



## Steering Committee Meeting December 7<sup>th</sup>, 2023

[Presentation](#)

[Recording](#)

Passcode: \$pVT21yB

[Summary Notes](#)

[Chat Box](#)

[Transcript](#)

### Summary Notes

#### **Research Updates:**

There is a recommendation for the Steering Committee to approve Research Bid Package #2 awarding a contract to Beacon Economics as the vendor. The process of selecting Beacon Economics is explained, including their ability to meet deliverables within a specified timeframe and their competitive price point. The steering committee is asked to consider approving CCF to move forward with contract negotiations with Beacon Economics. LAEDC will monitor and report on deliverables without any additional funding needed. Some committee members express concerns about Beacon's relationship with labor and request more time for review before making a decision. The chair agrees to hold the decision over, allowing new members time to review materials and give both sides an opportunity to address concerns raised. Zahira expresses support for allowing further review without delaying the process. She explains that decisions are made even if one member has concerns, and they discuss those concerns before moving forward with a vote. Eddie Escoto suggests reviewing the agenda before making a decision and mentions potential conflicts in attending the next steering committee meeting. Nadine acknowledges delays due to elections and holidays but emphasizes the need to start work soon. Chioma offers one-on-one presentations for labor partners to catch up on California Jobs First. Crystal proposes giving members more time to review and conducting an online poll for voting. The committee agrees to conduct the vote via email with an extension of 3 additional business days to close the poll, aiming for completion by next Monday at 5 pm.

The research updates include data collection and community engagement for economic development summary and SWOT analysis projects conducted by civil economics and Beacon Economics respectively. They aim to complete drafts of regional plan materials by the 11th of next month. Process mapping updates have been made available in a Word document with room for comments, which will be editable as needed in the future.

#### **Regional Plan Update:**

Discussion on the timeline for the submission of the Regional Plan Part One, tentative timeline:

- December 11th – Convener will receive draft material from research contractors to integrate into Regional Plan Pt 1
- December 11th - 15th – Convener will draft Regional Plan Pt 1
- December 15th – 19th – Comment/Review period
- December 21st – Steering Committee votes for adoption of Regional Plan Pt 1 for submission.

\*Final data will not be received until end of the year\*

### **Fiscal Updates:**

The transcript discusses the payment schedule for the Affinity hub leads. Initially, there was a proposal for three staggered payments, but concerns were raised about it not covering the costs incurred by the organizations. After discussions with the state, an 80% upfront payment was agreed upon. The revised agreements will be issued to the Affinity hub leads and they will receive \$40,000 upfront. The remaining 20% will be paid at the end of the contract term. There is also discussion about reporting requirements and a request for a template to ensure consistency in reporting. Additionally, there is mention of obtaining an indirect cost letter and sharing contracts with other steering committee members for transparency purposes.

Concerns are raised about verifying if work has been done according to contract requirements and this is scheduled as an agenda item for future meetings. The Fiscal representative suggests smoothing over an issue and asks for feedback on resident participant stipends. They discuss creating a policy and procedure around the costs and making recommendations on how to use the stipends. There is mention of adhering to a \$100 cap per participant, per meeting, per day. The speaker asks for clarification and requests feedback from the steering committee in order to draft a policy.

### **Discussion on Allowing Orgs and Businesses to Present to the Steering Committee:**

There is a proposal to invite organizations that align with DEI (Diversity, Equity, Inclusion) principles and sustainability goals to present at future meetings. Criteria will be established before inviting them. A process will be developed for reviewing company information prior to inviting them onto calls or meetings. The team is in consensus to move forward with developing a template online. The template will be presented at the next meeting for people to submit companies that meet their standards. They emphasize the need for quality, accuracy, and transparency without sacrificing speed.

### **LA HRTC vs. LA Collaborative**

There is a discussion about changing the name of the program and collaborative from HRTC to LA Collaborative or LA County Collaborative. There are considerations regarding branding consistency and potential impact on current partners. It is recommended to stick with one name for less confusion, but LA County is noted as an important reflection. A poll will be shared to allow the SC partners to vote to adopt the official name, closing next Monday at 5pm.

### **Chat Box**

Alan Cheam

03:50

**AC**

Good afternoon all,

Please fill out the attendance form here: <https://forms.gle/aLKcHe9SaSCoYVRW8>

Steering Committee Action Items Tracker:

[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1adMxqngNZjvfbuxMwdLfS1bZgHW\\_K0Pk6OFsfrKNwzM/edit?usp=drive\\_link](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1adMxqngNZjvfbuxMwdLfS1bZgHW_K0Pk6OFsfrKNwzM/edit?usp=drive_link)

Agenda Item Jamboard:

[https://jamboard.google.com/d/1SAGYWNVFqJLwTGv10XmbE39IRSoSyRcmA\\_vKqD4u19U/edit?usp=sharing](https://jamboard.google.com/d/1SAGYWNVFqJLwTGv10XmbE39IRSoSyRcmA_vKqD4u19U/edit?usp=sharing)

Steering Committee Resource Tracker: <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1apfhPM7h5RVzcDLB7pMqZ-B4UVGFc68z1mrz0qedH64/edit?usp=sharing>

Kevin Harbour BizFed Institute

07:29

**KH**

Kevin Harbour BizFed Institute

Scarlet Peralta

07:30

**SP**

Good afternoon all,

Please fill out the attendance form here: <https://forms.gle/aLKcHe9SaSCoYVRW8>

Alan Cheam

08:09

**AC**

Bid Package: RFP2\_Bid Package\_BeaconEconomics.pdf ([hubspotusercontent-na1.net](https://hubspotusercontent-na1.net))

[1 Reply](#)

Scarlet Peralta

10:21

**SP**

Good afternoon all,

Please fill out the attendance form here: <https://forms.gle/aLKcHe9SaSCoYVRW8>

Alan Cheam

17:48

**AC**

FYI - The original deadline for the vote was set to today at 5pm.

Kelly LoBianco

18:09

**KL**

Good by me on timing so our members can review

 1

Jessica Quintana

19:23

**JQ**

Hello Everyone Jessica Quintana Present

Jennifer Zellet

19:43

**JZ**

If there are a significant number of new members, is it possible to onboard them at once so business is not delayed?

[2 Replies](#)

Scarlet Peralta

22:28

**SP**

Good afternoon all,

Please fill out the attendance form here: <https://forms.gle/aLKcHe9SaSCoYVRW8>

Luis Portillo, San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership

23:27

**LP**

so have they already been awarded the contract?

[1 Reply](#)

Alan Cheam

24:27

**AC**

December 21st

Kristal Romero, LA Fed

27:49

**KR**

Thank you, Chioma that will be extremely helpful

👍 1

Matt Horton

27:52

**MH**

Can we provide some clarity on the methodology involved in the industry cluster analysis to ease any tension on that element?

[3 Replies](#)

Charles Johnson

29:16

**CJ**

Matt, Arman could probably answer that better than I could.

👍 1

Alan Cheam

30:14

**AC**

Votes are not conducted during meetings, we conduct votes by email to ensure we capture all Steering Committee members that may not be present at the meeting.

👍 1

Jermaine Hampton - LAEDC

30:39

**JH**

The big piece here is if we don't want to move forward with beacon we will need to reissue the Rfp potentially and/or go with the next best option/bidder. This will have timeline implications given that the LAEDC research arm is the next best bidder and our team may have challenges condensing the timeline. I just want to give some context.

Kristal Romero, LA Fed

32:57

**KR**

Thank you, Jermaine. Important context to note.

Alan Cheam

33:01

**AC**

The bid package is in the chat, we'll send it by email as well to our labor SC members.

👍 1

Alan Cheam

34:26

**AC**

Deadline to submit vote for RFP#2 Review Committee Approval: December 11th, Monday at 5pm

👍 1

Benjamin Torres

36:53

**BT**

Those contracts were received today

Alan Cheam

37:05

**AC**

Good afternoon all,

Please fill out the attendance form here: <https://forms.gle/aLKcHe9SaSCoYVVRW8>

Benjamin Torres

37:05

**BT**

For affinity hub leads

Charles Johnson

41:07

**CJ**

Excuse me, everyone, but there's an emergency at my child's school so I must leave to pick him up now.

👍 3 👍 1

Scarlet Peralta

41:19

**SP**

The scope of work was drafted based on feedback we received from the SC.

A template is being provided.

Luis Portillo, San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership

43:28

**LP**

Can someone share the link to the document Kevin referenced? Thank you.

Luis Portillo, San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership

43:39

**LP**

Can you share a copy of the contract?

[2 Replies](#)

Alan Cheam

45:49

**AC**

Flagging 47 minutes left in the meeting!

Alan Cheam

48:30

**AC**

Agenda Item Jamboard:

[https://jamboard.google.com/d/1SAGYWNVFqJLwTGvI0XmbE39IRSoSyRcmA\\_vKqD4u19U/edit?usp=sharin](https://jamboard.google.com/d/1SAGYWNVFqJLwTGvI0XmbE39IRSoSyRcmA_vKqD4u19U/edit?usp=sharing)

[g](#)

[1 Reply](#)

Alan Cheam

50:42

**AC**

Welcome to our new Steering Committee members! Glad to have labor on board!

👍 1 👍 1

Alan Cheam

52:21

**AC**

Flagging 40 minutes left in the meeting

Adine Forman

55:26

**AF**

Adine Forman, Hospitality Training Academy (HTA); I am finally back to my laptop and don't see where to sign-in for the meeting.

Scarlet Peralta

55:38

**SP**

Good afternoon all,

Please fill out the attendance form here: <https://forms.gle/aLKcHe9SaSCoYVRW8>

Alan Cheam

58:04

**AC**

Flagging 35 minutes left in the meeting.

Adine Forman

58:36

**AF**

With labor at the table, shouldn't we confirm that it is a union airline? Kristal?

[1 Reply](#)

Benjamin Torres

59:24

**BT**

Appreciate the fact that process will be critical

Benjamin Torres

01:00:55

**BT**

DEI, sustainability, commitment/proven track record of working with marginalized communities

Adine Forman

01:02:57

**AF**

Would want to know if they have a union workforce, which unions, if there is a strike/boycott situation, etc.

Kristal Romero, LA Fed

01:03:02

**KR**

Thank you everyone! Have a good day. Please feel free to reach out via email.

Toni Symonds

01:03:15

**TS**

There should be a component of this that relates to small businesses.

[👍 1](#)

Stella Ursua

01:04:06

**SU**

Absolutely Toni. We have a number of start-ups that I believe will want to highlight their businesses to us.

Rita Kampalath (she/her), LA County Chief Sustainability Office

01:05:11

**RK**

I'm going to have to hop off for another meeting.

👍 1

Alan Cheam

01:06:16

**AC**

Vote for Name Change: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/PV5FCDH>

(Amending the name would take a couple months.)

ZahirahMann

01:07:33

**Z**

Thank you for the discussion. I need to leave for another meeting.

Alan Cheam

01:08:05

**AC**

Will also be sent by email!

Jermaine Hampton - LAEDC

01:08:22

**JH**

Also be mindful it impacts our 420 plus partners and the branding that's already been happening as well

👍 1

Alan Cheam

01:09:40

**AC**

Flagging 23 minutes left in the meeting.

Alan Cheam

01:12:41

**AC**

Please fill out the attendance form here: <https://forms.gle/aLKcHe9SaSCoYVRW8>

Arman Koohian

01:19:54

**AK**

Please fill out the attendance form here: <https://forms.gle/aLKcHe9SaSCoYVRW8>

Benjamin Torres

01:22:07

**BT**

Thank you

Jermaine Hampton - LAEDC

01:22:07

**JH**

For those unfamiliar with regional planning I would look at the La county Ceds. General knowledge of the Ced's will help this process

👍1

Stella Ursua

01:23:40

**SU**

Thank you for your contributions, feedback and question during today's discussion Steering Committee members! Thanks to our Chair Kevin Harbor for keeping us on point during our meetings. And thanks to the LAEDC team for all your leadership and support.

👍1

Alan Cheam

01:24:11

**AC**

Reminder: Partners Meeting tomorrow!

👍1

Cheyenne Capelo

01:24:32

**CC**

Thank you!

## [Transcript](#)

**02:44**

Speaker 1

Well, good afternoon, everyone. It's 01:00 thanks for joining us. We'll give folks a few more minutes to get on so we have maximum participation from the beginning. Hey, Jennifer.

**03:00**

Speaker 2

Hi, Kevin. How are you?

**03:02**

Speaker 1

I'm well.

**03:03**

Speaker 2

Good.

**03:04**

Speaker 1

Good to see you.

**03:05**

Speaker 2

And you, my friend. How Charles. Hi, Alan. Hi, Armand.

**03:11**

Speaker 1

Hello. See, we got Kevin Clark and Stella. Hey, Stella.

**03:18**



Speaker 2  
Hey, everybody. Hey, Kevin.

**03:21**

Speaker 1  
Got Bobby Davis, Chris Temblador, Annie Escoto, Maria Garcia. Good afternoon. Good afternoon. Patrick Hogg. Good afternoon. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon. Crystal Romero. Good afternoon.

**03:43**

Speaker 2  
Hi. Good afternoon.

**03:49**

Speaker 1  
The California jobs first team. Alan, Armand, Charles. See Chioma here. Chioma. Hey, Jermaine, how you doing? Hello. Good afternoon. Hope all is well. How you doing, Mr. Chair? We are well, as good as could be expected. I'm recovering in my last stages of pneumonia, but I'm here. Oh, that's not good. I hope you're feeling better. Yeah, well, trust me, I didn't plan on being here, but I woke up feeling pretty good this morning, so here I am. That's a good thing. That's a blessing. Yeah, God is good. See? Matt Horton, I see you on here. Mr. Hara, good afternoon. Good afternoon, Mr. Harbor. Hope you recover quickly. Me too. And Mr. Harbor is my. Oh, sorry there. No, I'm just kidding. I'm at that age now. I just have to accept it. I hear you.

**05:09**

Speaker 1  
It's more of a respect than anything else, and I take it exactly as that. And I appreciate you offering that to me. Sign of a man well raised. Yes, thank you. I appreciate that. My mom would appreciate that. As I say, it's a cultural thing, but also it's polite, so I appreciate it. Definitely. All right, let's see here. It's 103. We'll give everybody another, say, minute and a half, and then we'll just get going. Hey, Scarlett, I see you there.

**05:53**

Speaker 2  
Hello, Mr. Chair.

**05:55**

Speaker 1  
Ricardo. Good afternoon. Good afternoon, Mr. Chair. Good afternoon, everyone. And Dr. McKeejan.

**06:10**

Speaker 2  
Good afternoon, everyone.

**06:12**

Speaker 1  
All right, good afternoon. Okay, got just a few more seconds and we'll just kick it off. All right, you know what? Everyone's here. I don't want to penalize you guys for being on time, so I'm going to toss it over to Alan to give you the welcome and some. Alan, you're not coming through. I totally forgot. I'm on my phone and my computer because the audio is not working. But we should be good now. So thank you again for kicking it off to me. So just for some housekeeping, as usual, if you could please record your attendance using the form in the chat.

**07:05**

Speaker 1  
And of course, we'd also like to remind everyone that we do have the action items tracker, as well as the Google chat board to propose an agenda item, as well as the resource tracker for all of your convenience to easily access all of the resources that you need as a steering committee member. With that said, I'll go ahead and move forward to provide the floor to our fiscal agent, CCF.

**07:33**

Speaker 2  
Thank you Ellen and hi everyone. It's always good to see you and I'm happy to hear you're feeling better. Kevin

wanted to start today's fiscal agent update with an update on the RFP two that we've been working on to try and get that solicitation for proposals completed. You should have received from Alan earlier in the week a package that includes all the materials that we've compiled for this solicitation and the recommendation that is being made by the review committee to select Beacon economics as the vendor for this solicitation. Just to give you some more background on the process before we move into discussion. And our request for approval is to just provide you more background on the process. Right?

**08:36**

Speaker 2

So we actually issued this solicitation back in August earlier this year in combination with two other solicitations and at that time we did not receive any responses from the public for that RFP two, which is around industry clusters. So we actually went back to the state and let them know that there were no responses that were received for that solicitation. We received approval from the state at that time to approach two of the selected vendors, Beacon Economics and CBL economics, that both received the contracts for the other solicitations to invite them to respond to this solicitation. We also received approval from the state to approach LAEDC given that they have worked in this industry cluster area previously and the state also approved that. So we approached all three agencies and invited them to respond to the solicitation. All three responded and submitted proposals.

**09:55**

Speaker 2

We recruited three individuals to serve as part of the review panel. They are Stephen Sachs, Brian Wally and Pietro Rossetti. These folks all have expertise in government accounting, procurement and public accounting, and so they reviewed the applications, scored them using a scoring rubric that was developed based on the RFP. And the top two scoring proposals were actually LADC and Beacon economics. CVL Economics received the lowest score. There was actually a 13 point differential between the CVL proposal and the next highest scoring application, so we did not recommend them moving forward given that the point differential was significant and moved forward. Beacon and LAEDC for interviews, the review panel interviewed the two responding agencies on Monday, November 27, and deliberated thereafter.

**11:08**

Speaker 2

And in their deliberation, they decided to go with Beacon economics, or make the recommendation to go with Beacon economics because they were able to convey how they would be able to meet the deliverables within the specified timeframe in the RFP. LAEDC, for their part, was proposing a much longer timeframe and didn't seem to have a response for being able to compress their timeline. In addition, Beacon Economics also had the most competitive price point, although the review panel was weighing more heavily on the ability for the vendor to deliver within a specified time frame. But given both points right, the competitively priced and their ability to deliver within the time frame that we want, the review panel ultimately recommended moving forward with Beacon economics. So we're bringing this recommendation forward to the steering committee for your consideration and approval.

**12:34**

Speaker 2

And upon your approval, you would be authorizing CCF to move forward and participate in contract negotiations with Beacon economics in an amount not to exceed \$150,000. So we would work with them and the budget that they submitted to execute a contract. And then the steering committee would also be authorizing LAEDC to monitor and report on Beacon economics deliverables. So CCF would be overseeing the financial management of the contract, and then LEDC, as the regional convener, would be working with them directly to ensure monitoring and reporting deliverables are met. And so that's my report. I'm open to any follow up questions.

**13:34**

Speaker 1

If anyone would like to ask Maria a question in regards to this, please raise your hand. Tony, could you mute your. Thank you. Okay. All right. Seeing none, I guess you could move to the next agenda item. Maria.

**13:55**

Speaker 2

I was trying to ask the question. I just couldn't find it on my computer. How to raise my hand.

**14:02**

Speaker 1

Well, go ahead, Tony.

**14:05**

Speaker 2

Yeah. You said that this is also an approval that LAEDC is going to be monitoring the deliverables. And what I'm wondering is, does that fit within their current funding? That can be quite some time and are quite time consuming. And I'm just wondering, or is this also an approval for a supplemental funding to cover that contract? That great question, Tony. And no, this is actually part of the role LADC plays as regional convener, so there would be no additional fiscal impact.

**14:45**

Speaker 1

Thank you, Maria. Adine.

**14:47**

Speaker 2

Hi. So, as newly added to the steering committee, I haven't had a chance to review any of this, debriefed on any of this. Really would love to have that before there's a vote to move this forward. I really remember having Beacon testify many times against the union I work with and having a fairly anti labor sense to them. So I am a little concerned about that. And since I did not know this was on here, we just sort of got this information recently. I would really like a chance to go back and understand Deacon's relationship with labor. And also, I think LAEDC should be given a chance to respond if the only issue is timeline, respond on timeline.

**15:43**

Speaker 2

So I'm hoping we can hold this over for another meeting so that those of us that are brand new to this steering committee, which is a significant amount, have a chance to review. Thank you, Adine. And that would be a decision for the steering committee and the chair.

**15:59**

Speaker 1

Crystal, do you want to comment on that?

**16:05**

Speaker 2

I think that's fine. I think that's pretty reasonable. So, Mr. Chair, if you're okay with pushing this to the next meeting just to give our people a chance, we'll leave that up to you. But I think it sounds fair.

**16:24**

Speaker 1

My only concern is timeline constraints. But, Alan. Yes, thank you. I just wanted to comment also. So, Crystal, you're already aware of this because we spoke and that's how we found out about who our new steering committee representatives are. And that information was given to us after we sent out the email that included the bid packages and everything. But I just wanted to let you know and the rest of our new labor partners on the steering committee that we can go ahead and resend you that email so you'll have all the materials that you need to review.

**17:04**

Speaker 2

That would be really helpful. I appreciate.

**17:08**

Speaker 1

Don't, I don't want to make this decision here in a vacuum. Adeen, your request is duly noted. I think we need to circle back on it. But before I speak any further, Charles, you're on mute. Charles.

**17:24**

Speaker 2  
Charles?

**17:26**

Speaker 1

Sorry. I believe Luis was ahead of. Oh, ok. Well, then hold. So I was, I'm fine with holding it over for another week. I would recommend we do two things. One, let's look at what are some of the requirements? Because I thought that as we're putting out request proposals, there are certain values and certain things that we ask our bidders to agree to. And so if those are some of the things that if they comply with that, I'd be concerned about just excluding them, despite the fact that they're saying they're going to conform with those. And then two, I think if there's concerns about them, I think I would like to somebody for them an opportunity, provide them an opportunity to respond as opposed to us just going around well, I've had this bad experience with them in the past.

**18:11**

Speaker 1

I don't think we should consider them. And I think it's only fair that if we got to this point where we're saying they're the preferred, they're who want the contract to go to, if there's concerns being raised about them, I think they should at least have the opportunity to respond to some of those concerns and see if they can be addressed. Okay.

**18:29**

Speaker 2

I totally agree with you. That's why I need time to go to the union and go get the details on.

**18:38**

Speaker 1

Dean, let me recognize you, please. You had a chance to speak. We have a couple other people that need to speak, and then I'll come back to you.

**18:46**

Speaker 2

Sorry, I'm just in a car, so I can't.

**18:49**

Speaker 1

No worries, Zahira.

**18:54**

Speaker 2

Thank you. I think if it doesn't delay the process, then people being able to further review sounds reasonable. But I do think that as we review it, my understanding in terms of how we make decisions is if one member has a concern, that doesn't necessarily mean that we wouldn't move forward with the process. We would talk about it and discuss the members concerns, and the other members would share and see whether they have that same concern. And if not, we would go ahead and move forward with a vote.

**19:29**

Speaker 2

And so I think that for one member to be able to go back and get more information and catch up on where we all are, but as was shared, we have been going through this process since August, and that there was this issue in terms of needing to go back out and get additional pieces, in terms of solicitation and all of those pieces. So I appreciate some of the process that's been gone through here, and it sounds like we have really out of the work that's been done. We have one strong option. So happy to have more conversations.

**20:06**

Speaker 2

And I would be curious in terms of what some of the questions would be in terms of why we're holding it over and what questions we'll be answering and digging into the next time we discuss this, just to have more clarity on what that is. Thank you.

**20:21**

Speaker 1

Thank you, Sahira. Eddie Escoto. Hi. Good afternoon, everybody. This is actually Eddie Escoto Alvarez, but the Alvarez didn't seem to show up. But we'll fix that for the next time, Mr. Chairman. No problem. Hey, so I'm just going to echo what my sister said over there. Since I'm new, I didn't get the agenda, and I'm sure it's somewhere there. But on the other commissions that I've been, I don't think it hurts giving it one quick look, making sure that we're all good with it. And then as long as you said, Mr. Chair, it doesn't delay anybody getting paid what they're owed or missing out a grant. I think that's fine. I don't see a problem with going to, I was actually going to abstain just on that fact because I hadn't seen the total process yet. Thank you, Eddie Charles. Thank you.

**21:17**

Speaker 1

Yeah, I was actually going to speak on this in another slide down the line, but obviously this is a good time to speak on it now. And Nadine, just so you know that I was going to speak on this before your comment. So this is not in response to your comment, this is just to the steering committee in general, we're a little behind, but we can get caught up quickly. And the reason we're behind is because of the elections. That process and the approvals took a lot longer than we expected. There's holidays, there's seasonal events like graduations that cause further delays. Now, as Maria from CCF was just know, the drafts for the rfps one and three there will be due soon from beacon and civil. And they've been working extremely, working on extreme tight deadline.

**22:10**

Speaker 1

And some of the reasons we didn't get a lot of bids on those rfps from the very beginning may be because the deadlines were so tight. So for example, beacon and civil both, when they put in their proposal, when we had the interview with them, they discussed, they asked about having an extended timeline to complete the work and we couldn't grant it because the state is not moving their deadline for our deliverables. And to Maria's point, early also, you see that there's a long and arduous process, equitable process for selecting the. So being that beacon was chosen for this. The, the issue is this, if the steering committee still wants to have a final approval on them before they do their work, whenever that approval process is going to happen, it's taking time away from Beacon actually doing the work.

**23:11**

Speaker 1

And we don't want to impact the integrity of a really solid report just because we're so married to a process. And that's still not dealing with the contract that CCF has to put in place for beacon and making sure they get their first payment in order for them to begin the work. So a lot of time can be taken away from them actually doing that work. So I just want this entire steering committee, not just you, Aiden, but the entire steering committee, to be aware of these type of challenges so they can consider maybe a different approval process. Okay, there's a question in the chat that has been answered by Scarlett from Luis, answered by Scarlett. Jermaine, I think you're next up. Jermaine Hampton, you're on mute if you're talking. All right, we'll get back to.

**24:13**

Speaker 1

I was just going to ask when is the next steering committee meeting? And the only reason why I ask is because if it's going to come up for voting the next steering committee meeting, I just want to see when that actually is going to be. That's my first question. And the reason why is obviously because there's holidays and I respecting everyone's time. So if we're talking December 21. So hopefully I think we need to bring that up for discussion if folks are going to even be, we're going to have enough folks on this call on the 21st. And then secondly, this is really for the jobs first team for our report that is also due this month.

**24:50**

Speaker 1

Is there anything that we need to note in terms of that research partner that has been identified and then the industry clusters, does that need to be part of the report is my other question. Armand, I can probably let you speak to this, but my understanding is that we just submit whatever we have up to that point with the caveat that the final report for RFP number two will be done late January, and then we'll have to submit through probably like the next progress status report. But maybe Armand or Alan, you can clarify that. Yeah, thank you, Charles. I'm sorry, Armand. I thought I was going to go speak. But just to clarify for the regional plan, they are expecting that we do have all components of the research, including the industry clusters report.

**25:52**

Speaker 1

However, at this point, what we're going to be doing is essentially providing a placeholder in the report, just letting them know where we are at with contracting the researcher as well as if we have any progress from them. At that point when we submit the regional plan, that's what we would provide in the report as well. Armand, you can go ahead and speak a little bit more if you'd, you know, Alan, you captured what I was going to say. We would just have to give whatever information we have about the scope of work, of what will be completed from the researcher and all these things. They could be streamlined. The sooner we are able to approve them and get the contract going.

**26:38**

Speaker 1

As I said, once we can get that scope of work agreed upon by both parties, we can include that in the regional plan that is due at the end of the year. Perfect. Okay. All right, Chioma.

**26:52**

Speaker 2

Oh, thank you. I was going to wait for another slide, but I just wanted to mention while we have labor on the call, I'm glad that we have labor at the table. And I wanted to reach out to all of the new labor partners to join me for a California jobs first one one presentation. And I just wanted to make mention of it on the call instead of via email. Since you're on the call, I was sending out information for you to get your schedules so that you all can get caught up to date on where we are with California jobs first and also the new upcoming catalyst program that we have and so that you'll be familiar with everything. But yeah, we just received the name, so I haven't been able to send that out yet, but that's all I have for now.

**27:41**

Speaker 1

Okay. So let's go back to. Well, her hand was up. Aideen, is there anything else you wanted to say? I was going to get back to you. All right, Eddie, back to you again. Yeah. Mr. Chairman, just to kind of move the train here along, the question was brought up about we don't want to stop this funding from stopping. The question was brought up on the 21st meeting. I know that I can't attend that meeting due to a prior conflict. Is it going to be okay that we push this until January? I guess that's my question for staff. From where I sit and listening to what Charles said, we need to get them started on the work. So pushing it out for a month, and that's basically what it would be, would probably be prohibitive. Crystal.

**28:52**

Speaker 2

Hi. Does this vote need to be conducted when I say in person, I mean in the steering committee call or are these votes that are conducted electronically? Because if that's the case, if you, Mr. Chair, and the rest of the committee is okay with it, then I would propose again, I think it's perfectly reasonable to give us a little bit of time. And thank you again, chioma, for offering that. I think that'll be extremely helpful. I would like to be a part of that as well. I do think it's a little reasonable to give us maybe at least a week or so, or at least until the meeting, and then if the poll can be conducted online, if that's cool, we can ensure that it's done by then.

**29:44**

Speaker 2

I just do believe it is reasonable to give us a little bit of time just to go over it since this is the first time that we're seeing it. But that was two questions kind of rolled into one. Thank you.

**29:56**

Speaker 1

Okay, Crystal. Thank you, Andrea. Andrea, you're on mute. Or maybe not. Your hand is up, Andrea. Oh, sorry. I think I must have hit a bad spot. I actually wasn't going to suggest the same thing. Thank you, Crystal. That given the fact that know right before the holidays and a lot of people are going to be out, that. Okay, I just saw Alan's response that this is one of those things that we definitely can send out via email or something for people to make their selection. All right, so there you have your answers, folks. We can do the vote after this meeting by email. And just personally speaking, given that you guys just came on board, I understand your concern. The whole reason that we want you here is for you to be able to lean in.

**30:55**

Speaker 1

On the other hand, we got to make sure we move the train along. So we're going to try to do both at the same time. And Scarlett, your hand is up.

**31:05**

Speaker 2

Yes. So we can just maybe get, maybe a consensus because we actually were going to have the vote end today at 05:00 p.m. So it was just a small time frame. Again, seeing the very restrictive timeline that we are and being able to contract the vendor, get them up and rolling and beginning their work, what would be a consensus as far as the time frame for the vote to end or to close off?

**31:32**

Speaker 1

Well, today's Thursday and we're voting on whether we want to accept beacon economics. Is that what you're, Scarlett?

**31:42**

Speaker 2

Yes.

**31:42**

Speaker 1

Yeah. So Chioma has to deliver the one one training. Hopefully that'll happen early next week. Chioma, you can do a doodle mean. What are we saying? Because what we're trying to accomplish is to get labor up to speed. Right. Let them have a chance to review it, have you do an overview of the whole project. Right. Bring them up to speed. And that has to happen soon. So I think my question to you, Chioma and everyone and our labor affinity hub leads, or should I say labor steering committee members, are you able to set aside some time in the next week to get this done so we can get this vote done, say, by next Wednesday at five?

**32:40**

Speaker 2

Yeah, I'll send out a doodle poll and see today. But I don't know if they need my presentation in order to make this determination to make.

**32:50**

Speaker 1

Well, Alan's going to send some backup information to do that. So we'll get both done. Get the poll done. They wanted a week. Hold on. Some other things that Jermaine put in the chat that I haven't had a chance to look at all right. So, Alan, you're going to get the information out to the new members, correct? That will be done today, if I may suggest, because I'd like to send out the bid package. I know it's in the chat, but I'd like to send it out by email right after this meeting just to give everyone enough time to look at it over. But maybe. So if you get it out today, right after the meeting, you'll have the rest of the day. Tomorrow, the weekend and Monday. How about if we do it Monday by Monday at five?

**33:52**

Speaker 1

That doesn't set us back too far. I'll make that motion. All right, I can accept that. Is there anyone object to that? Okay, so labor got, we're pushing it two business days and four calendar days to give you a chance to look it over, and we'll close the selection Monday at five. Is that reasonable? Scarlett?

**34:22**

Speaker 2

Thank you.

**34:23**

Speaker 1

All right. Okay, so we got agreement. All right, folks, we got to get through this agenda. Next item, Maria.

**34:30**

Speaker 2

Thank you, Mr. Chair. The next agenda item is relative to the Affinity hub lead payment schedule. As you know, we came to the steering committee a couple of weeks ago and mentioned that we had a payment schedule and we're issuing agreements out to the twelve Affinity hub lead organizations and had proposed to do a three payment, staggered approach. We did hear your concerns in that the payment schedule that we had set up was not going to be enough to provide the cost that you've incurred for participating in this project. So we heard your concerns. We went back to the state and asked if we could provide a full upfront payment and got feedback from the state that was not possible. The California Jobs first program provides for advanced payments to our subrecipients or subcontractors. We cannot do full payments.

**35:46**

Speaker 2

And so went back a couple of times, started proposing different percentages and were able to get an 80% advanced payment for the twelve affinity hub leads with 20% at the end of the contract term. That's the best we could do given the state's policies around advanced payments. And so what our next step is to issue out the revised agreements to the Affinity hub leads and have them execute this revised agreement. So the new agreement will be 80% upfront. This is \$40,000 contingent on the execution of the contract and receiving payment from the state so that we're able to issue out the funds. There are reports that are part of the deliverables for the affinity hub leads. However, the reports basically are not contingent on payment. In other words, they're going to be due.

**37:04**

Speaker 2

The first one will be due at the end of December, and then the last one will be due in September next year. The payment itself, though, is only contingent on having an executed contract and having the funds in our account delivered by the state.

**37:26**

Speaker 1

So, Maria, I raised my hand. There's a step that was left out. First of all, personally, I think I've seen two payment potential payment schedules. One on contract at 2015 and 15, which was 40, 30, and 30 in terms of percentages. Then in a couple of meetings ago, when you left out a step because were told that were going to get 50,000 up front, I called everybody and went out in print. And since it's my name out there, I want you to clarify that it was 50,000. All right? Because you left that out, and I want to know how that commitment was made and what I need to do or please just clear the air and clear my name to my colleagues here.

**38:19**

Speaker 2

Absolutely. Thank you, chair. So there were multiple conversations that we had with the state around the defining advance payment and percentages. We were able to give out an initial conversation after we proposed the 40 1515 split, or the first split that we had. Right. With the three payments, the initial direction we got was that it was possible for us to issue out a full payment up front. However, we had subsequent conversations with the state where they got clarification and they came back with an official response, revising their original advice, and let us know that weren't able to do a full payment upfront.

**39:14**

Speaker 1

Well, first of all, I didn't mean to cut you off. Were you anything else?

**39:19**

Speaker 2

No, that's it.

**39:20**

Speaker 1

Okay, how do we put this? This a learning opportunity, right? Let's make sure before my name associated with something and anyone else's name, or I set our Affinity hub leads and our HRTC, our steering committee's expectations around this, that we don't have to cross this bridge again. Because, to be candid, 80 20, it works for



me. But that's just me, right? We report to our boards, we set expectations as I did, and now we got to go back again and say something different. So if we can make sure that we put the right steps in order before we make commitments, it would help me in terms of leadership. And then secondly, that's it for me. But as I said, in comparison to the first proposal, I'll take 40,010 at the end.

**40:21**

Speaker 1

From a business model that makes sense because you want people to be incentivized, but you certainly want to reward us for our good faith. And our dedication to this project and the work that we put in. Luis, your hands up. Yeah, I wanted to see a couple of questions. One, did we ever spell out what the duties are of the affinity hub leads and how we will measure success to see if those were accomplished? So, Louise, if you look at the contract, I think it's on page two, and then all the exhibit a, the scope of work is in there, and that'll probably answer 80% to 90% of your questions. LADC will be working with them to put that out. In fact, there's a 1231 deadline that I understand has already been met. Okay. So there's no work to be done there officially.

**41:16**

Speaker 1

CCF is going to the link to the contract in the chat. That way it's on the top, so I can see what it is. And then finally, for reporting purposes, I'd recommend if staff can kind of put together a template that people can use. That way we have everybody reporting the same information, the same way to looking for certain items. Luis, you and I are, again, symbiotic in our thinking. It's already in the. It's in the contract in terms of reporting. But I asked for a template, and. And that makes it easy for us that we know what we want to do. I asked Charles for that today, and he also communicated that to CCF. So CCF is going to get back to me with those specifics and the fact that the 1231 progress report has already been completed.

**42:03**

Speaker 1

So there's no fire alarm between now and then. And then secondly, as we move forward, I have the same questions as you do, and I need clarity so that we're accurate and there are no issues. Andrea. Hi. What do we do if we need an indirect cost letter? Because we'd like to put a cap the indirect cost. And so how do we go about getting that? I did ask when the first contract went out, but I haven't got response. And we do need it. We need it as part of our admin stuff. Maria?

**42:45**

Speaker 2

I'll actually turn it over to my colleague, Jose.

**42:49**

Speaker 1

Yeah. Hi, everybody. Andrea, can you elaborate? Because my understanding is not a one time payment, but it's a full amount of 50% to be given. There is no budget, thus there is no direct indirect cost associated with it. It's the \$50,000 for just the full participation. So not sure how the indirect plays in context of this payment structure. Okay, so without getting into the week, it's UCLA. So there always has to be some type of indirect cost because they're going to take their part off of the top so I can email you and we can talk, because it can be up to 50%, we've learned. Okay. For the pleasure of using their name. So, yes, we can talk. And if I could get that, I totally understand. And now I have reference.

**43:50**

Speaker 1

Yes, and unfortunately, universities do tend to have huge and indirect, or, and they call Negra's negotiated indirect cost rates letters that can absorb a lot of these costs. So, yes, we can take this offline, we can work it out, and we can provide a document where we can cap the indirect at a certain amount. I just want to make sure that I get that information and I can reference it with a document from the state as to where it gets capped in order for you not to have that barrier. So we could definitely talk offline and figure it out. Thank you. Great question. Thank you, folks. We're going to move forward on the agenda. But one last thing, Maria.

**44:35**

Speaker 1

Are there any confidentiality issues around us sharing these contracts that you sent to us so that other people on the steering committee can see what we're talking about? There's concern around the scope of work, and then

there's an exhibit in the contract that goes over that on a line item by line item basis. Sorry, Mr. Harvard, if I can be recognized, please, Jose Maria, I could take this one. So, yes, that's why we didn't present the contract. We wanted to bring it. We wanted to be sensitive to the hub leads. But if you guys, for full transparency, I don't think there's anything in the template itself that has. So we can share the template without any specific organization information on it, because the structure is the same. The template is the same.

**45:31**

Speaker 1

It just has basic information on the scope of work and the payment structure. So we don't mind sharing it. If you guys are okay with us sharing it, do any affinity hub leads object to the sharing of the information so that all the steering committee members can understand what the scope of work is going to look like for the Affinity hub leads. If you object, please raise your hand. Okay, no objections. We got 47 minutes left in the meeting. We're going to move to the next bullet. Maria, back to you, Mr.

**46:02**

Speaker 2

Chair.

**46:02**

Speaker 1

Before we move on, can I have a quick question on that last item? Go ahead. So when the reports are submitted, are those reports going to be shared with the steering committee as ahead? Go ahead, Maria.

**46:18**

Speaker 2

Those reports feed into our report. That's due to the state.

**46:23**

Speaker 1

No, but I'm saying, because who's going to be determining whether the affinity hub leads have condoned the work that their contract requires them to do. Who's going to be verifying that? I was under the assumption that would be the steering committee. It will be LAEDC. So the way that it was structured is. So I did want to answer, and I know we're short on time, so I'm going to try to be very efficient. There is a template report, Luis, already in place, that should have gone with the contract, and if it didn't, I'll circle back to make sure that you guys all get it. But there is a template on the report on things that meetings have you attended and all that stuff.

**47:01**

Speaker 1

LADC is the one that put it together and that's going to be the template that everybody receives once they get submitted. They're going to be reviewing it because again, as you know, they're the ones who are taking the lead and making sure that everybody's attending, being engaged, et cetera, and adhering to those scope of works in order to be able to stay, quote unquote, in compliance in order to receive that last payment. No, but I guess I'm understanding that part. My concern is that what if interest, we've got to move on what we're going to do. Can you add this to the agenda for the next meeting then so we. Sure, Alan, go ahead and put that on the agenda and let me answer it this way so we can move on.

**47:39**

Speaker 1

Luis, I don't have a problem with anyone seeing Bisfest institute's work submission or report or template submission. That's me personally, I would assume that no one else does. I also concur with you that there should be transparency and everyone is accountable to do good work. And then it's going to be clear, especially to a certain extent in the bylaws, that there will be accountability around getting work done that's professional and thorough, so we can put that on the next agenda item. But your point is well taken and we are not going to smooth over it. But I'm letting you know ours is going to. I have no problem, personally speaking, I would think no one else does or should either. But that's just me. All right, next agenda item on the fiscal update, please. Yeah, that's me, and I'll keep it short and brief.

**48:41**

Speaker 1

So I'm following up on the resident participant stipends. I know we're trying to put a policy and procedure

together around these costs. I circulated a document. So what I'm going to ask, just like for the research, in that same spirit, I'm going to ask that you guys review it and then provide feedback in order for us to move forward. So I did make some recommendations on how to use the actual stipends on how to use gift cards. We created a log as required that has all of the data points that the state is requiring. We are going to be adhering to the \$100 cap per participant, per meeting, per day cap as well. So what I'm asking is there are some questions for clarification. We don't need to address it. Now.

**49:26**

Speaker 1

What I'll ask for the steering committee is to review if you guys can provide feedback as a whole in one document that will guide us as to how we're going to contract, procure, set up documentation, standards, et cetera. And then I can come back at the next meeting and present to you guys an actual draft of the policy and procedures on how we're going to handle these resident and participant stipends, as well as the CBO microgrants. Fair? Very good, Jose. Thank you. Okay, thank you. Any questions on Jose's or the fiscal agent update from Maria and Jose? Let's move on to the next agenda item, please. Okay, so for labor, Crystal, do you want to go ahead and lean in on that?

**50:19**

Speaker 2

Yeah, absolutely. So, hi, everyone. Crystal Romero with the La County Federation of Labor. Happy to be on. This is actually my first steering committee call as well, so a lot of this is new to me as well. So once again, thank you, Alan Chioma LaUDC staff, for helping us on board and getting all the information to us. We're really excited to get caught up to speed and get this train going. I know that a few folks joined as well, so I would just want to give them a second to introduce those folks. I know you've already heard from them, Aiden and Eddie and then Patrick. So if you guys want to quickly introduce yourselves and just 2 seconds. Your organizations that way folks know who you are, that would be fantastic. And then that's it for us for go first.

**51:32**

Speaker 1

Yeah, I can go. Patrick called with the Work Education Resource Center. I know she said 2 seconds. I don't know if y'all want to say anymore, so just trying to keep it short, respecting the agenda and Eddie, I didn't know you were with LAOC Building Trades council. Friends of. Yeah, yeah. I am the new council rep for the building trades. I'm actually. I was traded for a bag of baseballs and a broken fungo. I was recently proudly though the rep at the Alameda county building trades in Oka, California. But when all the kind of hoopla happened when Andrew stepped down and Chris Hannah, my good friend, took over as the state building trades. This position opened up, and I grew up here in Los Angeles, so it was nice to come home. Thanks, Eddie. Tell Chris Hennon I said I will. I will.

**52:32**

Speaker 1

I'll probably be seeing him a little bit. Well, thank you. Welcome, labor team steering committee members. How about brady? Brady, anything you want to say as an. No. No updates here, but happy to have labor reps in the steering committee and looking forward to meeting everyone else that joins. Okay, thanks, Brady. All right, let's move on to the next agenda item, please. All right, so we're going to hit on the Kellys proposal if Julie Zeissler is on. Otherwise, Charles, is he back? Mr. Chair, I can go ahead and fill in for Charles. Okay, you got the floor. All right, so just to provide a general update, we did submit the catalyst program proposal on the deadline on November 30 last week.

**53:32**

Speaker 1

And you can view that submitted application as well as the catalyst program MoU on our website, lasurf.org, at the bottom of the about page under program resources. So feel free to check that out. And just a round of applause to everyone for contributing to this process. I know that's kind of not a landmine, a landmark that we passed, but thank you to everyone that contributed and moving on to the regional plan part one, our next huge deliverable that we have with the state. So, just to reiterate, the regional plan part one is due on December 31, so we have less than a month to complete that and submit to the state. We do have a tentative timeline that we'd like to share with you all.

**54:22**

Speaker 1

So December 11, we will be receiving draft material from our research contractors, civil economics, and beacon economics to integrate into the regional plan part one. Since the regional plan requires those analyses. December 11 to the 15th, the convener will be drafting the regional plan. So we'll be working on creating that document. And from the 15th to the 19th, we'd like to open the document up for the comment and review period. So you may review the document and add any comments or feedback that you see fit. And December 21 is our next steering committee meeting. We would like to have this put up for vote for adoption of the regional plan part one to go ahead and submit it successfully to the state.

**55:09**

Speaker 1

And just a little point that we have at the bottom here is that the final data will not be received until the end of the year. I know we already discussed some of the information about the industry clusters and how they have not been contracted, but just wanted to be transparent with that bullet point there. All right, thank you. All right, so, folks, we had an opportunity to meet with a specific company that is doing some of the things that we project that these businesses should, the kind of activities that they should be engaged in to make us successful in terms of what we're doing. And I asked for them to hold off on that.

**55:59**

Speaker 1

So just in the spirit of collaboration, I just wanted to get your support or see if there are any objections to us bringing in maybe every meeting, one organization that can describe the work they're doing that's complementary and that's going to make our work complete. And it'll also give us a platform or some traction on what we should be looking at in terms of businesses that are going to hire the folks that we train and get positioned and prepared with a specific focus on underserved, historically underserved and disadvantaged populations, seeing their commitment, and then it'll create kind of a standard. So if there is no objection to that, I'd like to, at the next meeting, invite in a company, probably someone like Alaska Airlines.

**57:00**

Speaker 1

They got a big deal they're doing, and they show a level of commitment that we want to see in all these businesses that we decide to partner with or bring once we get through this process. So unless there's any objection to that, I felt it was important to bring it before you, before we move forward, rather than to move forward without you being aware or cognizant of it, any questions or concerns about it. I just like to have some sort of opportunity to have a kind of thorough discussion or to lay out. I don't want it to be random. In other words, I want it to be strategic. If you're talking about Alaska Airline, why Alaska Airline and not why another airline? You know what I'm saying? What is the strategy behind beginning to invite folks?

**57:55**

Speaker 1

What's the thinking around it, and where is the process for us to lay those pieces out? So it could be any company, right? It could be. If it's not Alaska, it could be. But the thought that was brought to me is that these companies have a commitment to DEI and beyond, and it doesn't have to be Alaska. It could be XYZ. It doesn't matter. Organizations that I know of that are operating in this way is Bydride, for example, and various other housing builders. So it could be any organization. It doesn't have to be Alaska. It doesn't have to be anybody in particular. So what I would suggest is that if you have an organization that you think makes sense, bring it to the table and we'll have a discussion around it and we'll decide how to move forward.

**58:56**

Speaker 1

This was just brought to me in the last couple of days, and rather than just put them on the agenda and have them present, I just wanted to run it by you. We can work out a process, Benny, so that it's not willy nilly as to who's going to come and why they make sense. Okay. Andrea. Andrea, if you're speaking, you're on mute. It was also related to sustainability. There are two components. So it's the DEI and the inclusion of the BIPOC communities, but also the sustainability component as we are moving into the green jobs. That was part of the mission, and that's how the organizations are being looked at. Okay, there you have it. Thank you for filling in that gap, Andrea. I did forget that piece.

**59:54**

Speaker 2

Stella, just real quick. Thanks for the question and comment, Ben, because I think that's going to be important as

we move forward is just to identify some criteria, because we could have 101 different organizations, but if they don't have the DEI focus, if they're not focused on decarbonization, putting people back to work, et cetera, family sustaining jobs, and we don't want to necessarily bring them to the table. So I think that's something that we need to work on. Just real quick, just certain criteria that we're looking for. Mr. Chair, thank you.

**01:00:35**

Speaker 1

I agree. And you were in on the meeting, Stella, and that's why I did not agree to just bring somebody to the table, that we need a process and that we needed to bring before the steering committee so we can get feedback like this. And Adine Foreman, your point is well taken. Labor will be at the table when the discussion is has how we're going to bring people in. So all that's going to be covered. Crystal?

**01:01:01**

Speaker 2

Yeah. Really quickly, and just a flag I do have to drop for 02:00 p.m. But before I go, I think, and I propose something to consider that as we create this process for review, I think there's clearly a lot of folks who want to know information about these companies, employers, whomever it might be, in a lot of different areas and departments. So I think my proposal is that maybe whomever is to be considered, perhaps we can get a packet of information in writing and allow the steering committee to review it, propose any feedback, and then based on whatever consensus we arrive to, then we can invite whomever party on to a call. So something to consider other than that I do have to drop. So thank you, Crystal.

**01:02:04**

Speaker 1

We're going to take it. We're going to take it beyond that. We're going to do it just like that. Okay. I think that putting together a template and getting several companies to apply and we pick who we want. Right. And that way we cover all those bases. And to be candid with you, as the affinity hub lead for business employers and associations, this is going to help. My responsibility, I feel, is to make sure that I identify and bring in companies, or we identify and bring in companies that after we do all this work, right, after we do the work that say, for example, CD Tech is going to be doing and training and getting people ready that we actually get them hired. Because without them getting hired in a thriving wage in a sustainable career, we wasted our a.

**01:03:03**

Speaker 1

Dean, we hear you loud and clear and you'll have an opportunity to lean in and make your voice known. Let's go to the next agenda item, please, Mr. Chair, just for clarification before we move forward. So there's no vote that we need to put out as of right now for that topic? No. I think we're all on consensus that we can move forward. I think the feeling is, unless I'm wrong, the feeling is that we're going to develop a template and we can do that online and then we could present it at the next meeting, but we can present a template on what that will look like and then people will have an opportunity to submit companies that they think fit that measure up to our standards and then we start having them come in. Okay, sounds good. Yeah.

**01:03:57**

Speaker 1

It's not like it's tied to a proposal or anything else. So we're not going to sacrifice quality, accuracy or transparency for speed. We're going to take our time, we'll do it right, and we'll make sure everybody's concerns are integrated into this process. Got it. Thank you. All right. Thank you. All right, so I think Chioma is going to take the collaborative name change.

**01:04:25**

Speaker 2

Sure, Mr. Chair. I'll give the context for this topic, especially for our new partners. And so our new partners may not be aware or fully aware. The original name of the program was surf C-E-R-F Community Economics Resilient Fund. And the name of the partners, the collaborative was HRTC. I should say is HRTC as of today. And so HRTC is Hyrule Transition collaborative. And so the state let us know around over the summer that a rebranding was coming for the program. And so the state let us know, I believe in last month's community of practice call, which is a monthly call with all 13 of the CGF regions, that the new name is now for the program itself. The new name is not surf anymore. It is California jobs first.

**01:05:25**

Speaker 2

And on that call, they also let us know that the new name for the collaborative would be jobs first collaborative, or like the region collaborative. So we thought it needed to be La collaborative. And so we started to make those changes. After more questions, we followed up with our state contacts to further confirm that we had to change the name of the collaborative from HRTC to La Collaborative. That is when the team was then informed that changing the name of the group was optional. And so one of the steering committee members felt that it needed to be brought to the committee as a whole for a vote, I believe. And so that's why it's here on the not.

**01:06:20**

Speaker 2

I believe we did submit to amend the contracts because changing the name of the group, we would have had to submit for an amendment to the original phase one contracts with the state because it's listed HRTC, I think like 50 or 70 times in that contract. So that's why it's here on the agenda. HRTC is high road transition collaborative. LA collaborative is just La collaborative. So you guys can decide how you want to vote. Alan has put the surveymonkey in the chat. It's for all of the onboarded steering committee members to vote. I want to say that, but yes, doing a name change to La Collaborative would take for us to submit the request to the state and for them to approve it. And yes, as Alan posted in the chat, that would take a couple of months at the least.

**01:07:22**

Speaker 1

So what is your recommendation, Chioma?

**01:07:25**

Speaker 2

My recommendation is to leave it as LAHRTC as it is. That is my recommendation because of the meaning of it.

**01:07:33**

Speaker 1

So, folks, the reason I asked for this on the agenda item is that in anything that we do, branding is important. There needs to be consistency in branding. It needs to be a part of our talking points and our communications, and it needs to be static. It needs to be consistent. It needs to be permanent. Okay, so the survey will go out. I think it's already gone out. I think Alan already put it together. But bottom line, La HRTC is something that I've been using. But whatever we decide on, let's put a pin in it. Let's make sure that our paperwork, our comms, our marketing collateral, our contracts all reflect that and are consistent. Okay? All right, next agenda item, please.

**01:08:28**

Speaker 2

You have a question, Mr. Chair? And I think Scarlett.

**01:08:34**

Speaker 1

Sorry. On the previous item, can I just recommend, if we do decide to change to La collaborative, can we just make it La county collaborative? LA is very La city specific. Good point, Luis.

**01:08:47**

Speaker 2

And also, Mr. Chair, can I mention Jermaine's comment that I didn't mention initially? He states, also, be mindful it impacts the 420 or 430 plus partners with that, because, yes, all of the partners have signed partnership agreements when onboarding to the program that does list HRTC, not La collaborative. So we would also have to take that into mind with a name change.

**01:09:18**

Speaker 1

So what that means is that again, LaHRTC. There you go. Luis, did you have another comment? Yeah, sorry, just on that. I'm like, couldn't we just. I know I'm part of some organizations where there's the official name for tax purposes, and then this is the name we go by. This is the name we go by. But for all intents and purposes, the back end, the contracts, all the stuff, still refer to the old name without us having to update them. Well, you mean like a DBA or something along those lines, yeah. Also known as. Yeah. Well, personally, I would suggest that we stick with one is less confusing. You won't have new people coming on and that's my suggestion.

**01:10:02**

Speaker 2

I agree.

**01:10:04**

Speaker 1

But the LA county is duly noted. And I feel that's important because it does reflect the county. Okay. In terms of the bylaws, we've completed all three levels now and then. Also, it's important to note the only outstanding piece that is currently under work is a standardized, definitive statement on conflict of interest. I think it's important that we have that in there to circumvent any impropriety or undue advantage. That being stated, we've all been on these calls for about a year and a half now, and many of you are subject matter experts.

**01:10:49**

Speaker 1

Your organizations have deep experience in this work, and I want to make sure that you have an opportunity to bid on any proposal, play any role that you desire, and not be penalized for your expertise on subject matter, your live work experience, your ability to contribute, to make this a superior, excellent program that people are going to embrace and want to see happen for the next ten to 20 years. So with that said, if it does happen that is perceived that there's a conflict of interest and something that comes up that you're bidding for, then when the selection process goes down, you recuse yourself from voting. And that way it doesn't preclude you from going after anything where you think you have the best solution. And that also ensures that we as an organization are optimizing our performance and putting our best foot forward.

**01:11:52**

Speaker 1

All right, any questions in regards to that? All right, folks, next agenda item please. So, research, let's go. Armand, you're up. Hello everybody. So happy to see everyone. I'm going to be providing some research updates on the actually now three different projects. So from the economic development summary, once again, this is being conducted by civil economics. Regarding their data collection, they have currently identified 27 variables to be included into these five categories that are the CJ California jobs first themes of equity, sustainability, job quality and access, economic competitiveness and resilience. There's a chance they will still be adding some additional variables. So we will see, as the research develops on their community engagement, civil economics will be taking 800 surveys across La county, equally dividing them by Spa. Racial and gender representation is proportionate to the spa population and these are in field surveys.

**01:13:02**

Speaker 1

These surveys are in field and they will be completed by the end of the year. Data analysis and index development will follow once the surveys are completed and we hope to have this done by January of next year. Industry clusters analysis we already have gotten some updates and discussed this a lot earlier in the meeting. As we know, Beacon Economics was recommended by the review committee and just pending the approval vote from the steering committee, moving on to the third research project, which is also being done by Beacon Economics. This is our swot analysis. They have finished the data collection and then their community engagement is also almost done. They may have one more interview with an expert, but apart from that they have three case studies and four interviews with experts.

**01:13:48**

Speaker 1

I know this was brought up in the last meeting, so I spoke with Beacon and they told me that when it comes to revealing the background of the interviewees, they will do their best to share the roles, responsibilities, areas of expertise and why they selected these individuals to be interviewed. As it pertains to a SWOT analysis for La county, they are following sort of a confidentiality standard that is present in a lot of research that doesn't explicitly state the names of individuals interviewed for their expertise. And then I just wanted to quickly note something about the case studies, which they were just mentioning to me, how they are yielding some quite interesting results.

**01:14:28**

Speaker 1

One thing that they mentioned was from an interview that was with an individual who works with small

businesses who noted that there is a lot of well intentioned government strategies with good planning but without accompanying accessibility measures. They ultimately aren't very useful for some small businesses. In terms of the analysis, Beacon is focusing right now on reductions in poverty in certain demographic groups over the last five to ten years. They're conducting analysis and running regressions to try and find out in this limited time the causal factors. After that, they will be also working on their recommendations, which we hope to be using to make our decisions, and then stitching everything together for that final report, both civil and beacon right now as it pertains to the regional summary and then the swot analysis respectively.

**01:15:20**

Speaker 1

They're trying to finish as much as they can to submit those draft materials for the 11th that we can then include in the regional plan. And that's it for me. Thank you. Any questions or concerns for Armand? Thank you, Armand. Thank you. Move on to the next agenda item, please. Process mapping updates we have for that. Chioma.

**01:15:46**

Speaker 2

Yes. Another update for we. Let's see, where do I begin? Oh, we created the process mapping, in a word, doc, where comments could be added. And so the comment period, I believe lasted until yesterday. And so I believe we had one comment and then I had a comment myself. And so we will make this document available on the website. But I want everyone to remember that the Mark USA when they created this is with the intention of it being a live document that can be edited. And so there are tasks and things listed on the document in the map. And so as time goes on, I'm surely, as next spring comes along, and then when catalyst begins, there might be tasks that need to be edited, especially with the timeline that's constantly changing with our phase one.

**01:16:49**

Speaker 2

And so we will make the map available on the website. And when it comes time for editing on there, you can let us know, let the leadership know, your steering committee leadership know, and it can go on the agenda and be done, but we will update it and make it available on the website.

**01:17:14**

Speaker 1

Okay. Thank you, Chioma. Any questions for Chioma?

**01:17:20**

Speaker 2

Thank you.

**01:17:22**

Speaker 1

All right, so table partner leads. Do we have Armand coming up on that? Yeah, I'll take this. Yeah, I just wanted to give an update on this discussion. So as we're waiting for the data to come out. And firstly, we need to get it approved by the steering committee that whoever will be conducting this analysis. So it is very much, we're on a tight timeline. We've discussed this earlier in the meeting, but it's just we need to get them approved and then contract it. So as we get the data coming in for this second RFP, it will be then that we'll be able to evaluate and decide how to proceed with these table partner leads. But I feel like we've really discussed this a lot earlier. I don't have much else to add. So there's just an update.

**01:18:19**

Speaker 1

No decisions are going to be made until we get the data, but just to let everyone know that the process is moving forward. Okay, any questions for Armand? All right, seeing none. Next agenda item, please. All right, Charles, go ahead. Alan? Yeah, I just wanted to say I'll go ahead and Chime in for Charles. I mean, we did have a very lengthy discussion earlier about the affinity hub lead payment distribution, so thank you to our fiscal agent for providing that information. In regards to the micro grantees, as we move closer to submitting our regional plan and finally into the next year, we just wanted to let everyone know that we'll be discussing the micro grantees during the first week of January. So that's currently in the works and something to look out for. And Mr.

**01:19:17**



Speaker 1

Chair, I'm just going to continue since these topics were to be spoken by Charles, if that's okay. Please continue. Thank you. In regards to timeline expectations, I know Charles had spoken about this previously. We completely understand the objective of being transparent and accountability, as well as holding this process as inclusive as possible. So I just want to thank all of you for your patience. As we all know, it's not easy to work with the tight deadlines as well as try to help satisfy that transparency and inclusivity values. But again, just thank you for your patience as we put our best foot forward and trying to be as efficient as possible while remaining true to those values. And Chioma, go ahead.

**01:20:10**

Speaker 2

Yeah. When it comes to the timeline, I just want to make sure when I give my California jobs first presentations to partners who would like a refresher or for our new partners, I do let them know about the timelines. And so I just want to make sure our steering committee keeps the timeline at the forefront and to remember that the catalyst proposal was submitted November 30. The work for Catalyst is scheduled to begin May of next year and go on to September of 2026. Okay. And then also with phase one. Remember phase one is March of this year to September of next year. But then remember that the phase two implementation solicitations will begin to come from EDD, as we've been told, starting July of next year.

**01:21:06**

Speaker 2

So that means the two to five strategies or investments, strategic investments, need to be decided on, submitted to the state and in place, so that those of you in our la collaborative LahRTC, who want to apply for those phase two solicitations will be ready. So that means we still have to know. Table partner leads micro grantees, capacity building vendor have capacity meetings, have convenings decide on strategies, submit those strategies to the state and be ready for the phase two implementations that will start coming from the state, as we've been told as of July 2024. So in all the things we do, please keep that in mind. I think we'll put like a timeline slide added and make it available. But we shared with you guys in the past, but just keep those dates in, please. Thank you.

**01:22:12**

Speaker 1

And thank you, Chioma. And one thing I would like to say is that I have ultimate faith in this group. All the questions that have been asked of us are good questions, and the questions are designed to allow them to operate thoroughly, efficiently, accurately, with the best possible information and work that can be done. So with that said, the request for templates, the request for how do we get this done? The request for, again, project management timeline information is going to be key. There's going to be a slowdown for the rest of the month. No more bylaws meetings. The next meeting is obviously our surf meeting tomorrow at nine, and then our next meeting after that is two weeks at our steering committee on the 21st. So again, we have until the Monday at six for the labor folks to get caught up.

**01:23:14**

Speaker 1

We're going to close off the voting Monday at close of business, and hopefully there will be no more catching up or backtracking or delays. So that as we move forward into the new year, we're going to have to be able to move swiftly, but with accuracy. All right, so thank you all for joining us. I'm going to give you nine minutes back from your time unless there are some other questions that are outstanding. Mr. Chair, this is Eddie Alvarez. Sure, Eddie. Hey, could you send me an email when you get a few minutes? Maybe you and I could talk offline. Nothing important. I just want to introduce myself and go through all that good jazz. We got to do that. We got to do that. LAOC building partners. I mean, I'll give you my history. They've been in my corner for a long time.

**01:24:05**

Speaker 1

Okay, that'd be great. Yeah. Let's sit down and just go through that. Like I said, it's good to be back home, but I got to meet everybody. All right, real quick, Eddie, put your email in, chat for me so I can get it. Yeah, no problem. Hold on. I'll get it there. And the rest of you have a great weekend. Should I say great night? See you tomorrow morning. Right? No weekend yet. One more meeting. See you tomorrow morning at 09:00 take care, folks.

**01:24:33**

Speaker 2  
Thank, thanks, everybody.

**01:24:34**  
Speaker 1  
Bye, everyone. Bye.