Steering Committee Bylaws Working Meeting
October 27th, 2023

Meeting Recording
Passcode: aM0jU=%7
Transcript

Meeting commenced with a recording disclaimer to track progress on bylaws revisions, including inputting comments and additional language on page two of the document. There are discussions about using data and research in decision-making processes, including lived experience data and ensuring inclusivity in research sources. Tony offers suggestions for blending different types of data into planning processes. The chair emphasizes leaving the bylaws intact until additional information becomes available but suggests making modifications if necessary, later on while aiming for a static final version at some point.

Members address an open item from a previous meeting regarding page five of the document but decide to add recommendations first before redrafting everything as a whole to avoid confusion or losing track of changes. The group discusses the importance of not adding comments after finishing a page.

There is a discussion about distinguishing between partner meetings and community meetings in terms of remote participation. The need to be sensitive to internet access issues in the community is emphasized, as well as ensuring inclusive community engagement activities. Importance of differentiating between LAHRTC partner meetings and community meetings in terms of their operations and functions. The community meetings have not been addressed in the bylaws yet, so there is a need to work on that. Specific roles and responsibilities of sub regional tables can also be added to the bylaws. There are discussions about including HRTC sponsored geographic and racial planning forums in section after section E. The term "LAHRTC related agendas" should encompass all LAHRTC-related events, not just partner meetings, to ensure transparency for the community.

They discuss the need for different versions of information for archival purposes. Members discuss adding language related to hyper local data in a specific paragraph on page two.

The group agrees to include specific language for stipends for community-based organizations (CBOs) and residents, including childcare, transportation, food, etc. It is mentioned that expenses should be documented properly with receipts. Gift cards may be provided instead of cash payments for easier tracking. There is a discussion about the importance of having definitive language and processes for tracking funds. They also discuss the use of gift cards and the need to track them carefully due to potential fraud. There is a question about whether childcare, food, and other expenses should be separate from the stipends given to participants. The budget for these stipends is questioned, and it is suggested that first-come-first-serve allocation may not be inclusive enough. Some language revisions are made in the document during this discussion. CCF will provide more guidance on this part of the Bylaws.

Modifications made after the meeting will be discussed in the next session, with a focus on specific points rather than going over the entire document. The structure of having one chair and two vice chairs is being proposed for one-year terms, but further discussion is needed regarding what happens when the chair completes their term. This will be discussed in the overview of bylaws for the SC chairs.

There are concerns about accurately capturing motions made during votes or decisions agreed upon by the steering committee. It is suggested that staff maintain a database of steering committee actions to provide a more comprehensive record beyond just voting outcomes.

Modification to the language in the bylaws is suggested to ensure consistency and clarity regarding the eligibility criteria for LAHRTC partners, including attendance at LAHRTC partner meetings.

The meeting stopped on page 8. Next Meeting will be November 3rd from 10-11:30am

Transcript:

02:55
Speaker 1
Good afternoon, everyone.

02:57
Speaker 2
Good afternoon.

03:02
Speaker 3
Afternoon.

03:05
Speaker 1
Andrea Allen. Long time no see. Scarlett. Hey, there. Jennifer zillette.

03:13
Speaker 2
How are you? Kevin?

03:14
Speaker 1
I am well. I see Rudy and Kevin are on the call. Julie. Good afternoon, Armand.

03:24
Speaker 4
Hey, Kevin, can you confirm if you can hear me?

03:27
Speaker 1
I can hear you. Great. Sound like a radio personality.

03:37
Speaker 2
Kathy Lewis sitting in for Mr. Robert Sal Fatal.

03:41
Speaker 5
I'm his assistant.

03:42
Speaker 1
Hi, Kathy.

03:43
Speaker 5
Hi.

03:44
Speaker 2
Nice to see you.

03:45
Speaker 1
Great to see you as well.

03:47
Speaker 2
Thank you.

03:58
Speaker 1
I saw an email come in from Robert. Are you going to articulate the contents in that email or should we read it and be advised after the meeting? Because I didn't have a chance to read it.

04:14
Speaker 6
He didn't tell me to.

04:15
Speaker 5
Articulate, so I guess everyone should read.

04:23
Speaker 1
Don't have we got to run the meeting, so we don't have time to do it, but we'll read it afterwards.

04:27
Speaker 5
Okay, sounds good.

04:29
Speaker 1
Hey, Rudy. All right, let's give folks a few more minutes to come on, and we got a lot of stuff to cover today, and then we'll go ahead and get started. I'll give them one more minute. People are still coming on.

05:30
Speaker 3
Yeah. In the meantime, we did have Alan drop the attendance link in the chat. If you can please just submit your attendance for this meeting today.

05:41
Speaker 1
Thank you. Scarlett. I see Kelly. I see Rita. Sahal. Bobby. Okay. All right, so we got a critical mass. It's 103. Would you guys like to wait one more minute? We got a lot to get through. How about we go ahead and get started? Everybody good with that quick thing on the attendance?

06:08
Speaker 4
Sorry, I just want to mention that on the attendance link, if you joined after it was posted in the chat, it won't show up for you, so it's not showing up for me. Okay, thank you.

06:19
Speaker 3
We'll go ahead and post it throughout the meeting. Thank you so much for that.

06:22
Speaker 1
Thanks, Louise. So I want to welcome everyone to our HRTC steering committee meeting. Are we going to record this?

06:36
Speaker 6
Yeah, it's recording.

06:37
Speaker 1
Okay, good. So, October 26, we're starting at 100 and 04:00 P.m.. Again, want to welcome everyone just as a matter of decorum as we work through the agenda. If you have a question or a concern, please raise your hand and we'll do our best to get to you. You can go ahead and drop notes in chat. It will be monitored. So thank you all for being here and we'll go ahead and get started through the agenda. As Scarlett, do you want to repeat any housekeeping keeping for those who have just joined?

07:14
Speaker 2
Yes.

07:14
Speaker 3
We actually do have a slide on there. If we can go ahead and just move forward with the slide. I also dropped in the chat the links that are associated with each point. But just as housekeeping. Again, please submit your attendance. The link is in the chat. Any actionable items shall be initiated during Steering Committee meetings. And we actually are logging and tracking any type of action items requested by the Steering Committee. So the link is there. You can see some of the past action items and responses and resources that pertain to each action item that has been requested. If you would like to propose an agenda item, please utilize our Google Jamboard to submit your requested item of discussion. The chairs will then take these requests and bring them up in future Steering Committee meetings. And then we also recently just developed a resource tracker.

08:11
Speaker 3
And so this tracker is a Google Sheet that has all our resources. Any documents, any tasks that are being asked to be reviewed, it's all being tracked on that document. We encourage you to please bookmark this for easy reference. But on there you'll find the timelines, the narratives, the proposals, any requests for feedback, and the documents that are linked to that. So this is something that I know our members have asked for in regards to one central place to be able to access all information. We'll be updating it accordingly.

08:53
Speaker 1
Okay, we can go back. So as of right now, let's go to the second agenda item, the Lahrtc Steering Committee and Chair Vice Chair bylaws. So, as you all know, we've been working on the bylaws and they're available for all to lean into. They've been out there for a while now. We intend on continuing that process. And so I encourage you all to go in and read the bylaws on all three levels. And if you have comments or suggestions or edits, there is a process available for you to your voice to be heard. As of right now, we are going to continue the process. There is a meeting tomorrow, which is October 27 at 930. We've allocated an hour and a half for that. We'll probably break it up. Probably. The Vice Chair and Vice Chair bylaws are not as extensive, but the HRTC and Steering Committee bylaws probably going to take up more time.

10:15
Speaker 1
So we'll probably go like 40 minutes, maybe a half hour. We'll play it by ear, but probably more like 40 minutes, 30 minutes, and the rest will be the Chair and Vice Chair. But the objective is to get through the process. And the reason is that we have deadlines that we have to meet. We like to try to get the vote done by November 9, but I know that there are some concerns amongst these Steering Committee members about how we're going to vote, when we're going to vote, what needs to be done before we vote. So I would like to give any of those members who'd like to speak, raise your hand an opportunity for your voice to be heard.

11:21
Speaker 5
Mr. Chair, are you talking about voting on the actual bylaws?

11:25
Speaker 1
That is exactly what I said.

11:27
Speaker 5
Okay, I was just making sure. So there's a new proposed date on November 9.

11:33
Speaker 1
It is not locked in stone. But that is our goal. And the whole idea is for everyone to have an opportunity to lean in at the November 3 meeting. We like to try to codify them, and then November 9 is a targeted date to try to adopt them.

11:56
Speaker 5
Thank you.

12:00
Speaker 1
Now, I know that there are some other concerns about things that need to take place, but this is a process where if we all lean in, we can move forward in a crisp way. Okay. Any other comments? Sharon, you have another question?

12:20
Speaker 5
Well, I was asking that clarification, and then we have a lot of granular detail in our bylaws. I haven't looked at the other two. I'm assuming we'll get back to that tomorrow. I would like to be concerned about the November 9 date based upon what we see, how much comment we have. Because, again, we've only reviewed one document. Right. We started reviewing one document. I think we're on page six or seven. So we might need until isn't there an in person meeting on November 15?

12:52
Speaker 1
So we'll get to that. But yeah, there is a plan meeting. So this is it, sharon we want to move fast, but not at the expense of quality and accuracy. Okay. And everyone has an opportunity to lean in. And just like I've gone through all three and I put my comments in all three, but we all have jobs, and I understand that, but we got to get through this process, but again, not at the expense of quality or accuracy. Okay. But if we can do this, it will serve us well. Just as a side point, we want to make sure that we're operating as efficiently as possible, as optimally as possible, but again, with quality and accuracy. I'll leave it that. Any other comments?

13:51
Speaker 5
The reason I asked for the question about the date is because we need alignment. In my reading of the document and reading the other two other documents that we've just received, I see a lot of contradiction. And so I'm concerned that if we're going to complete and finish up all of our bylaw stuff on the third and then we're going to all chime in and have that change. I think we need a moment to make sure that all of the other documents we have are all saying the same thing. Because I see a lot of conflicts, I see a lot of contradictions, and we're kind of voting on things that are changing things. And somewhere between that third and when we meet in person, we need to fix it all. So we're swimming in the same direction and saying the same thing everywhere.

14:38
Speaker 1
Absolutely. Sharon, you and I have talked about this, and so what I need from, you know, I understand your point. Your point is duly noted and recorded, but what I need is a definitive answer with documentation to support your claims of conflict so that when we do meet, we can be efficient on how to address it and resolve it. Is that fair?

15:07

Speaker 2
Yeah.

15:08
Speaker 5
And as I said, I couldn't do it in two days. I got that process map document and I see a lot of stuff. So it's going to take. We work. I need a little bit of time.

15:18
Speaker 1
Let's move on. Your point is taken. What I'd like you to do is reply. First of all, is there anything else new other than what you've already shared?

15:28
Speaker 5
No. Thank you.

15:30
Speaker 1
Okay. Because I don't want to cut you off. So why don't you give us the information we need? In fact, if you can give it to us so that we can discuss it tomorrow, so that we can move on and we don't have to backtrack. Okay. And I think we're all interested in making sure that there's accuracy, because that's important, right? We don't want contradiction. So you have over a year and a half in the saddle as a co chair of Outreach and engagement, you've been elbow deep in this. So if there's anything that, as a group, we could benefit from that you could bring to the table and with receipts we need, that fair enough. Is that fair?

16:19
Speaker 5
I put in the chat. I've responded. I'm asking until the third. There's just no way I can do this in less than 24 hours.

16:25
Speaker 1
Okay. All right. Well, we extended the meeting tomorrow for an hour and a half to go through the documents and we'll go through with Rigor. But again, we're not going to speed through and have mistakes. So that's going to dictate how it goes, and we'll just go from there. Okay. The next item on the agenda, if there are no other comments, the next item on the agenda is The Mark. They're going to explain the process mapping.

17:12
Speaker 4
Yeah, we have Adri on the call. Hi, Adri, are you there?

17:16
Speaker 2
Yes, I am.

17:17
Speaker 4
Awesome. Did you want to share your screen?

17:20
Speaker 2
Yeah, sure, I can do that.

17:22
Speaker 4
All right, go ahead and let me know if you can share. If not, I might have to make you a co host.

17:26
Speaker 2
No, I can't.

17:28

Speaker 4

Okay, 1 second. All right, go ahead and give it a shot now.

17:43

Speaker 2

Can you all see that?

17:46

Speaker 4

Yep. And for everyone, before we start, Adri, I did drop the draft for the process map, as well as the supplemental narrative that the Mark also provided. So you can have that on your own screen as well while Adri goes through this. But go ahead, Adri.

18:04

Speaker 2

Thank you, Alan. Hi, everyone. I'm Adrian Salaya. I am assistant director of research and evaluation at the Mark. Just to give you all a bit of background, this Outreach and Engagement process map, it was the result of information obtained via sessions with Lahrtc personnel in both August and September during the election period. Based on the information that we collected, we provided initial recommendations for planning and engagement activities. However, I want to stress, and I'll probably do this several times as I go through this that this is a living document. So it should be continuously revisited and updated as new developments unfold and as more discussion takes place. So nothing on here is set in stone. This is your document, and you can alter it however it is that you all see fit and agree upon. We included in this Process Map best practices and examples to further illustrate concepts.

18:59

Speaker 2

But again, all of these sections should be reviewed and updated as additional members join or key planning decisions are finalized. So the Process Map is divided into four sections. It's. Prepare, share, co, create, adopt. And each of these sections represents a step of a draft outreach and Engagement Process. I know many of you have already looked at this, and Alan was nice enough to share the comments that you had, and so I'm addressing them as I go through. But if there's anything that I may have missed, there'll definitely be time for you to ask questions or share your thoughts. There was a comment which I want to start off with, saying that the descriptions of the Process mapping need to align with the approved governance structure. And I completely agree in terms of the descriptions, if that meant, like, the stages, like just the names, like Prepare, Share, Co, Create, Adopt those were just names that we came up with based on the information that we had, but you can change them however you'd like.

20:00

Speaker 2

The ultimate goal of this Process Map and these stages was to take in all the information possible from the community, have an open engagement process, and then at the end fund two to five pilot projects. We refer to them as Pilot Projects because that's how they were referred to us. But I know somebody mentioned they'd rather have the name Strategic Projects. That's absolutely fine. Up to you all again.

20:24

Speaker 6

Adrian. Adrian, real quick, there are folks asking if you could zoom in a little bit.

20:29

Speaker 2

Oh, yes, I'm sorry. Let me pull that up. Sorry about that. I know it's small.

20:37

Speaker 6

No worries. Thank you. Available, correct. It'll be uploaded to everyone?

20:42

Speaker 2
I believe it was shared with everyone already.

20:45
Speaker 4
It's shared in the chat, so you can go ahead and access in a chat if you'd like as well.

20:50
Speaker 6
Okay, thank you.

20:52
Speaker 3
Yeah, and it was shared. I believe I shared it Monday or Tuesday with everyone as well. So it should be in the last email from Surf as well.

21:04
Speaker 2
Thanks for that. So the first slide of this Process Map is really an overview of the entire process. It really serves as just an introduction to help members orient themselves to the different steps and major planning and outreach engagement activities within each step. This should be updated as planning decisions are made and finalized. It should also include links to online resources, so any documents, videos, meeting notices as they become available. I'm kind of going to go through each of these at a high level. So the second slide focuses on stage one, which we called Prepare. And in this stage you're really developing relationships and tools to sustain La HRTC's equity focused outreach and engagement work across La County. This includes timelines that were created in conversations with Charles, with Chioma and Alan. There was a comment saying that dates should be looked at more closely.

21:59
Speaker 2
And definitely timelines are important. Dates can be updated depending on how you all decide. However, this would be more on you all. So it would likely need to be done through internal conversations with among members because there was a comment saying that the expectation of this document is that it's fluid and that was our expectation. It should be updated based on feedback and it's something that can change over time. So if you look at this, we kind of just did like a rough timeline based on the conversations that we had. Each of these numbers has a step that needs to take place and then under it'll say owner, which is really the lead, who it should be reviewed by, if applicable, and who should be the participants. If there's more individuals that you think should be involved in this process, you can go ahead and add them on there as well.

22:54
Speaker 2
Prepared takes over two slides, so we have quite a few tasks when we move on to share. The focus here is really to build shared understanding of needs across La County, disinvested communities through learning, data analysis and particularly dialogue. There was a comment that you can't really connect community data unless you also begin to talk about the regional plan and how it can affect communities and links between the community. And we thought that was a great point, that's great feedback. And so a suggestion was that maybe instead of calling the November and December activities shared understanding of needs and opportunities, it should be initiating a shared understanding of needs and opportunities. The third step is co create. So here we're talking about creating and refining data, informed, inclusive economic development strategies and pilot projects for building an equitable and sustainable regional economy. And then the final stage is adopt.

23:54
Speaker 2
So here's where you would select those two to five pilot projects, or I think we referred to it as strategic projects that are well positioned to support long term economic resilience and the region's transition to a carbon neutral economy. We also provided, which should have also been shared with you, a supplemental narrative. What this really does is it gives more detail and rationale. It states why a task is important and our recommendations for how to complete these tasks. Again, these are just recommendations based on the information that we received. So I do want to emphasize that this is really a starting point. This is not a final document. So we expect this to

change as you work through the process, and determine what is working, what is not working. You should all collaboratively make this your own. That's kind of like my overview of the process map.

24:48
Speaker 2
There was a few more comments that were given. Somebody had suggested to offer office hours in each of the phases to allow partners in the public to come and ask questions in real time. We thought that's a great idea. The more dialogue, the better. And then there was also a question about that. We use the phrase la HRTC? We use this just as a general name. We focus primarily on the governance structure. So micro, grantees tables, steering committee. So if a different name is needed, this is completely acceptable. You can also set whatever deadlines you would like to internally. And then there was another comment which I kind of touched on a bit briefly in the beginning of the presentation, that the slides and the supplemental information need to better integrated. So maybe that includes adding links in there. And we agree because they should be taken in side by side, they have to align.

25:43
Speaker 2
But at the same time, it's also important that, as some of you pointed out, they have to align with the documents that you already have approved as well.

25:54
Speaker 1
Okay, Adrian, does that conclude your presentation?

25:57
Speaker 2
Yes.

25:58
Speaker 1
So I'd like to just open my first initial comment that I appreciate is that this is what I call a living document. And that is it is modifiable relative to findings that make our work more impactful and aligns in a way that makes sense. So I'll leave it at that. And now at this time, are there any comments or questions for Adrian? No questions. So I'm assuming that everybody's comfortable with what they've seen and that we can move forward.

26:50
Speaker 6
There's a comment in the chat, kevin, we need more time to review this. The LAEDC agenda indicates this will be presented to the HRTC. And that's from Sharon.

27:04
Speaker 1
Sharon, could you come on and articulate a little bit more?

27:11
Speaker 5
Trying to figure out how can we hear me? Hi, Jonah. How are you? Okay, so again, it was a very voluminous details in looking at the content. You guys are such experts in the space and I truly appreciate it. But much of that sometimes part of the comment I was making in the last comment is there are some inconsistencies. So in our structure, we have an outreach phase and then we have a planning phase. And in the outreach phase, there is a combination of both lived experience data from our community based organizations that gets combined with our formalized research data that is gathered by our paid researchers. Those finding reports was intended to be returned to our community stakeholders for planning forums that we funded in the budget. So I couldn't follow that. And the timeline seemed to be a bit off because the people that need to do the lived experience work seem to be showing up after it's already been done.

28:17
Speaker 5
So I think we need some time to mesh through that, figure it out, and make sure that the roles that are captured

and our original intent are clearly represented there and that they're consistent with what we're putting in the bylaws. Does that make sense?

28:36
Speaker 2
Yeah, to me that makes complete sense. And I think what you bring up is important because I feel know when you do these process maps, just like you would do a logic model or an evaluation strategy, as Kevin mentioned, these are living documents. That's what they're meant to be. Nothing should know, fixed for all time. And I think it's important to gather feedback from each of you because you all have different expertise in different parts of the outreach and engagement process. And so there may be things that we didn't catch, like you just said, Sharon, that need to be refined and maybe moved up or down or the timeline needs to be changed or even the activities and who's involved themselves. So I do think that's very important.

29:18
Speaker 1
So let me say this also, Sharon. Just in my own personal professional experience in this assignment that I'm currently in second year in the saddle, it was clear that our bylaws no longer complemented the way that were doing business currently and our future direction. So guess what? I brought it up. There was a little contention and concern because some folks like to hug trees. But after the presentation, there was substantial change in our bylaws and it was codified. There's nothing and that's with the 501. That was with the 501 C three. So there's nothing that says that we can't continue to evolve like that when it's appropriate.

30:14
Speaker 5
Absolutely.

30:15
Speaker 3
Yeah.

30:17
Speaker 1
Any other comments? I see folks coming in and off. Mute if you're not speaking. Could you mute? Okay, thank you. Yeah.

30:28
Speaker 5
Hi. Kevin. This is Jessica. Your hands raised. I apologize. I'm driving so I can't see it's.

30:35
Speaker 6
Okay. Go for it, Jessica.

30:37
Speaker 5
Hi, everybody. Good afternoon. So I hear what my colleague is saying, and that's all true and correct in regards to the data and the data research for these communities. But what would be the timeline on that? When do we anticipate getting that data research from the researchers? Because I don't know if we have time to wait for that. Right. And then what would be the timeline for these grants? So a lot of these communities, if we're trying to get lived experience and get that captured as data and voices, I think that some of these communities also come with their own local could be that could be cited.

31:23
Speaker 1
Thank you for your comments, Jessica. Andrea. Andrea Slater.

31:32
Speaker 6
Hi. Sorry, I couldn't click the mute button fast enough. I was also going to add, like from the research component side, as pilot projects are being developed, part of it is actually doing the interviews and getting their

feedback. So they're happening simultaneously. You can do it at the beginning of the programs, you can do it at the end of the programs so that you're capturing all of that data and you're not going to lose it and you're actually getting it while they're in the midst of it. And then you can allow some time afterwards to also after they've had time to process and digest and all that kind of stuff. You can also add another component in there to interview or do surveys or something so they can be happening while these other things are happening.

32:17
Speaker 5
Very good. I do want to comment on Jessica's comment. We actually have a formal timeline that is out. We did publish a timeline in the original proposal and we know we got pushed back a few months because of the delays in contracting. But our RFPs are out for that lived experience for the formalized research side. And it has an eight week timeline. So December 20 is the date I think I have on my notes. That's RFP number two. And that's going to come up in our next discussion as well as we talk about Table Partners.

32:59
Speaker 1
Okay. Thank you, Sharon. All right, so folks, we will continue on this process. Sharon, I understand that in regards to, again, going back to the contradictions of eleven three, we're looking for that and any inconsistencies that you see that you could put together. I want to say this, let's go ahead and scroll forward and I'm going to bring one agenda item up to the front. I am proposing, and I think you've all seen it, that we have an in person meeting and we block out a morning and we can cover a lot of these things and it's two weeks out. It will be two weeks out, actually more than two and a half weeks out. So that should give us enough time to assemble all of our documentation and work through some of these issues in person so that we can still be on track and meet our deadlines.

34:03
Speaker 1
It's critical. I don't want to speed forward just for the benefit of speed, but we have to operate with rigor and it has to be accurate and it has to be high quality and the documentation allows us to be both. So thank you all for your feedback. I think this discussion is really meaningful and important because at the end of the day, we're all stakeholders and the expectation is that we got to go forward and be excited about what's going to happen here. I'm excited. And what we're doing right now, the norming process and getting through these things, it's a necessary not even going to call it a necessary evil. It's a necessary process and I think it's important. And so we appreciate your voice. Next category. The next agenda item is Table Partner leads. As you look from left to right, you have the list recommended by Outreach and Engagement.

35:10
Speaker 1
The original list. Then the additional recommendations that came from the Institute of Applied Economics of LAEDC. And then the steering committee leadership had a meeting to try to flush this out and try to figure out how can we accommodate both trains of thought. And so with that, I'm going to bring up Armand Kuyan to talk about some of the research that he's done that helped us land here. Go ahead, Armand.

35:56
Speaker 6
Mon, I think you're on mute.

35:58
Speaker 1
Yeah, I don't see the mute button, but we can't hear you. Armand might be that new technology he's using. Okay, I'm on.

36:22
Speaker 4
Can you hear me?

36:23
Speaker 1
Yeah. There we go.

36:24
Speaker 4
There we go.

36:25
Speaker 1
All right. There we go.

36:27
Speaker 4
All right. Yeah. All right. Thank you, Kevin. So just like I said, examining some projection data and also just reading some of the county plans and city plans for development in the future, we have some data to support that. We have certain industries which will have growth and growth in sustainable jobs and that are paying living wages, which are some of the key goals of our program. So I'm just going to go over some of these projections. So we have housing listed here. I don't think it's listed here, but it's under infrastructure. And so looking at some of the projections for housing, we have about 6400 new jobs between 2022 to 2027 projected. Some of those are in real estate, with other ones in building construction. These are certainly jobs that pay very well. Looking at BLS data, the real estate jobs in that industry pay about $92,000, and in construction, it's 81,000 per employee annually.

37:35
Speaker 4
So, like I said, these are certainly jobs that pay very well and address one of the key concerns of La County, which is a lack of housing, then moving on to sports and entertainment, which has long been one of LA's economy's strong points. These are also industries which are projected to grow very much something around 10,000 new jobs by 2027 compared to 2022. These are also jobs that pay very well, much above the AMI, which is 88,000, and the living wage, which is 45,000. So these jobs are paying something close to 150,000. They're paying close to 122,000 per employee in motion pictures and sound recording studios and in performing arts is an astronomical wage of 235,000 per employee. So these are industry averages, of course, but it does go to show that these are very much well paying jobs, and they do work off of a good infrastructure we already have in La.

38:31
Speaker 4
Moving forward, we have transportation. As La tries to transition into a green and blue economy, one of the key factors in greenhouse gas emissions is our transportation grid. So hopefully these 10,000 new jobs that are projected by 2027 can begin to utilize green and blue technologies and be a part of the green and blue economy. These 10,000 jobs include things such as urban transportation systems, aerospace, manufacturing, ship and boat manufacturing. And motor vehicle manufacturing. Moving forward we have also life Sciences has been identified as a high growth field with 17,000 new jobs which also do pay very well between 82,120 6000 annually depending on the specific industry we look at from chemical manufacturing to environmental consulting, scientific research and I've already mentioned chemical manufacturing. Lastly, we have infrastructure. Infrastructure is projected also to have something between 2003 thousand new jobs by 2027. And once again these are very well paying jobs, well above the living wage and the Amis at about last one, which I am just going off of some other research and that's energy and water under utilities or that's how they're generally classified.

39:58
Speaker 4
But here we have energy and water and these are also very much part of our county plans looking at specifically our county document La 100, the Climate Action plan and some research and plans from the Metropolitan Water District. There's going to be a lot of jobs that have to do with water storage as La transitions to using mostly a local supply of water and also transitions to 100% renewable energy. So bottom line is this is preliminary research but these are industries that do show a lot of potential for growth and they do seem to align certainly with the now California jobs first initiatives and objectives.

40:39
Speaker 1
Thank you Armand, appreciate your hard work and detail and research and helping to understand the approach

that we're trying to take to this process. Next, I'd like to bring up Andrea Slater to talk about the proposed Table partner categories.

40:58
Speaker 6
Hey Kevin, real quick, there's a question from Luis. Is healthcare listed or am I missing it? Armin, where does that fall under life science? Life science, okay.

41:11
Speaker 4
Yeah. So we do have it under life science. In the next slide we kind of broke down which some subcategories that would go under, for example, infrastructure and then life science. We have here healthcare.

41:23
Speaker 6
There you go.

41:23
Speaker 4
Okay, perfect.

41:27
Speaker 1
Okay.

41:29
Speaker 6
All right. So one of the things that was brought up at the last meeting was how these Table leads were going to be selected and who was going to be selected. So what we're proposing and have started the research on is calling up the industry experts, the associations that are usually intersectional groups that represent members, specific members or BIPOC members as a whole. So that one of the reasons that we're going with associations as opposed to specific employers is that they usually are, like I said, the subject matter experts. They know what the trends are, they know who key employers are. They also are able to see how many jobs are going to be coming forth, who's going to be posting at specific times, what kind of trainings are needed. So they can also help with the developing of training programs and other key pieces that are going to be needed moving forward.

42:30
Speaker 6
So by looking at associations versus employers, we're going to be targeting nonprofit organizations which most of these organizations are classified as C, three organizations. And the hope is to get at least three or four for each of these categories and send out an application for them, inviting them to apply and explaining what the program is. And then we're going to be using a rubric to select so that it's based on their qualifications and points, who they target, how long they've been around, who are their key members and key partners, who are part of their coalitions. And all of that will be used in the evaluation to determine who will be getting this role as the table lead for each of these areas.

43:20
Speaker 1
Any questions? Thank you, andrea, any questions for Andrea? Okay, folks, so as Andrea said, we're going to send out an email in which you have until Monday, tomorrow at 05:00 to adopt this strategy. And the whole idea is to continue to move forward on the selection process. Luis?

43:54
Speaker 4
Yeah, I'm kind of a little confused on this process because it says we're going to go to associations. So what's the likelihood that, one, these associations are actively involved with the current surf process now for La County? And then, two, I think it's a good thing to practically reach out to groups involved in those spaces, but I would say we shouldn't limit ourselves to that because there may be groups who maybe don't represent, like they say, a specific region, but have involvement in those spaces. And so I would think there are probably a lot of organizations who are currently part of our and I'll keep using Serve because I forgot what the new name is, who

have been active in this thing, who may serve as could probably fill over the world some of these groups, as opposed to some association, who has never been involved with our effort and is kind of randomly going to be hit out of nowhere saying, hey, do you want to get a contract for this?

44:43
Speaker 4
So I would say let's not limit ourselves to just those groups. I say open it up to anybody who wishes to apply for some of those and see what kind of hits we get.

44:52
Speaker 1
So what I'd like to do is, first of all, thank you, Luis, for your comments. And I'm always in agreement in letting the best players play, right? Because that's going to make us better. It's going to make a better program. What I would suggest that you do in that case is send the information to Andrea Slater and give them an opportunity to throw their hat in the ring. And if I'm not off base, assuming that my vice chairs and everyone else's agreement, I think that makes sense. Are you guys okay with that? Okay. Is that fair? Luis that's fine.

45:39
Speaker 4
Can we get a copy of what the request can we also send that request for proposal out to the general membership of La County Serve so that they can see that as well.

45:55
Speaker 6
I would think that it would go out in the newsletters that go out. They're usually like announcements as far as anything that's open. Sorry about that. Kevin.

46:04
Speaker 1
No, absolutely. Remember I asked you to do that. Okay.

46:07
Speaker 4
Yeah. From the way it was presented, maybe I misinterpreted it. I thought it was only going to go out to those specific organizations that are being identified.

46:18
Speaker 6
Oh, no. Like I said in the newsletter, it always lists any open proposals.

46:25
Speaker 3
Yeah, and just to chime in, we can also introduce that opportunity at the next HRTC meeting. We do have some already onboarded partners that deal with water energy. We might not have onboarded partners that deal with other type of categories. We are on an on rolling basis when it comes to welcoming and bringing on new partners. So if there are partners that deal with these industries that are not onboarded, if you know them, reach out to them, send them our way, chioma can help them in onboarding them to the surf program. But it was at the will and desire of the HRTC to do on a rolling basis onboarding to allow folks to have access to these types of opportunities.

47:19
Speaker 1
I don't think anybody is going to turn someone away that has a lot of value to contribute. And even if we have to change the way that we do things, if it makes sense, we got to be smart and we pivot but we got to have a standard and a baseline to start with that makes sense.

47:39
Speaker 5
Sharon I am actually quite flabbergasted to see this and the reason is because I don't know if you guys have to remember when we created the affinity table hub structure, it was a negotiation. It was actually a compromise

between governance and outreach. They had hubs and we had something else. We had subgroups and when we created the business table under each hub there was 27 subgroups comprised in those hubs and they were added by the HRTC. And in the business and employer hub there's five or six categories of tables under that affinity hub and the trade associations and industry associations are listed there. So for us to be considered to taking what is already an approved hub that has a seat for all of the industry associations and turn that into eight seats in order to eliminate that the potential place for LGPT. Workers and those other individuals that were identified seems to be a bit discriminatory because they already had let me finish the definition and I'll make sure I bring this out by tomorrow.

49:03
Speaker 5
The definition and the purpose of a table partner was to give voice and a seat to those subgroups that were overlooked and under voiced. Because of our affinity hub structure, every one of these industry associations already has a seat at the business and employer. And Scarlett, I think you have that affinity hub structure with those bulletic 27 categories and they're already there. But to displace our LGBT and our other representatives that were under voice, went to see what potential underemployed individuals did not have voice, and that's why the recommendation of Table partners were there. So I'm a little troubled by this because it's really a misappropriation, and we recruited 400 members with that understanding. So the HRTC members may have a little bit of problem when they find out that they don't even have a seat at the table.

50:07
Speaker 6
Okay, so, Sharon, I think you may have missed the part where I said that we are looking for groups, nonprofit associations that are specifically targeting constituency groups. That's who they are working to protect. So we're not looking at trade associations like convention type and that kind of thing. We're looking at the associations that are specifically working to empower marginalized groups.

50:36
Speaker 3
If I may chime in, I did drop the affinity hub lead link, which shows the breakdown. And maybe to add some context, a lot of the Table partner leads that were proposed are still being served within the affinity hub lead. So under families and youth, we do have LGBTQ youth. We do have LGBTQ families. We do have seniors that are under the homeless veteran senior category, and so they are being served within the affinity hub lead structure that we have as well. But I did drop that in the chat if you guys would like to see the specific breakdown of the affinity hub lead and who they will service for reference.

51:23
Speaker 1
Any other comments? Okay, folks, I do.

51:32
Speaker 6
I put it in the chat, but.

51:33
Speaker 4
I'll just speak it. Just so I'm clear again, the reason why we're looking at changing the table partner leads from the categories or the structure that we had originally discussed that came out of the one is based on the feedback that we received back from Charles from that last meeting with the state that they were redefining or were letting us know that they didn't tell us this to begin with. But now this is the format that they would like us to move forward with. And there was a concern that if we don't adhere to this structure that they might make some difficulty for us moving forward in terms of our funding. Is that the reason why we are moving to this new structure?

52:19
Speaker 1
Charles, before you answer that, I want to make it clear that the chair and vice chairs were not involved in that meeting. So, Charles, why don't you speak to the origination of the additional categories, the authors?

52:34

Speaker 7

Sure. So just another recap of meeting with the state. I'm not a fan of speaking for other organizations, but they made it very clear that the tables that can you go back a slide, please? That the categories that on e suggested on the far left seem very much duplicates of the affinity hubs. What they were looking for were industries that they could actually invest in essentially the meeting was surrounded around the state being an investor and the investor was giving pretty solid directions of what they wanted to invest in sectors. And the sectors really should be defined by the research that they're paying for. So we have close actually over a million dollars if you add Armand as a research analyst to the surf program. So we're looking at over a million dollars being spent towards research. And if the research is not reflected in what they're going to invest in, it's a very high probability that Los Angeles or whatever region that doesn't abide by that research will not get their fair share of funding.

54:18
Speaker 1

Thank you. Charles, any comments? Libby, are you okay with that answer? Any other questions for well, I know.

54:26
Speaker 4

The answer is what it mean? He's sharing the feedback that heard. I just still concerned that all the time that was taken that we spent weeks after weeks or coming up with that format only to be told that what you have decided upon is not what we'll fund. Just trying to find a happy medium that we can make sure that those groups that we see as disparate groups are still incorporated into those table leads without putting our funding in jeopardy.

54:55
Speaker 1

That's my libby, if I could just lean in, Charles, real quick, that's how the third category came up is trying to find the happy medium. Based on that information, I want to make sure that everybody's voice is hurt today. So Sharon, I'm going to come back to you. Zahira, thank you.

55:14
Speaker 2

I appreciate know, I think to Libby's point and to the answer that Charles provided. When we last spoke, I know we talked about how we have the chair and the co chairs and conversations with the state because I think it's a little hard to really understand. Did the state issue a rule that.

55:41
Speaker 3
Says we have to kind of go.

55:42
Speaker 2

In this direction or was this a discussion with the state and this is what the state signaled? And I think ultimately as we kind of approach this issue and as we've had to go back and forth with the state in these discussions, there's what the state is trying to achieve. And if it's trying to achieve the work in the same ways it's done it before, it's not going to be successful because we've already used the old playbook before. That's why this new level of coordination and effort in terms of moving forward. And so I would feel a lot more comfortable with the chair and the co chairs having that conversation with the state to explain what La is trying to do, why we're trying to do it this way and then see what the median part is. What does that look like? So respectfully and appreciate, Charles, that you had some of those discussions, but I also know, yes, the state is an investor and it needs something to invest in and so what it wants to invest in ultimately has to be successful.

56:44
Speaker 2

And I think what we did is spend a year talking about what we think is going to be successful in our region and a pivot to something else. I would feel more comfortable if there was just more conversation so that the state had more clarity in terms of why we reached the decisions that we reached. Thank you.

57:06
Speaker 4

And Kevin, before you select Rudy to speak next, just want to flag. We have six minutes left. Just to be

respectful of everyone's time. I don't know if you want to just take Rudy's question and then we can go on, because we have.

57:20
Speaker 2
I.

57:20
Speaker 5
Have put something critical in the chat, but let Rudy go ahead. That speaks to this, and this is why.

57:27
Speaker 1
Please allow me to recognize you, please.

57:29
Speaker 5
Absolutely, sir.

57:30
Speaker 1
All right, Rudy. Go ahead.

57:32
Speaker 4
Yeah. Mr. Chair, I just want to reiterate that I think it would be amazing if you and the vice chairs met up with the state just to have a little bit more conversation about this. I mean, you get what we're trying to come across and why not have that meeting?

57:51
Speaker 1
Okay, so to those that made that comment, we are not opposed to having that meeting. It's just a matter of their availability. But I understand your points. And to be clear, we serve as leaders. We serve at whatever consensus this group reaches, not toward our own personal interests or opinions. So I just want to make that clear. And that's something that we probably need to take up. Sharon, give you 1 minute so that.

58:25
Speaker 2
We can move through.

58:26
Speaker 5
I have put in the so this is premature. LAEDC Institute of Applied Economics has recommended a series of industries. We have in our formal proposal a process already predefined and approved by the state on how were going to select our high growth industries. It is a budgeted line item. It is in the RFP number two. And I have extracted that content from the RFP that is live with CCF. It is not for LAEDC or for our chairs themselves to determine which industries we focus on. Our industry high growth industries. We put in our proposal how they will be selected. They'll be defined by the industry cluster researcher, which we're allocating hundreds of thousands of dollars to. And I've extracted that into the chat.

59:20
Speaker 1
Thank you.

59:21
Speaker 5
This should be on Vote for Tomorrow because we haven't got the industry cluster report back.

59:26
Speaker 1

Your point is well taken and appreciated. Andrea, this has to be the last comment because we got to get to the other items. Please.

59:37
Speaker 6
Okay. Well, as a person who's coming in late, and I know that the proposal has been referenced a lot of times, but just in the short amount of time I've been on these calls and going to the meetings, I know that this is how I look at the proposal. The proposal is what gets your foot in the door, right, and what gets you in the process. But then once you start doing the work, you realize that there are factors that maybe were not apparent and that maybe need to be adjusted and changed. And I think that one of the things that we're falling behind on, which is probably why we're taking so long to get things done, is that we're thinking everything is set in stone. Instead of that, the more information you get, the more informed the decisions are and then you're able to evolve and change to suit what the needs.

01:00:28
Speaker 1
And thank you, Andrea. And to Sharon. Your comment? The chairs and the vice chairs don't make decisions on their own opinion. Chairs and the vice chairs represent the collective group's interests, period, in the story. That's how we operate. That's how we have to operate. So, based on what you folks have heard today, if you want to put in the chat your thoughts on the comments of Sharon, of Zahira, of Libby, of Rudy, of Luis in regards to the table partner leads, please put them in so that we can figure out on next steps, the most logical next step and keep this process moving. We need to move to the next agenda item, please. Hopefully I'm willing to stay until we get the work done. But on the selection process, andrew, do you want to go ahead and speak again on the rubric on the Tbo selection committee?

01:01:28
Speaker 1
We want to get two representatives from the steering committee, two additional people on the steering committee on the selection process. So I just want to say that.

01:01:40
Speaker 6
Yes, so we're definitely trying to make it inclusive and then, like I said, we're going to put together a rubric. It's going to be shared with everyone and then as the applications are processed, they're going to be evaluated, as I mentioned, based on that. So that it's an equitable process. And some of the key factors that are going to be considered, as mentioned before, are the constituency groups that these groups and associations are working with and have been working with.

01:02:12
Speaker 1
Thank you, Andrea. And I saw a note from Libby in the chat about voting on or moving on the table partner leads. So again, we're going to meet, hopefully you all will be available to meet on the 15th, because if we can't resolve this where we are all in lockstep, then we can't move forward. So we've got to reach consensus one way or another and we got to figure out the best way to do that if we're going to keep this ball rolling. So if we can go to the next agenda item, please. So, micro grantees presentation. Scarlett.

01:03:05
Speaker 4
I can go ahead and speak on the micro grantees, but just a little status update. So we have been working on the development of what the process looks like for the selection of the 90 micrograntees and for the Affinity Hub leads, table partner leads and subregional table scope of work and progress support this kind of ties in with our fiscal agent. But we've been working closely with CCF on the scope of work for the Affinity Hub lead contracts, which I'll go ahead and drop in the chat in a moment for all of you to view, as well as the monthly progress reports that we will have the Affinity Hub leads table, partner leads and subregional tables to submit on a monthly basis. That will also be shared in the chat as well. And I'll go ahead and pass it on to Charles so he can speak on the California Jobs First rebrand.

01:04:00
Speaker 7
Thank you, Alan. So just want to just make this quick. Although there's been a rebrand from Community

Economic Resilience Fund to California Jobs First, the state hasn't given any indication that anything is going to change other than the actual name change. I know it may seem like it's a lot of changes because of the timing of the state making their pivoting in their thought process of making sure that those tables be geared towards sectors, but they've made no indication that surf is going to be anything. I'm sorry. California jobs first. Is anything other than surf? So business as usual. And just to be clear about the last issue for the tables, the state has not mandated anything. It's up to each individual region to choose what they feel is best for them. However, the fact that they've been clear on those tables being geared towards sectors, los Angeles would be doing themselves a very disservice by not making sure they're geared towards, you know, each know, makes their own decision.

01:05:25
Speaker 7
But I wouldn't be doing my job if I did not explicitly tell you guys this is the way the state is looking at everything in order to get the maximum amount of funding for our region. You can go to the next slide.

01:05:39
Speaker 1
Okay, hold on a second. Yeah. So I'm proposing that we meet on November 15 from nine to 12:00 P.m. At the LADC office in person and whatever. We have not been able to move forward, hopefully having an in person meeting and everyone having whatever documentation they need to support their position or their thoughts, we would encourage them to bring it. There have been a lot of comments on not adopting or having not adopting the Table partners, and that's why it's going out to vote, right? And so people have had a chance to voice their concerns both verbally and in writing, and you all have heard them. And so if they are not adopted, obviously we have to go back to the drawing board. All right, so any of my vice chairs you want to lean in on what I've just said? Your thoughts?

01:06:55
Speaker 6
Hey, Kevin, this is Stella. No, I hear you. We hear you loud and clear. And, you know, just listening to the other steering committee members feels that we definitely want to meet with the state to have this conversation to perhaps point out, like what Sharon just shared in the chat, some of the comments. But at the end of the day, then it's like, how do we reinforce all the work that we've done, reinforce these discussions and say to the state, like Charles just said, we don't have to do exactly what they're saying, but we're going to have to come to, obviously, some decision that says we have reflected these sectors in our affinity. Hubs. We are going to reflect them with the table partners. So I think that next meeting is really critical and that we'd be able to meet with the state in the next few days, next week so that we can have this discussion and just iron it all out.

01:08:07
Speaker 1
So I think you make a great point, Stella, and that's really what I was looking for because at the end of the day, there's nothing that says that we have to do it by tomorrow at 05:00. Right. And to me, it's logical. If we do have the opportunity to meet with the state, I think Charles mentioned that he could probably get that set up. Then we have a better informed mindset maybe to report back, know, inform the steering committee on our findings. And it might mean that we go back to the drawing board again. I want to move with rigor, but not at the expense of accuracy, not at the expense of quality. So, Charles and Alan, why don't we go ahead and suspend my recommendation is that we suspend the vote from taking place tomorrow until after we meet with the state. And then if there's any other recommendations that we need to make, then we can do so.

01:09:16
Speaker 1
Is that fair?

01:09:20
Speaker 7
Sure, if that's what you guys would like to do. I reach back out to the state, see if we can set up another meeting between the chairs, specifically around the.

01:09:30
Speaker 1

01:09:39
Speaker 4
I just want to say I'm completely on board with the in person meeting. Can I recommend that we extend it out beyond 3 hours to maybe at the minimum nine to one or maybe even nine to two? I just worry that people get there late. It's going to take some time to get us settled. So all of a sudden we're not starting until 930. Then we're down to almost 2 hours of work. If we're going to have everybody get down there, let's at least try to get as much bang for our bucks. I would say if we can go from nine to one or possibly nine to two, I would say that would maybe give us at least more breathing room. And if we finish early.

01:10:11
Speaker 1
Let's do it. Let's do it. Roll the sleeves up and Charles is going to spring for lunch. We'll figure it out. Okay, so let's adjust that. Vice chairs, you good with that?

01:10:31
Speaker 6
There's actually an SCIU conference that day, like, a statewide conference that day, and then a couple of other major events happening. I know that I would not be able to make it. I could send somebody else, but, yeah, I would not be able to make it. But I know that there are also other events happening on the 15th.

01:10:52
Speaker 1
All right, well, I think you're important for the conversation, Andrea. So, alan, why don't we try to figure out the best date and give us 4 hours, all right?

01:11:05
Speaker 4
Okay. Sounds good.

01:11:06
Speaker 6
Mondays, to be honest, mondays are usually my lightest day, believe it or not. I don't know how that happens. But mondays and Tuesdays are usually the lightest.

01:11:14
Speaker 1
I can do a monday afternoon, can't do Monday mornings. But if everybody else can do it Monday morning, I guess I'll have to. That's my team session, and that's important right now. But you know what? After the 8th, things become a little bit more flexible for me. So, alan, maybe we do a survey monkey, our calendar monkey was it calendly, one of those applications, and let's find a date. Okay. And I'll do my best to adjust my schedule, take into consideration Luis's point about 4 hours, and then we go from there. Zahira, your hand was raised. Are you good?

01:11:59
Speaker 3
Yes.

01:12:00
Speaker 2
You addressed what I was going to speak to, so thank you, mr. Chair. The only other piece that, since I have some space to just talk about is I think at the last meeting, we talked about potentially extending these meetings a little bit longer, and so I just wonder about that. To give ourselves a little bit of cushion. Today, I didn't have anything afterwards, but oftentimes the way that my calendar is structured is that it's back to back, and so having something, a cushion would be helpful for me, and it might be for others as well. I think that's what we heard last time.

01:12:31

Speaker 1
So you're saying extending them to an hour and a half.

01:12:35
Speaker 2
Yeah, it makes me, like, bite my nails thinking about it. But, yeah.

01:12:41
Speaker 1
You know what? After November eigth, I won't be sweating bullets. And then after my board meeting, I'm not as worried about that. After November eigth, I can do it. It's just right now, time is a premium for me on my job, but I'm all for, again, getting it done, because after we get through this, zahara, things are going to change a little bit. It's going to be a lot more fun. But we got to get through this. We got to go through the pain. So let's do it.

01:13:11
Speaker 6
This is fun, kevin, this is fun.

01:13:15
Speaker 1
You know what? This is okay. This is important because everybody has to have a clear head. Everybody has to be excited. There's got to be some passion. Around this because we're going to change things. We're going to change things. We're committed to that. We are going to change things and we got to make sure that whatever decisions we make today, we get down the road and say, oh man, we should have done it differently. No, let's do it right now, let's do it as fast as we can. We don't sacrifice quality or accuracy, right? And those that have deciding opinions or concerns, welcome those. But let's make sure that we have the documentation and that we're not just going on the opinion or thoughts of a few, that we're all on board with this. Because once we get done, let's run hard. We don't have to worry about anything else.

01:14:09
Speaker 1
And I hope that makes sense to everybody. That's where my head is because my board is wondering why I'm spending so much time doing this and not driving more of the revenue piece than some of the other pieces of my business. So hopefully after we get through this, we're going to be okay. All right, so folks, is there a fiscal agent update at CCF on this?

01:14:35
Speaker 4
So Jose and Maria had hopped off around 159 because they had a 02:00 meeting. But again, as I mentioned earlier, we are working directly with CCF in trying to get those affinity hub lead contracts all sorted out. Sorted out for the budget modification. We do have that on our website. Now if Scarlett, you can drop the chat or I can drop it in the chat in a moment, but you'll be able to view that budget modification on our website and for the research RFPs. Again, CCF is not here to speak on that, but we are still waiting on some bids for that second RFP and that's as far as I'll go for.

01:15:22
Speaker 5
Deadline.

01:15:24
Speaker 1
Can I recognize you? Sharon, please. We really needed to get that information from CCF. Can they give us a write up or something as to what they were going to talk about today?

01:15:39
Speaker 4
Yeah, I can reach out to CCF and we can send it through the email that will go on after this meeting.

01:15:46
Speaker 1

Then the other thing is, when is the affinity hub payout the first leg of the payout disbursement? When is that going to.

01:15:58
Speaker 4
Happen?

01:15:59
Speaker 1
Yeah. Sharon, your hand is up.

01:16:05
Speaker 5
No, no, I was typing it.

01:16:07
Speaker 1
Okay.

01:16:08
Speaker 5
All right, typing it.

01:16:10
Speaker 1
Okay, folks, that was the last one. Any questions on the upcoming meetings? Again, I was hoping that we could do the 15th, but Andrea, if you can't be there, you're going to be critical to this discussion and to Sharon's point. I was really looking forward to CCF's report today, so they need to give us something in writing at their earliest and hopefully tomorrow as to what they were going to present. And that needs to be socialized amongst the group, the whole committee, please. All right, here are upcoming meetings. November 9, steering committee, HRTC partners. November 17, nine to ten, bylaws working meeting friday, tomorrow, 930 to eleven. Friday, November 3, ten to 1130. So we did extend those timelines by half hour. Beyond that, folks, thank you for your time, thank you for your passion input. We're going to get through this and hopefully everyone's voice was heard.

01:17:23
Speaker 1
Those of you that did not, speak up, I need you to speak up to make sure I'm hearing all the voices. And we're going to go ahead and adjourn the meeting. Thank you so much.

01:17:35
Speaker 6
Thank you, Kevin, Andrea, thanks everybody.

01:17:37
Speaker 2
Thank you everyone. Thank you.

01:17:39
Speaker 4
Thank you everyone. Have a great day.