and two, obviously out of good faith in the fact that we all agreed on those five additional seats, we're leaving those vacant for that purpose as well. So just wanted to clarify that because it is a mandate and so we would fall short of our deliverables not having them at the table.

23:53

Speaker 2

That's a good point.

23:54

Speaker 3

Can I just ask one last question? If they choose to. Since you said that it was unclear from that meeting where they stand. If they choose at the end not to join us, are we still going to be held to be not in line with what our mandate was? If they opt to elect not to be a part of Serf and then go their own way?

24:17

Speaker 2

Yeah, I think that's a question for the state because I had a similar question in that meeting as well. But I have a good feeling they're working well with the labor unions in order to bring them back to the table. However, that's a decision that the state made, not anything that we even have privilege.

24:37

Speaker 3

All right, thanks.

24:42

Speaker 2

So the updates on the research, the RFPs last week, there was the Bidders Conference where we gave an informative presentation for different vendors, and CCF facilitated that meeting. The period to apply ends on September 5. But there's a Q and A period also where the potential bidders well, the bidders potential vendors could ask questions. We answer those questions, and then we post those where the bidders can see the answers and consider if they want to move forward with their bids. If you'd like to see that meeting, there's the link. There

that you can click on. And there is a passcode right there where you can click on to see it. And just a recap of the three RFPs that everyone's bidding on is for the labor market analysis, the industry cluster report. And even though the third one is a little bit more generic, it is for a climate report.

26:07

Speaker 2

We're looking for either three separate vendors or one vendor who can handle all three or some type of combination. So keep in mind that the research vendors will be working with this dedicated CERF research analyst who was just signed. I don't want to mention his name right now, but he should be on calls going forward. After Labor Day, it was an exhaustive search, and I'm talking about over close to 500 candidates, zero down to two, and that became competitive. So make sure once he comes aboard that we all give him a nice warm welcome. But our research RFPs will be working with him. You guys will be working at the HRTC. The steering committee affinity hub leads. You all be working with him as well to gather the data and share with one another. Also, in that meeting with the state, we talked about the importance of having bylaws for the steering committee.

27:16

Speaker 2

What we want to prevent is having some of the challenges and frustrations that we had with the CERF program up to this point. And a lot of that had to do with two things. There was no process in place for what consensus was. We have that in place now. But also there wasn't a live document of bylaws that we could all go back and refer to eliminate some of the ambiguity of how to move forward and how to make decisions. So that is going to be one of the first things that the steering committee should focus on. And one of our partners from regional partners from the southern border, they've paid great attention to organizing their bylaws and they shared how their document with can you I can't remember where we posted that or link to it.

28:18

Speaker 3

I'll share the link. Right.

28:20

Speaker 2

Yeah, yeah. So we have a copy that. I highly encourage the current steering committee members to take a look at this and just not that you're adopting what they do, but put your thinking cap on and how we can apply it to the Los Angeles region and let's move forward and make sure that the second half the most important work we do. It a lot smoother than it's been up to this point. If Chris from GoBiz or Matt from OPR is on the call, I'd like for them to take over this slide. This is dealing with the Catalyst program, which I'm sure a lot of people on this call are interested. Oh, Matt, you're here. Great. So what I did, Matt, is I just took four slides from the Community of Practice meeting. You can just discuss it however you feel I can chime in if you need, but I'm sure they much rather hear the information from you a little bit more versed than I am.

29:33

Speaker 1

Yeah.

29:34

Speaker 8

Thank you so much, Charles. Good morning, everyone. I'm really glad to be here. Thank you so much for having me. My name is Matt Phillips. I'm a senior program analyst at the Governor's Office of Planning and Research. I work specifically on the CERF program, and OPR is one of the three agencies that helps run CERF for anyone unfamiliar. So I'm here today to present our updated Catalyst program proposal. We're calling it catalyst. 2.0 and what I want to do thank you, Charles, for putting these slides together. What I want to do is just talk through a little bit about what we heard and then what we're proposing now. Just a little bit of background on Catalyst for those who may not be aware. So originally CERF was a program that has had a planning phase, which is what you all are doing now. Each region gets \$5 million.

30:26

Speaker 8

Each of the 13 regions gets \$5 million to do this inclusive equitable economic planning process. And then the implementation phase had about \$450,000,000 reserved for funding projects that emerge out of those planning processes. What we heard and have seen over the past year is essentially that we need some other phase in this process to bridge the gap between planning and implementation. There just hasn't been a enough projects that we, within our program timeline, will be able to fund through implementation because of how long it takes to get projects built and up and running. And our funding expires in September of 2026. And so that's the end of the CERF program as it is now in the legislation. And so we wanted to figure out a way to move some of that money forward, get it out into communities faster, and make sure that we're building up a pipeline of projects that are aligned with state goals and that also allow us to maximize investment from other state programs as well as the federal government.

31:37

Speaker 8

Right now, we're in sort of a period of historic federal and state funding opportunities. There's 48 billion from the California climate commitment. That's a three year horizon. And then combined from the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, the Inflation Reduction Act, and the Chips and Science Act, which all have about a 2026 horizon, which is when the funding will peak. There's a combined total of about \$190,000,000,000 in federal funding there for California. So rather than waiting until the beginning or middle of 2024 to start funding these projects, this is going to give us an opportunity to get projects to get funds out into communities, to start doing pre development on projects quicker. So what we heard from the last Catalyst proposal, I tried to break it down into these five themes. So some administrative hurdles, transparency, more expedient contracting on the state's process, extending deadlines. One thing we've done there is we've made sure that the application is no longer than eight pages, because we heard that the applications for serve have been long and challenging.

32:48

Speaker 8

And so we want to make sure that these are much simpler and quicker to get through. We heard about allocation of funds not being proportionate to the size of regions, which is a concern. We heard from La and definitely took that into consideration. We also heard about standard definitions and metrics of equity. The state needs to develop those. So what we're

doing is ensuring that every region has access to economic development funds and we're allowing the discretion at the regional level to decide on the most equitable use of funds and leaving those to the Hrtcs. We're also in the process of developing evaluation and project criteria so those will have metrics of equity, sustainability, some of the core CERF proposals or core CERF priorities, the state process and communications needing for more clear terminology and more accessible materials. We're updating our program fact sheet and we're updating our FAQs, and we'll make those available in multiple languages.

33:52

Speaker 8

And then for the catalyst. More specifically, we heard that the funding amount was too large for A, for some regions to liquidate those funds and that it takes b, that it takes too much away from the implementation phase. So we're decreasing the amount of funds from the originally proposed 26 and a half million down to 14 million per region. And we're bumping up the amount of funding available just to keep the HRTC running from one and a half million to 2 million. So that'll help ensure that the HRTC can continue meeting and operating during the planning phase and that we don't take too much away from implementation. So right now with this updated expenditure breakdown, we would have about 268,000,000 left over for implementation. We also heard a lot about the need for flexibility in the funding buckets and so we are being less prescriptive in the categories that we are recommending that we're requiring for funding.

34:55

Speaker 8

Charles, next slide. So the breakdown is this. So 14 million per region to bridge the planning and implementation. We're going to fund HRTC operations at 2 million, which means doing what the work you guys have all been continuing to do while funding while bumping that funding up to 2 million away from 1.5. We also previously had incorporated these, what were calling industry collaboratives, which was sort of another level of decision making within the HRTC. We were requiring each region to pick three industries to prioritize instead. What we've done is we've loosened the requirements there. The Sector Investment Coordinators are what they're called now, and these are positions that will help the regions grow ecosystems around the prioritized industries that come out of the regional planning process. And we're going to allow regions to hire up to five of those, with the priority being five of the prioritized industries.

35:59

Speaker 8

But that'll be at 1.5 million. And we're removing the level of decision making, the industry collaborative level of decision making and leaving those decisions about funding, allocation, industry priorities up to the Hrtcs themselves and your existing governance structure. We also are leaving 9 million for project pre development activities. And the opportunity here is that projects that come out of the HRTC's planning process say you all are working to design, to think about projects that would meet the needs of a particular community in La. That doesn't have a lot of projects already sort of ready to go. This is an opportunity to start funding the beginning implementation of those or the beginning pre development of those projects, which know, maybe you need to do a feasibility study or maybe you need to do a workforce study or maybe you need to build a little bit of infrastructure in order to access those additional federal dollars.

36:59

Speaker 8

Federal and state dollars that I talked about. So the sort of 9 million is really the catalytic piece here. This is to say turning 9 million into potentially billions of dollars for La County. And then we also included up to 1.5 million towards grant administration and compliance. This was something we heard from a lot of regions that we basically weren't giving them enough money to execute the grant. And since the hotcs are going to be effectively grant making institutions in the region for this catalyst fund, the fiscal agents didn't feel that they were being supported enough to do the kind of compliance that's needed for a big project like this. And so we're allotting up to 1.5 million towards the fiscal agents and regional conveners for grant administration and compliance. So just to sort of wrap this up into the narrative that we're trying to explain, so the planning phase is 5 million per region and then the pre development phase is going to be 14 million per region.

38:14

Speaker 8

The goal is to take some of the ideas from the planning phase and start putting them into a project, into the pipeline where projects can start to get ready and get positioned for federal, state and private investment. The pre development phase, which is the catalyst phase, those investments will still be from the bottom up, they'll still be regionally governed by the HRTC. And the goal there is to again create good paying jobs, prosperous communities, and a clean energy economy for implementation. The rest of the CERF funding those projects will come primarily out of the planning phase. Those are projects that are ready to go, that we can start funding immediately as soon as the planning phase ends. And that's going to be 268,000,000 to sort of support projects that sync up and align with the planning phase goals and the priorities that each region comes up with in the planning phase and then turning some of those priorities into real projects on the ground.

39:27

Speaker 8

This slide is yeah, so this is the investment into communities that I mentioned before. There's about 190,000,000,000 coming into California in federal funding and in addition to another 48 billion, which is the California Climate Commitment Funds. So the opportunity here is really massive to take 600 million from CERF and turn it into potentially hundreds of billions of dollars for the state.

39:52

Speaker 2

So thank you for that.

39:53

Speaker 1

Matt.

39:56

Speaker 2

I want to do a quick QA for you just to clarify. Alan, can you go back to the previous slide? So the 268,000,000, whatever amount comes out of that for each region, let's say La gets, I don't know, 75 million out of that. Now, if you can go forward, Alan. So if 75 million comes

out of the implementation, the goal is for the La region to try to match some of that 75 million with the billions that are coming down the pipeline in the future. Is that a good way of saying.

40:39

Speaker 8

Mean that's definitely our hope is that for implementation projects, that those projects are able to match federal funds because that just expands the amount of money that we can spend in the state. Alan, can you go back a slide? Sorry to keep jumping for Catalysts. What we're really talking about is this 14 million and the Catalyst is supposed to I think the funds from the Catalyst are really the ones that we want to link up most important or most critically with those additional federal funds. We expect that we'll be able to through implementation, we'll be able to fund entire projects from start to finish. Catalyst CERF is not enough money to fund the needs of communities across the state at the level of planning that you all are doing. So the Catalyst is an opportunity to start sort of putting some projects on the pipeline that will then be able to access the additional federal funds that I mentioned.

41:47

Speaker 2

Got it. Just wanted to try to do a more simplistic context for especially some of the newer members who are on the call get bogged down. So sorry, I didn't mean to try to hijack you.

42:01

Speaker 8

There no problem.

42:03

Speaker 2

And thank you again for giving that update.

42:05

Speaker 8

Yeah, I'm happy to answer questions if you all have time on the agenda.

42:09

Speaker 2

Oh, I see. We see a couple of hands up. So, Tony, see your hand first.

42:16

Speaker 6

Thank you. I wanted to make just a suggestion to the state to maybe come out with some documents about what does equity based decision making look like, what is shared power decision making? And I know that you had some really good pieces early on, but I think as we move forward and we start to look at specific projects, it's kind of an American view is we always go for biggest bang for your buck. But if we really want to do equity work, we kind of have to have a slightly different framework. Which is not to say we don't do high impact projects, but it's a little. Bit different. And so I would just encourage you, which is not to tell the regions what to do, but to kind of remind them about shared what does equity based decision making.

43:11

Speaker 8

Yeah, thank you for that suggestion, Tony. We have our evaluator on board now, and we're working with them to come up with project criteria and metrics that will help regions decide, evaluate projects based on whether or not they're meeting equity goals, whether or not they're meeting sustainability and resilience goals. So that's in the works. It's just taking a little while because it's mostly because it's a really complicated task and we're trying to balance between being too prescriptive and being the same and leaving the regions with as much decision making power as possible.

43:54

Speaker 2

Benjamin Torres, why don't you go ahead since you haven't spoken yet.

43:59

Speaker 1

Thank you. Thanks for the presentation, Matt. So just to be clear, even though we had response from the La area around the distribution, equitable distribution of those big pot of dollars, the 268,000,000, is there going to be an equitable proportional distribution of those 368 across the state, or is it still going to be divided by 13?

44:26

Speaker 8

So the 268,000,000 for the implementation phase, that is going to be statewide competitive. So the state is not setting any proportionality on it, either equity or equality based. Those projects, whichever regions propose competitive projects, those are the regions that will receive the funding. We are committed to every region receiving funding through that implementation phase. So no region will be without a significant investment via the implementation phase in CERF. But we're not requiring any sort of specific allocation for the implementation dollars like we are for the redevelopment.

45:10

Speaker 1

Okay, thank you very much.

45:14

Speaker 2

And Luis.

45:17

Speaker 1

I was curious, what was.

45:18

Speaker 5

The thought process in giving every region the same amount for the pre development phase? I think we highlighted in our position letter that La County has roughly 10 million people, eastern Region has 200,000. When this program was going through the legislature, at least. The impression I always got was that it was meant to address communities that had been

historically disenfranchised, oftentimes minority communities, and that by giving Eastern region the same amount as Alley County, which is one of the least diverse communities in the state. It's almost kind of continuing that idea of minority communities keep getting left out again. So it's a little frustrating. Seems kind of counter what the legislature had intended. And I'm not sure if that's something you guys looked at and what the thought process was there.

46:08

Speaker 8

Yeah. Thank you. Luis, it's a really important question. I'll just know we read the letter from the Lahrtc, from the La delegation and from CBOs and other partners across La that submitted comment. And one of the reasons we took the funding amount down from 26 and a half to 14 was to ensure that regions like La have still enough money to make Catalyst useful, but also that we don't take too much out of the implementation phase, out of that competitive funding pot that will fund projects that will be competitive statewide. And there isn't a specific allocation breakdown for it as far as our thinking is because the reason that all regions are eligible for an equivalent amount of money is because from the perspective of our leadership team, while some regions have smaller populations, they have also not historically received equitable investment for economic development or community resilience at all.

47:16

Speaker 8

I think the difference here is talking about regions versus communities. And I think a lot of these regions don't have almost no economic development infrastructure set up at all. And so part of it is investing in them to make sure that they can attract additional dollars to the region going forward while still making sure that we're investing in regions like Larger regions like La to make sure that communities across the state are getting this investment. And then I think the other direction I've received is that at the HRTC level and the regional level is where the HRTC is able to make decisions about equitable distribution of funding. And so you all will be able to say within La County which communities need the most support out of this 14 million and then out of the 268,000,000.

48:20

Speaker 2

Gone. Randolph hello, everyone.

48:24

Speaker 1

This is more me speaking to the HRTC, but Matt, appreciate the updates, good to see you and all that. But I wanted to share kind of la NSYNC's perspective. A couple folks have mentioned the original language and the legislative documents and all that stuff. We agree that it did seem very clear in that language that communities disproportionately impacted by COVID-19. That was clearly and explicitly written into there. It was very clear that it seemed like minority communities were to be the focus, et cetera. My point is this is that from our perspective and again, Matt, I'm trying to be fair, so tell me if this is off base, but from our perspective, it seems like the legislative language was meant to be fairly equitable and that's how many of us viewed it in the beginning. And it seems like the state is adding this additional layer of regional equity on top of it.

49:24

Speaker 1

Whether or not that is an issue, there are ongoing conversations and advocacy around that. But I just wanted to clear up that piece that you all are seeing kind of a difference between the original language of CERF and the original language and the legislative documents versus kind of what we're seeing with the Catalyst program. Those are kind of two separate conversations going on. Again, opinions around the importance of that and all that. I'm going to defer that's not a conversation for right now, but I wanted to share that clarity for the HRTC.

50:01

Speaker 2

Thank you for that, Sean.

50:02

Speaker 8

Yeah, just real quick, thank you, Sean. I don't want to speak to the original intent of the legislature or how our leadership has been interpreting the language. I think that there's room for both. And the other fact is that the conditions around this program have changed a lot since its original inception because of the passage of all these federal programs. And so I think there is a need to make sure that we're supporting regions to access all of this money that's coming to the state. Which is not to say anything about changing the equity priorities, but I think from our perspective, what Catalyst does is it sort of balances these things where we're able to get additional funding and bring that in and help regions that don't have the infrastructure, the social or technical infrastructure to get those dollars in helping them do that while also ensuring that hotcs are able to make decisions about and regions are able to make decisions about which communities on the ground need the funds the most.

51:16

Speaker 8

And part of the reason we decreased it from 26 and a half to 14 was exactly because of the response we received from La and just wanting to make sure that we had more geographic equity built in through the implementation phase, taking less out of the implementation phase.

51:37

Speaker 2

Thank you, Matt. Kevin harbor.

51:42

Speaker 4

Matt, thank you for your clarification. I would argue that when you decide on equity, I think you got to look at populations and density we've invested over a year in this process. And the things that we have been communicating far and wide have to do with making sure that historically disadvantaged communities affected by systemic institutional racism, in many cases redlining and other issues that have prevented these populations from getting educated, from closing the wealth gap. This is far more prevalent in some of your large metropolitan areas. I'm not suggesting that other counties not receive their quote unquote fair share, but I would question the methodology and the algorithms that you're using to determine these funds and resource allocation strategies. I think when leadership makes these decisions in a vacuum, in silos, without including other voices, especially voices from these communities,

that will be, I feel negatively impacted by this process is an error and it really perpetuates the problem that we as minority communities have been impacted by for generations.

53:19

Speaker 4

So I think you need to take the message back that we really need to rethink and think this through carefully because at the end of the day we're going to be judged by the return on investment, right? How many people are actually going to be benefited by this in addition to the geographic areas. But at the end of the day, those most impacted and most severely impacted over generations have people from these historically disadvantaged communities. And that was in the original language. And I think that in order to be consistent and credible, we need to maintain that conversation and we need to be accountable to that conversation. And I'm speaking as an individual, not as the affinity hub lead for employer business and associations. But I guarantee you that if we have what we consider our fair share, we have the ability, the intellectual capacity, the motivation, and the tools to really give you a return on investment that will last ten to 20 years and beyond.

54:41

Speaker 8

Thank you.

54:42

Speaker 5

Kevin, one quick final question. So is this done? So this is officially there's no more changes to the Catalyst program, or is it still being yet to be approved? Could additional revisions be done?

54:56

Speaker 8

I don't believe so. I think we're planning to release the Solicitation for the Catalyst program next week in early September.

55:06

Speaker 5

Sorry, not to just delay the point, but just do the breakdown of population. So under this program, la county gets a dollar person. Eastern Sierra Region gets \$72 cents person. So just f one.

55:21

Speaker 3

Charles, there's a couple of questions in the chat that I think we should get to before we move on. Sean had a follow up question regarding the implementation dollars. Is there a minimum that the state will mandate each region receives? For.

55:42

Speaker 8

Know, I believe there is, but I don't have the number for you. Right you I can double check and get back to Charles and the LEDC team.

55:53

Speaker 3

Okay. And one other question is, are these potential projects a pipeline into the state digital equity, which is a competitive grant? Matt, are you able to answer that one?

56:06

Speaker 8

Yes, I think any state the legislation for CERF says that as long as we're not supplanting any funds that CERF projects and programs can align with and funnel and indeed should align with and funnel into other state investments. So I'm not familiar with the specifics of that program or the timeline, but I don't see any reason know, CERF projects would not be able, know, align with and funnel into that program as well.

56:40

Speaker 3

Okay. Great. Charles. That's all I see in the chat.

56:44

Speaker 2

Thanks, Chris. Actually, you're up.

56:48

Speaker 3

All righty, well, thanks to Matt for that presentation. And thanks for Chris for posting the information in the chat. And for our partners, we will be sharing the Catalyst information via our newsletter and via our new website. And so for process mapping, we are still in the process of creating the process map, and I think this will be very helpful given the statements and questions today, especially from Luis in understanding all the different pieces of our governance structure. I think the illustrations that come out of this process map would be very helpful to all of our partners. And so, yes, the timeline is still the same. We are still having our weekly meetings with the Mark USA. And so eight weeks total, but should be done by the end of September is our current timeline and it hasn't changed. And I'll just recommend our partners who have questions about the structure.

57:54

Speaker 3

I really recommend you look at our site, La CERF La Cerf.org and go to the about page. I'll list it in the chat. But I've been sending it to our partners who have questions, who have not done a CERF presentation with a CERF 101. But it's very helpful for you to see the steering committee, the Micro grantees, the upcoming Table partner leads, the Affinity Hub leads, the steering committee, stewardship committee, all listed so you can see a visual. I think it's very helpful. So please take a look at our website. If you have questions, please let me know. But until we have this process mapping, please use the website to help you or email us for help. So that's all I have. Thank you.

58:44

Speaker 1

Chioma and going back to our meeting from two weeks ago, we did release a questionnaire for the Training and Capacity building lead scope of work to solicit some feedback from you all on what you envision the Training and Capacity building lead should have in terms of characteristics and what types of services they should provide to the hub structure. And we

just like to let all of you know that this has closed earlier this week and we'll be taking that feedback into consideration in developing the scope of work. So for our stakeholder count, as of August 23, which was two days ago, so we had an exponential increase. So for our new partners here, just to distinguish the differences between the different rows here. So total numbers, number of organizations engaged, that 514 number is the number of organizations that we have engaged, but not necessarily onboarded, and the number of organizations officially onboarded have successfully become members of the HRTC.

59:51

Speaker 1

We are at a whopping 401 now. So round of applause to everyone who has been doing outreach and contributing to onboarding more and more partners. I'd also like to highlight that we had a great increase in the individual residents of the Lahrtc in the past six months or so. Its majority has been organizations onboarding. But in the past couple of weeks, we have had a lot of individual residents that have been onboarding as well. And that red number there is the number of organizations that are not fully onboarded but are engaged. So we're looking to thin that number out as we go on for our geographic breakdown of HRTC members based on the service planning area that they're headquartered in. So we had increases all across the board in the last two weeks. However, we did have a change here. So previously we did see that Spa Four metro La dominated in this bar graph.

01:01:02

Speaker 1

However, here we have South Bay Spa Eight in the top representation for the HRTC. Very close to Spa Four. But just want to give a little round of applause to our Spa Eight representatives for advocating for their communities. And again, we have had an increase across all spas, which is awesome. And for the stakeholder types or the entity types that are mandated by the state via the SFP. We also saw an increase in almost all entity types. However, the largest increase that we saw here was in the grassroots and CBO as well as the community members, which includes the individual members as well. So for our next upcoming meeting dates, we do have Chioma will be holding a CERF 101 presentation for our new partners. So if you're a new partner, please feel free to reach out to us by email or Tioma directly. But you can always reach out to CERF@laedc.org and then we'll go ahead and give you the details on the CERF 101 presentation.

01:02:20

Speaker 1

I think Chioma might post the link in the chat as well, but that will be held on August 29 at 10:00 A.m. On Zoom. And of course we have our HRTC Biweekly meeting two weeks from now on September eighth at 09:00 A.m.. Just to give everyone some heads up, there may be some changes to these meetings once we have the steering committee set, but more details will be forthcoming and for our next steps. So of course we have our vacancy selection, so we have our election coming up on Monday through Tuesday for the Affinity Hub leads and then the following week we actually have our General Steering Committee elections for those vacancies as well on Monday and Tuesday following. And we also need to start thinking about the steering committee bylaws I know there was a slide about the southern border bylaws that Charles had mentioned and the steering committee will eventually convene and create these bylaws the sub.

01:03:30

Speaker 1

Regional tables, which are the CBO micrograntees, the selection criteria and the process for what that looks like has not been hashed out yet. So that definitely is on the agenda. And of course completing the regional Plan part one, which is due on August 31. So this is currently being drafted and developed and before this is sent off to the state, this will be sent to our steering committee members so they can go ahead and review, make any revisions or suggestions as well as approve for us to send it off to the state. That's the last slide, so I'll go ahead and pass it on to Charles so he can close it off.

01:04:12

Speaker 2

Well, you close it off for there's. We have two minutes left if there are any questions or.

01:04:22

Speaker 3

Oh, I was going to say there's one question in the chat from Benjamin. To be clear, none of the resident seats have been filled. Correct. And Scarlet, you want to talk about that's in the works. Yeah, as of now they are vacant, but we did open nominations this week. Nominations have closed and we will be electing those seats not next week, but the following week in the General Steering Committee election that we will be hold be and if we have any other questions, we have about a minute left.

01:05:00

Speaker 2

Okay, well, thank you all for attending this meeting today. Enjoy your weekend and let's get ready to do some work to make La better. Enjoy your weekend.