



Steering Committee Meeting November 9th, 2023

[Presentation](#)

[Recording](#)

Passcode: 4L\$H0b*D

[Summary Notes](#)

[Chatbox](#)

[Transcript](#)

Summary Notes

Fiscal Agent:

The meeting commenced with routine housekeeping announcements. Jose from CCF presented a fiscal update, covering stipends and compensation for CBOs and residents, along with guidelines for documentation. The conversation focused on budget clarifications, particularly addressing concerns about vague language. Participants expressed the need for further clarification on stipends related to meeting participation.

Bylaws:

Regarding bylaws, the LA Collaborative Steering Committee discussed progress and encouraged members to provide comments and suggestions, even if unable to attend meetings. The bylaw meetings were broken up and more dates were added. The goal is to adopt the bylaws before December 30th, aligning with the deadline for Regional Plan Part 1.

Research:

In the research update, information was shared on economic development summaries, data collection stages, and community engagement. Beacon Economics is currently in the data collection stage and will be designing surveys for community engagement. Concerns emerged about conflicts of interest related to the industry cluster report project bidding process, specifically LAEDC's Institute of Economic Research being allowed to bid by the State since no bids were received originally. The Steering Committee discussed the issue and affirmed its authority in making final decisions on such matters. The CJF team has requested steering committee to identify potential proposal reviewers and submit their names for consideration to help score the Industry Cluster contract proposals.

Labor:

A labor update followed a meeting between the Chairs and State and Labor partners. Charles announced that an agreement has been reached with labor. KIWA will remain as the labor affinity hub. Labor (LA FED) will nominate representatives for the six steering committee seats. Discussions in the SC meeting centered on whether labor should appoint individuals to fill reserved seats as negotiated through the process with the State or if an election process should be implemented. The importance of diverse membership and concerns about including low-wage versus high-growth industries were highlighted. Suggestions included active participation by labor representatives in meetings and providing input on bylaws. Stella proposed researching unions aligning with high-growth sectors, emphasizing adherence to guidelines and responsibilities for all steering committee members.

Table Partner Lead:

The Chairs provided an update on Table Partner Leads, emphasizing the state's role in providing suggestion recommendations rather than mandates. The state indicated that the decision on whether to have table partner leads is up to the region, but they provided guidelines and expressed concern about certain industries not having representation. Industry-based categories for table partner leads were recommended by the State, with the final

decision resting with the regions. The Steering Committee will have the ultimate say on table categories through a vote, acknowledging associated risks.

Catalyst Grant Application:

Concerning the Catalyst Grant Application, due on November 30th, the grant writer presented a first draft that will be shared after the meeting. A comment period was announced and set until Wednesday, November 15th, for Steering Committee input. The grant writer will incorporate comments into a final draft.

Upcoming Meeting:

The next steering committee meeting falls on November 23, which is Thanksgiving Day. The CJF team will work to reschedule and update the calendar invite with a new date for the meeting. The Partners meeting is scheduled for this Friday at 9 am.

Action Items

- Research Review Committee list be made available to the Steering Committee.
- Graphic Showcasing all parts of the Hub Structure, highlighting the elected/chosen identities.

Chat Box

Toni Symonds

01:34

TS

Hello. Hope everyone is having a good day.

♡ 1

Alan Cheam

01:34

AC

Good afternoon all,

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

Alan Cheam

06:11

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/1adMxqngqNZjvfbuxMwdLfSlbZqHW_K0Pk6OFsfrKNwzM/edit?usp=drive_link

Agenda Item Jamboard:

https://jamboard.google.com/d/1SAGYWNVFqJLwTGvI0XmbE39IRSoSyRcmA_vKqD4u19U/edit?usp=sharing

Steering Committee Resource Tracker:

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

Alan Cheam

10:03

AC

Good afternoon all,

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

Stella Ursua

13:25

SU

Good point Toni!

Alan Cheam

14:31

AC

Good afternoon all,

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

Brady Collins

15:16

BC

Good afternoon folks. Sorry I'm a bit late.

♡ 1

Sharon Evans

21:28

SE

Thank you. I cannot attend all these meeting and still do work. Will do what I can. Blessings

♡ 2 👍 2

Kelly LoBianco (she/her) - DEO

22:48

KL

Thanks for getting these on our calendars too. Look forward to joining in next two weeks

♡ 1

Stella Ursua

25:25

SU

thank you Arman!

Benjamin Torres

27:33

BT

Who are the potential reviewers

Derek Steele

29:59

DS

that part

Benjamin Torres

30:02

BT

That conflict of interest issue is important but this is something the Steering Committee should be able to vote on.

Sharon Evans

31:38

SE

Understood. There are now other bidder so I believe this is the issue for th SC. Typically in procurement, if there are not bids, it may have to be the way the RFP was written.

Sharon Evans

32:44

SE

The SC

Benjamin Torres

33:26

BT

I think this is something we need to decide as a steering committee on.

Sharon Evans

34:31

SE

Agreed.

Sharon Evans

35:34

SE

The Steering Committee will define conflict of interest in its bylaws. CA Procurement rules exist as to conflict of interst. Will pull

IEA could bid, but the award may or may not be conflicted out.

Sharon Evans

38:35

SE

Is labor only nominating six?

kevin clark

40:58

KC

Can we get transparency on who AFL CIO Labor is placing, such as high growth, high demand industries such as creative tech?

kevin clark

42:19

KC

What are the industies?

Sharon Evans

43:02

SE

Average wage in hospitality is \$36K per year. We are focused on high growth sectors. How will we achieve our goals/

Sharon Evans

44:11

SE

There was a complaint when Christel presented that all but 1 of the organizations presented we Latino serving. The membership should have the opportunity to see who they are eleted and determine whether there is racial equity

Brady Collins

44:45

BC

I encourage you to look into payscales of union vs nonunion jobs.

Sharon Evans

46:09

SE

Brady is only 1 vote on the SC,
"you are not forgotten - Andrea"

Brady Collins

46:55

BC

Happy to respond, Kevin, when you think it's appropriate.

Alan Cheam

47:02

AC

Flagging 16 minutes left in the meeting.

Sharon Evans

47:12

SE

Why? this is Chair/Vice Chair role

Alan Cheam

47:19

AC

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

Jennifer Zellet

47:20

JZ

I agree Kevin...if people are genuinely going to engage fine, but I would hate for people to have the veto power without participation

kevin clark

47:23

KC

How did they determine those six slots?

Benjamin Torres

47:48

BT

I'm hearing 3 things here to address - 1. Do we vote them in? 2. Do they need to provide additional nominations and 3. Are these the unions that represent the industries we all believe are in line with the goals.

👍1

Sharon Evans

49:29

SE

We should encourage Union to nominate multiple Union representatives so that the HRTC can elect its choices

Alan Cheam

50:27

AC

12 minutes left in the meeting.

kevin clark

50:53

KC

In recent years, Los Angeles County has experienced growth in several sectors, including:

Technology and Digital Entertainment: The county has become a hub for technology startups, software development, and digital entertainment companies. The presence of major tech companies, such as Snapchat and SpaceX, has contributed to the growth of this sector.

Biotechnology and Healthcare: LA County is home to many renowned biotech and healthcare institutions, including research centers, pharmaceutical companies, and hospitals. The focus on medical research and innovation has led to substantial growth in this sector.

Stella Ursua

51:11

SU

Thank you Kevin Clark!

kevin clark

51:18

KC

Creative Industries and Media: With Hollywood being located in LA County, the media and entertainment sector is a significant contributor to the local economy. The county is known for film and television production, animation, music, and fashion, with continuous growth in these industries.

Sustainable Energy and Green Technology: As environmental concerns continue to grow, LA County has placed an emphasis on sustainable energy and green technology solutions. The county has seen increased investments in renewable energy, electric transportation, and green infrastructure.

Aerospace and Defense: LA County has a strong aerospace and defense industry, with major companies like Boeing and Northrop Grumman having a significant presence in the area. The sector continues to grow with advancements in space exploration, satellite technology, and defense systems.

It's worth noting that these sectors may continue to evolve and adapt to market trends and technological advancements in the future.

👉1

Sharon Evans

53:23

SE

"Best Step to take in terms of table partner leads"... what does that mean?

Derek Steele

54:12

DS

is that the state, or is that people lobbying to trying to have labor take over the space?



👍 1

kevin clark

55:04

KC

The project highest growth areas are a few sectors that have traditionally experienced growth in the region and might continue to do so. These sectors include technology, healthcare, entertainment, tourism, and green industries.

Alan Cheam

55:29

AC

7 minutes left in the meeting.

Derek Steele

55:34

DS

That part Chair.

Thank you for standing on that

kevin clark

56:19

KC

This data has been culled by three Different databases, who project futures for markets.

Sharon Evans

57:52

SE

I am online

Benjamin Torres

58:09

BT

So to be clear we have not agreed to this proposal of the merger correct?

Sharon Evans

58:55

SE

How does the steering committee get input into the Catalyst fund proposal.

kevin clark

58:59

KC

My information is braided by <https://www.weka.io/> and Microsoft Azure for any data that is evolving at the speed of thought?

Toni Symonds

01:00:31

TS

Can you set up early Zoom access too?

Derek Steele

01:00:47

DS

ill need the zoom link for the next meeting. I won't be in the city

Sulma Hernandez

01:01:03

SH

Alan - can you please send me the calendar invite for 11/16

 1

Alan Cheam

01:01:53

AC

Please email me if you'll require any accommodations!

CERF@laedc.org

Sharon Evans

01:01:59

SE

Can we be clear that The State wants LAHRTC to increase it business and industry participation

Benjamin Torres

01:02:08

BT

Thank you folks

Jennifer Zellet

01:02:14

JZ

Thank you all, I have a hard stop as well.

Andrea Slater

01:02:23

AS

I hAVE a meeting at 2pm

 1

Sharon Evans

01:03:33

SE

There are many ways for the SC to increase Industry participation without stripping community of its partner tables

Toni Symonds

01:03:38

TS

Industry Focus can be developed through Catalyst.

Sharon Evans

01:04:10

SE

Industry focus can also be added via steering committee seats

Alan Cheam

01:04:11

AC

Affinity Hub Lead SOW:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1hnlEyMhJFvezsDGSEnUX9EKUox70EJABY5H3m4PwqQQ/edit?usp=sharing>

Progress Report:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1BKJPZY2WfP1yKXdgrBELEwTJrLVn0hdx/edit?usp=sharing&oid=110013364096302700735&rtpof=true&sd=true>

Sharon Evans

01:04:48

SE

Please hold on scope of works for table partners until the issue is resolved.

Toni Symonds

01:04:50

TS

Can these links please be added to the Tracker?

Sharon Evans

01:05:07

SE

Thanks Andrea, Have a good afternoon

Stella Ursua

01:05:18

SU

Steering Committee members, just food for thought...a report that SCANPH conducted around hiring & retention practices that include DEI...might be helpful when we are interacting with industries that do not reflect DEI in their hiring processes.

Monserrat, IAC

01:05:29

MI

Thank you

Sharon Evans

01:05:42

SE

Have a good afternoon.

[Transcript](#)

02:25

Speaker 1

Alan, am I required to fill out the attendance sheet? I did. Hey, Tony. Long time no hear from.

02:59

Speaker 2

I know. If only we did stuff together.

03:01

Speaker 1

Yeah.

03:05

Speaker 3
It.

03:06

Speaker 4
Tony, I like your picture with the email plug.

03:16

Speaker 1
Hey, Zahira, thanks.

03:20

Speaker 5
Hello. Good to see everyone.

03:22

Speaker 4
Hello.

03:47

Speaker 1
Since we have an hour, are we going to wait? What, till 103? Hopefully. Everybody's falling in now.

03:58

Speaker 4
Yeah, I think 103 should be good.

04:01

Speaker 1
Hey there, Jennifer. Zillette. Good seeing you yesterday.

04:05

Speaker 5
Good afternoon, sir. It was wonderful. That was a great event. Good job.

04:11

Speaker 1
Thank you.

04:12

Speaker 5
Yeah, made a lot of helpful connections.

04:15

Speaker 1
That's what I want to hear. All right. Kelly Lobianco. Good afternoon.

04:22

Speaker 5
Hi, folks.

04:24

Speaker 1
Good afternoon. Rita Kappala.

04:27

Speaker 5
Good afternoon. Good to see everyone.

04:31

Speaker 1

Yeah, good to see you. Or as they say, as Denzel Washington would say, good to be seen. Better than the alternative. Hey, Charles, I haven't seen in a while.

04:50

Speaker 6

I'm trying to remember who you are.

04:53

Speaker 1

I like that. Witty, witty. You get witty points.

04:57

Speaker 6

Okay, now, I'm sorry I missed the event. Know I was at Burns and McDonald yesterday. They put on a.

05:09

Speaker 1

Kid.

05:11

Speaker 6

We had the eddies yesterday, last night. And quick shout, know LADC put on a great event. But Kelly Lo Bianco, you were wearing that very well, very fashionable.

05:28

Speaker 2

Oh, thank you. I appreciate it.

05:29

Speaker 5

It was an awesome event. I loved it.

05:38

Speaker 1

Okay, so just out of respect to everyone's time, we got 17 folks on. Let's go ahead and kick it off. First of all, welcome you all to our steering committee meeting. Today is November 9. One 3100 and 04:00 p.m. We're going to go through some housekeeping real quick from Alan Cheam.

06:03

Speaker 4

Thank you, Kevin. So for those of you who have just joined, I'll go ahead and add the attendance form in the chat one more time so you can go ahead and fill out your attendance there. And we'd like to remind everyone that you may see the actionable items using the actionable items tracker, which I'll also drop the link. In addition to that, if you'd like to propose an agenda item, as usual, feel free to use the Google Jamboard. All the links should be in the chat as of right now, also including the resource tracker that we created. So that's very useful. If you'd like to bookmark that, it's a lot easier to get to all the resources that you need as a steering committee member. So I'll go ahead and pass it on to our fiscal agent, Representative, I believe. Jose, if you're here.

06:58

Speaker 3

Yes. Good morning, everybody. What we'll be going over today, I think we had a follow up item. I know that it was requested that we present or show information regarding the stipend and what I had promised was to provide the language not only from the contract but the procurement guide and then have a discussion around that and that process and then open it up for questions. So what I'm going to be doing is let me share my screen here if I may.

07:35

Speaker 4

Should be able to Jose. If not, let me know.

07:38

Speaker 3

Yeah, I think I'm good. And you guys, please let me know when you guys see it.

07:49

Speaker 4

Yep, I can see it.

07:51

Speaker 3

Yeah. OK. Thank you. So what I'll do is going to make it a little bit bigger. So this is the language that's in the contract and the budget that we have for these stipends. So participant compensation, it's \$295,000 and it's broken out by the first and I'll read it. A total of the amount of 270,000 for the local CBO stipend meetings paid on an hourly basis to participants. And that's going to equal to 3000 times per agency, times 90 CBOs. And that brings us to 270,000 but not to exceed \$100 per day per participant as per state requirements.

08:35

Speaker 3

To further support the ability of CBO representatives to participate in surf engagement and outreach, then the second part is the amount of \$25,000 for local resident stipends, not to exceed \$100 per day per resident per state requirements to facilitate participation in surf meetings and planning activities. So that's where we have the 270,000, the 25,000 and that's the total 295,000. The procurement guidelines are pretty prescriptive in regards to what we can do with them. So participate compensation is an exchange of payment for services rendered in the development of community work products and appropriately documented with deliverables such as signing sheets or written surveys. Compensation of up to \$100 per day is allowed to attend surf related meetings or to engage in HRTC activities. Travel is not included under participant compensation. The fiscal agent is required to develop and establish a policy for participant compensation.

09:38

Speaker 3

To ensure proper documentation is collected, a copy of the policy must be submitted to the SuRF Project management team. Please note that after this meeting, after what's decided, we will put a formal policy in place that's being requested here in this document. At minimum, the items that need to be collected, it's meeting agendas, an Excel sheet listing the individual receiving compensation, which must include demographics such as participant name, age, city of Residence, reason for attending a meeting, and the actual participant signature. Participant compensation should not be used in lieu of a subcontract for community members that provide services to the HRTC. And then last note, the list of items to be collected are something to change based on program evaluation requirements. So I'm going to pause there, but before I open it up for questions I do want to share.

10:37

Speaker 3

I do have a spreadsheet. Again, it's draft format. We can have a discussion if anybody has any feedback. But I created this log. I'm going to make it a little bit smaller so you can see the whole thing. Participant compensation Login sheet. We'll put the name of the event here, the date of the event here, or meeting participation, name signature. These two items are the ones that we added. Amount provided via Gift card, the gift card number, the participant age, participant, city of Residence, and then reason for attendance. And then here at the bottom, we're putting. I so and so certify that this event meeting was held on the date for the purpose of and then space for them to complete. Name of the entity leading the event. Name of the program.

11:32

Speaker 3

I mean, name of the person leading the event, signature of the person leading the event and then the actual date. So I know I went a little bit fast, but just want to make sure that for the sake of time, I open it up for questions. Are there any questions? I see Stella's hand, I believe. I'm sorry. Chair.

11:54

Speaker 1

No, no, go ahead. You have the floor. You have the floor. You recognize who you want to speak.

11:59

Speaker 3

Thank you.

12:00

Speaker 5

Thank you, Jose, just real quick. And if you could increase the size just a little bit, maybe I'm just not seeing it. Is there a column for organization name?

12:12

Speaker 3

Yes, actually that's a good column. I didn't put it up here, I'm putting it down here. So it'll be name of the leading of the event, name of the person. I'm sorry? Name of the entity leading the event. I put it at entity because I didn't want to put company organization. So entity is what's covered and that's where that information will be.

12:33

Speaker 5

Okay.

12:33

Speaker 3

Okay, great question.

12:36

Speaker 5

Thank you.

12:38

Speaker 3

Tony, I believe I see your hand.

12:41

Speaker 2

Yes, thank you. This may not be an issue for you and maybe just putting a pin on a future conversation, but I was wondering if we currently have a tracking system and a policy around accessing this. I'm just thinking a lot of times, sectors that are well organized or groups that are well organized find it quite easy to immediately go in and hold meetings. Groups that have less capacity or maybe neighborhoods that don't normally engage. It may take a couple of months for them to gain the trust, to actually participate. So I'm wondering, do we have a policy around, if 500 people use this in the first two months and they all live in Long beach, how do we track it? So we don't need to have the discussion here, but I'm thinking that a fair, equitable allocation over time policy might be helpful.

13:39

Speaker 3

Yes. Thank you. And the only response that I'll provide from the fiscal agent perspective is, and I'm going to go back here, each CBO is going to be getting \$3,000 to manage, so everybody's going to be getting the same amount. How they spend it. I think, again, it's to this group to kind of determine, once we identify the CBOs, we can end their agreement, prescribe a little bit more in detail, some of these things that you're mentioning, Tony. But again, I'll leave it up to you guys. The other thing that I did want to bring up, and I'll use this as a segue, is the fact that for the \$25,000 here for the local resident stipends, they didn't prescribe to who or how much. So to your point, it's very little in regards to dollar amounts versus what they're getting here.

14:36

Speaker 3

So not sure how we're going to divvy that up or how you guys are going to determine how to allocate it and who's going to get what. We can try to do an even share or we can try to find another type of allocation justification, but again, they weren't prescriptive, unfortunately. So I think it's going to be up to this committee to determine that.

15:01

Speaker 2

Thank you.

15:02

Speaker 3

You're welcome. Any other questions?

15:06

Speaker 1

Yes, I have a question. Well, not as it pertains to this.

15:10

Speaker 3

Yes.

15:12

Speaker 1

All right. So is this the end of your presentation, Jose?

15:16

Speaker 3

Yes.

15:17

Speaker 1

So the only other question I have is, as it pertains to the Affinity hub leads, we'd like to get an update on when the first round of funds will be released to us.

15:30

Speaker 3

So, yes, thank you. We do have an update. I'm happy to report that the agreement with Paykeeper has been finalized, and they're the ones who will be processing them. We reached out yesterday. We're scheduling a meeting for early next week to review now that we have an executed contract. Next steps is to provide them with the agreement, MoUs for the Affinity hub leads, and then determine and schedule the first tranche of funding that's going to go to them in order for them to issue those payments. So the meeting will be held early next week, and then we'll be discussing the agreement, the actual form, because there are some deliverables involved with the agreement, and so there's a progress report that's part of the deliverables.

16:29

Speaker 3

So we'll be giving them all that documentation, sharing all of the Affinity hub information so that they can put those agreements together. And then you guys should be getting them. I would anticipate either late next week or early the following week for you guys to start, or the Affinity hub leads to start seeing these agreements in your inbox. We'll definitely keep you guys posted as we know more, but that's the update on that.

17:04

Speaker 1

Okay, thank you. And we have. Sharon Evans has a question.

17:09

Speaker 2

Hi, I'm on the phone. I apologize. I'm trying to dial in. I had a question regarding the \$3,000 allocation. I was under the impression that the \$3,000 to the organization was actually a stipend for them to attend and participate in the HR and Affinity hub and steering committee meetings. Are you saying that is money for them to use for other purposes?

17:47

Speaker 3

So I'm going based on the language here, and it looks like. So, a total amount of \$207,000 for local CBO meeting stipends. So I'm interpreting it as participation for the meetings. Not sure if that's for the CBOs to manage and to provide participation. So I can get that clarification. I think this has been a little bit of a challenge for us because the language has been vague at times. So I can definitely circle back with the state and other fiscal agents to see what they have been doing.

18:31

Speaker 2

Okay. I received a call from. I mean, when were on planning, I remember that for those particular. Were four items on that budget, and they were in a line item budget, and that I happened to because I was on the original front. I received a call, this meeting is being recorded. Sorry, I'm actually getting the login. I received a call during the contracting process where there was a budget narrative that broke down all of those funds. And I just wanted to kind of forward that. Forward that. I do remember there was a budget narrative. Actually, Stephen called me while they were in the middle of the contract stuff at the state, and I was able. Because there was a budget. So just. Can you clarify that?

19:17

Speaker 2

Because, again, I think that as groups participate, one of their incentives for making sure they met our meetings and were fully engaged Was that they were getting the stipend correct.

19:29

Speaker 3

And I can double check with that, Sharon, the only response I can give you right now is the language that I presented today and that I read out that is from the budget narrative.

19:42

Speaker 2

All right, thank you.

19:44

Speaker 3

Thank you.

19:47

Speaker 1

Okay, Jose, does that conclude your report?

19:51

Speaker 3

Yes.

19:52

Speaker 1

All right, thank you. So let's move on to the next agenda item. Alan. All right, so as of right now, we are continuing to move through the LA Collaborative Steering Committee and chair, vice chair bylaws, respectively. Three sets or three bylaws in one set. So we had to break it up due to our meeting with the state and having a better understanding that we have to have all this done. Based on the holidays in November and December. The only way were going to be able to do this is to divide and conquer. So our apologies for having so many meetings, and especially for me, is a challenge with my calendar. But as with you all, but this is the only way we're going to get it done. So with that said, we've broken it up into three segments.

20:54

Speaker 1

I am continuing with the LA Collaborative bylaws. And by the way, Sharon missed you today, but all your suggestions were adopted. Just so I'd give you a little sidebar there. And I say this because I encourage you all to go in and lean in. Please get your voice heard. We need your expertise, those that of you that feel comfortable. And let's get your comments in now so that even if you can't attend the meeting, your work will be and your comments will be recognized. And I see your comment, Sharon, your work was recognized and all your edits

were adopted. So it is not time spent in vain. So I encourage you all to please go in. You got all the dates. I know it's a lot, but come when you can, and sometimes you might be a little late after the meeting starts.

21:57

Speaker 1

Come when you can. Okay. And if you can't get your comments in, I'm not going to beat the dead horse, but you guys get it. Any comments? All right, thank you.

22:10

Speaker 5

But come prepared. And please have your comments there before the meeting starts. If you know that you're going to be late, actually have them before it starts, period. It just saves a lot of time.

22:23

Speaker 1

Thank you, Madam Vice Chair.

22:25

Speaker 4

And if I may, Kevin, just add on to that. We did also send out a reminder email, and we will continue to send out reminder emails about these. But if you could please include your justification for your suggestion in the case that you're not in the meeting. We're not able to ask you what you meant by a certain phrase. We're able to move through it quickly.

22:47

Speaker 1

Good point, Alan. And that's one of the reasons why we were able to do that pretty efficiently today. We made very good progress. We only got five pages left out of 30. A little exhale there. But everybody got a chance to lean in. And we had a few areas but that we have to go back to. And also, when those reminders go out, all the links will be there. You don't have to look for them. Okay. So we'll leave it at that. Seeing no additional questions, let's go ahead and move to the next agenda item.

23:28

Speaker 3

Hello, everybody.

23:29

Speaker 1

Research updates. Armand, you're up.

23:33

Speaker 4

All right.

23:33

Speaker 3

Thank you, Mr.

23:34

Speaker 4

Chair.

23:35

Speaker 3

Hello, everybody. Yeah, I'm just going to provide some updates on our research projects. So just a quick refresher. The research project One, which is our economic development summary, including the CJF Regional Index. This is being done by Beacon Economics, and they are currently in the data collection stage, having completed most of the demographic data, if not all at this point. And they're just trying to get this data down to the smallest geographic level possible after the data collection, they will. I'm sorry, this is actually, I have to take something back. This is not Beacon.

24:11

Speaker 6

This is.

24:11

Speaker 3

Civil Economics is working on this one. Beacon is in the third one. But to go back to where I was after the data collection stage, they're going to begin designing their surveys for the community engagement aspect. And I will be meeting with civil economics later today to provide then an update on research project Three, which Beacon Economics is working on. This is the SWOT analysis. It's addressing the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats within La county at the spa level. Beacon Economics is also in the data collection stage. And I just got an update from them that they have found a breakthrough in terms of getting the data to a very granular level, which is at census track level. And they have actually already begun their community engagement.

24:56

Speaker 3

So they've already interviewed or have interviews lined up with leaders of the various chambers of Commerce and experts from academia, which will then help guide them with their research in finding opportunities for LA County. And I will be meeting with them next week. They're moving at a very good pace, and that's pretty much it for me. Charles has an update on the second research project.

25:19

Speaker 6

Thank you, Armand. Great update. So RFP number two, the industry cluster report, to give you a little bit of back history there, we put it out for RFP at the same time we did the climate report and the labor and workforce RFP, we got absolutely no bidders on that. So I went to the state and asked what the next steps could be knowing that at the time there was an issue of LADC, who put out the initial industry cluster report, RFP number two.

25:56

Speaker 4

Industry clusters.

25:57

Speaker 6

By the way, the RFP number two is essentially a completion of the industry cluster report that the LAEDC's Institute of Applied Economics Department already put out. However, LADC, IEEE, and I believe the HRTC decided they didn't want any conflicts of interest for IE to bid on that RFP. So, however, since it was put out there and no one bid on it, I went to the state to ask for suggestions, and the state said that it was okay to have IAE to go ahead and send a proposal in. At the same time, went back to Beacon and civil, who are doing, again, RFPs number one and number three, and asked them if they were interested in bidding on it, although they didn't bid on it the first time, and they did decide to bid on it. So we're going to have three bids.

27:11

Speaker 6

We're going to have still a selection process where there's a scoring with rubric. We're in the process of identifying who will be scoring those, and CCF will facilitate that process, of course, but we'll keep you updated on how that pans out in the future.

27:39

Speaker 1

Charles, Benny Torres has a question. Who are the potential reviewers?

27:44

Speaker 6

Yeah, that's what I'm saying. We're trying to identify them right now, so we don't have any names.

27:50

Speaker 3

I guess what my question is it people in the industry? Is it the steering committee members? What are we talking about here?

27:56

Speaker 6

Yeah, so it would be people. CCF could probably speak on this a little bit better, but the reviewers would be subject matter experts dealing with that. If you guys have potential, if you have candidates that you would like to be considered, feel free to send the names to the surf team, and we can submit those to CCF for evaluation.

28:26

Speaker 1

Sharon, you got a question? You're on mute. Sharon, are you still on by phone? If we can't hear you, put it in chat.

28:40

Speaker 2

I'm on mute. It may not.

28:42

Speaker 1

Okay, now we can hear you.

28:44

Speaker 2

Okay, thank you. I'm a little concerned about this because this seems a bit problematic. I'm really happy to hear that Beacon and TVL are interested in bidding, but I do believe that the conflict of interest that the committee raised originally still exists. And I really am struggling with the idea that one that LAEDC is seeking to propose on a contract where they are the convener. Because that's one conflict. The other conflict is because your role as implementer on the stewardship committee means you're implementing what you're recommending. That's one conflict I'm concerned about. The other one is that already on the table is a viable discussion around the institute's recommendations to replace the table partners by industries that they already have affiliations with. That is a little bit.

29:55

Speaker 2

We're creating a quagmire here, and so I would encourage the steering committee to take a position or examine this and take a poll as to whether it will consider an LAEDC bid. It definitely appears to be a conflict of interest.

30:14

Speaker 6

Thank you for that, Sharon. And I certainly understand your concerns, which is why IAE and LADC refrain from being involved in the first place. However, there are two issues that the steering committee needs to be taken into account. One is that there were no other bidders. The fact that had there been other bidders, this would not be an issue at all. The fact that we had to go back and ask two well known research firms to bid on it kind of gives pause that maybe they didn't bid the first time because they don't have the capacity or whatever reason they didn't bid on it. So it was more of a protection mechanism in order to make sure that at the end of the day, we're delivering the right product for the region.

31:10

Speaker 6

However, at the end of the day, there's going to be a lot of different ways to evaluate to make sure that the right decision is made for the region, and that includes the input from the steering committee. So I just want to give context of, again, why LADC and ie had to get involved, but it's not for any other reason, except initially, we just didn't have any bidders and we need the report.

31:40

Speaker 1

Okay. So I don't want to spend too much more time on this, but there are a couple other comments in the chat, and I think that, Benny, let me go ahead and give you an opportunity to speak and Sharon, one more time, then we need to close it down and move to the next agenda item.

31:59

Speaker 5

Yeah.

31:59

Speaker 3

For me, I just want clarity. Chairman, if we are the steering committee, I am concerned with the word input versus decision making, or I would like some clarity as it relates to this issue, in relation to this conflict of issue situation. If that makes.

32:20

Speaker 1

You, Charles, you can correct me if I'm wrong, but in terms of this particular, the industry cluster research question, is it the state that determines the policy on if there's a conflict of interest and what should be done about it?

32:43

Speaker 6

Great question. I don't think the state wants to make any. I don't want to put any organization's words in anyone's mouth, but went back to the state with the concern, and I can tell you exactly what happened. Went back to the state with the concern of, hey, we don't have any bidders on this. What do we do next?

33:06

Speaker 1

Okay. I guess what I'm saying is, I understand what happened, but I'm trying to get to the bottom line so we can move to the next agenda item. Technically, it seems like the steering committee would have the final say in this in terms of whether this is an issue or not.

33:31

Speaker 6

I don't think the state would have any issue with the steering committee making the final decision. Essentially, what the state was saying was, they don't see this as a conflict of interest. At the end of the day, the steering committee or the region. We can do as we see fit. But I just want to make sure that everyone on this call understands the reason that LADC had to get back.

34:01

Speaker 1

Think, first of all, I think that maybe we do have a little time, so maybe if there are issues around this, why don't we submit them in writing, formally to myself and copy Charles? And then we could come to a determination on if next steps, like a vote should take place. All right? Is that acceptable? Andrea, I want to recognize you.

34:31

Speaker 5

I was just going to say, even though we are also one of the hub leaders, and we did ask about the RFPs that are going to be going out, and were specifically told that there's no conflict. So I don't see this as any different.

34:52

Speaker 1

Okay. So your position is heard. I've heard Sharon, I've heard Benny. It'd be fair to everybody. So we'll give them the platform to carry forth their argument in writing. They will copy Charles. We will present that to the body at our next meeting, and if we can't resolve this, then we'll vote on it and we move on. Okay. All right, so the next. Any other questions? Charles?

35:30

Speaker 6

Yeah, sorry. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah, I just want to make, obviously, time is an so, and we don't want to rush this, but if it comes down to it, where it becomes a time issue, where we have to make a decision, I will recommend that, ie just Bow out, and then the selection would just between two. Because I don't want to get to

the point where we're damaging a timeline. Just keep in mind that Beacon and civil did not bid the first time. So we don't know what their capacity would.

36:17

Speaker 1

So what I'd like you to do when the concerns are given to us in writing. I'd like you to respond with all the data that you have to the steering committee. And then at our next meeting, we'll make a decision as to what to do. And just have the survey monkey on deck to do a vote, if that's what's necessary. Well, I appreciate your willingness to take steps not to delay this process, if that's what's called for.

36:50

Speaker 6

Okay, agreed. I'm sorry, there's one more thing. I just see that Sharon put a comment in the chat, but I don't understand it. I was wondering if she could just expound on it.

37:03

Speaker 1

Sharon, last comment. We got to get through this agenda. All right, let's do this. Charles, let her write it up. And if there's a concern, let her write it up. Okay. So we can move forward. Thank you. All right, Charles, let's just go right into the labor. You still got the floor.

37:27

Speaker 6

Okay, thank you. So the good news is that labor, the unionized labor, we worked out an agreement. They are back with the California Jobs first program. Congratulations to Kiwa. We had done a few back and forth, but Kiwa will remain as the affinity hub for labor. So congratulations, I think. Brady, you're on the call. The agreement will be that one of the tables will be reserved for unionized labor and for the six steering committee seats. These are the organizations that will be appointed to it. The actual leads have not been identified yet. I'm sure they're still working on that. And once they figured that out or decided upon it, they will share that with the steering committee, at least the steering committee chair and vice chairs, or just the steering committee as a whole. Was there any questions regarding this?

38:37

Speaker 1

All right, we have. Is labor only nominating the six?

38:45

Speaker 6

Sharon, labor has six seats reserved, so they don't have to nominate anyone. They're essentially just appointing at this point. I'm not sure if that answers your question.

39:05

Speaker 2

I do, but I challenge their right to a point. They certainly have them read the reserved seats for them to put forth nominees and be able to choose from. However, it was an HRTC designated responsibility to elect its steering committee members. And so I don't know of the organizations that are listed. I know three of them. Two of them. One, two, three of them really well. But we still have an election process, and we have to elect them to the steering committee. My concern is that the membership have the ability to affirm, select, and if they're only going to put forth six, that's great. But some of these are not high growth industries, which is supposedly our focus for Labor. Some of them are low wage industries. But regardless, I think there should be a feedback loop, because that is our process.

40:11

Speaker 2

Had they participated in the election that they were slated to, they would have made their nominations and the membership would have made cast its vote.

40:23

Speaker 6

Mr. Chair, I can probably pass to you, however, my comment is that we've seen the mate, the HRTC, and the

state and labor have been going back and forth with this quite a while, and there's been a deal that's been made, and the agreement was that six seats were set aside for labor at their discretion. However, I'll allow you to have.

40:58

Speaker 1

So, first of all, Sharon, thank you for that. At the end of the day, I think what the concern is who's going to get those seats, right? Who's the individual? But let me go ahead with, we got two hands raised, Brady, and then you, Andrea, following Brady.

41:17

Speaker 7

Yeah, I just wanted to clarify something that was said about them being organizing industries that are low wage. I think it's fair to say that was the case before they were organized. And now there are contracts between these unions and the companies in these industries, and these are some of the last remaining middle class jobs in what were previously low wage industries. And that's the whole purpose of the labor movement. And so I think it's not accurate to say these aren't industries that we need at the table. They absolutely are. And many of these workers are absolutely in careers that have futures ahead of them. That is the whole point of organizing and building collective bargaining contracts.

42:18

Speaker 1

Thank you, Brady. Andrea?

42:22

Speaker 5

Well, I was going to respond to Sharon in that if they're only putting one person for each of these seats, is it really worth going through all the drama of an election? I mean, look how long the other elections took. And so while we understand but the back and forth and the back and forth, we also have to think about our timeline and getting things moving, and they're only going to put one person into each of these. You know, is it worth another whole process?

42:59

Speaker 1

Okay. Thank you, Andrea. Luis? Yeah, I would just, I would probably be inclined to support, prefer like an election, just because, again, the seats are specifically dedicated for labor representatives. Not specifically, these six specific know, there may be some folks who are members of the California Faculty association who may want to run, California Teachers association who may want to participate. There's a whole host of other different labor organizations who may want to run for some of those seats. And so I think even if we simply get these six people, they are the only ones who apply. Great. But I think the idea that at least, we least provide the opportunity for others who may be interested from the labor movement to participate, I think would seem appropriate. Thank you, Luis. Robert Salcedo.

43:54

Speaker 8

Yeah, I just wanted to Andrea's point, I think the voting should stay in place because that's the process. We don't want to bifurcate process because of time. Everyone's had to go through that. So that's what we need to do. Secondly, the most important thing, I think Sharon said, what she just shared was growth industries. So really making sure that these six seats are filled, for example, I don't see aviation on the list. We know that American Airlines alone, United Airlines alone has to hire 30,000 people by 2030. I think that we would ask of labor those of you who are interacting. We would ask of labor to give some consideration to those growth industries that will provide longevity of employment for the individuals that we're helping.

44:44

Speaker 1

Thank you, Robert. I think that one of the solutions I see, because it probably won't be resolved in this meeting, Charles. We need to get labor in a couple of areas. A they need to start coming to the meetings, right. So they're going to be asked these questions directly and also to lean in on the bylaws, because what we don't want to do is do our work and then have it challenged. They have a strong voice and opinion about things. So they need to get engaged since they're going to be a part of this. They're on a steering committee. They need to be engaged

because we can't answer these questions for them. We can't dictate policy for them. We can recommend, I have my own concerns around DEI and who they're recommending. So that's my thought. Charles.

45:36

Speaker 6

Okay. Thank you. Well, my understanding is that's why Brady is, you know, Brady, unless you see it differently, you are the voice that's carrying labor so far. If you have any recommendations of how everything is going to move forward with the tables in those steering committee seats, we'd love to hear it. If there's a meeting that needs to be set up with someone else besides just your know, we'd love to hear.

46:19

Speaker 1

Let me get to you, please, Andrea, please.

46:21

Speaker 5

Okay.

46:23

Speaker 1

Charles Brady is one person. Those are six steering committee seats, which are six people, right. Those are the voices we need here. And if they have delegated to Brady to speak for them for those six seats, that's fine. But I guess what I don't want is for us to make decisions, and then for them to come back and say, we got a problem with it.

46:49

Speaker 6

No, my apologies. That's not what I meant. I didn't mean for him to make decisions, but I meant to reach out to them in order to him be the point of contact for the labor in order to convene for those. I don't want to step in his way. I don't want to step on his toes.

47:09

Speaker 1

I got three people that want to follow up. I got you, Charles. Okay. Three people I want to follow up. Stella, Andrea, and then Brady.

47:19

Speaker 5

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Real quick, I'm looking at the comments and just trying to kind of digest all of that. So, to Sharon's point, yes, we did talk. Obviously, this is all about high growth sectors, and that wage there for hospitality is 36K. That's barely a living wage. I don't even think it is, but living wage for families. But I was thinking that perhaps, Armin, that if you have some reports that you can share some research on the various unions so that when we do have this discussion, that we're prepared, that we can say, yeah, we looked at all of the one through six organizations here, and these are the ones that we feel are high growth and just to be able to reinforce what it is we're trying to do here. Thank you.

48:18

Speaker 1

Thank you, Stella.

48:19

Speaker 5

Andrea, back to the conversation about they, which they did push to have these six seats on the steering committees, they need to beholden to the same guidelines that all the other steering committee members are expected, and that KIWA and Brady are just one of the seats out of the 30 something on the steering committee. And so that's not a fair burden to put for him or KIWA, rather, the organization, because we're representing organizations to be the Affinity hub lead. That means that they take on that responsibility in that capacity, but it doesn't substitute for participation of the other six seeds, in my opinion, that those other six seeds have to meet their responsibilities.

49:14

Speaker 1

Absolutely. That's where I'm coming from. Brady, I promise to circle back to.

49:22

Speaker 7

Yeah, and I think most of this has been said, but just to clarify, I don't see my role speaking on behalf of labor, either. We're a very tight burst group. I have been in touch with them. They're still figuring out who will be the representatives for each of these seats. And I think once they have that, we have to push them to be present at these meetings, and that's something I will certainly do. And then, yeah, that last point, we are all representing organizations, optics of course matter. We need to make sure that this group is diverse. But I would also just encourage us to pay attention to the demographics of the workforces that these unions represent as well.

50:04

Speaker 1

Okay. All right. Sharon, Benny, I captured your concerns. Andrea, let me recognize you again.

50:16

Speaker 5

Sorry. No, my hand just didn't go down.

50:19

Speaker 1

Okay. So, folks, I think, let me make one more question. I saw Sharon made a comment that why this is chair, vice chair role. What do you mean by that, Sharon?

50:39

Speaker 2

It's mood at this point. Brady declined the role to be our representative to labor, which what I thought Charles was.

50:55

Speaker 1

So let's go ahead and move forward. At the end of the day, we need to get labor here at the table. They have six seats. They need to show up. Okay. As a steering committee, we retain the right to enforce that. We all know that's already in place. And that is, we have to be able to elect them. We don't have to agree with whoever they decide to step forward with. But what we don't want to do is get into a situation where we're going around and around. So we need labor at the table. They need the six people that they're talking about. And depending on who they bring forward, we also need to make sure that these industries that they are recommending are growth industries, because that's the whole spirit of this whole thing. Brady had a rebuttal to concern around that.

51:57

Speaker 1

So we will continue in this conversation. But for now, let's go ahead and move forward. Unless there are any other questions on the table partner lead status. So we had a meeting with the state in regards to this whole question around table partner leads. And let me be clear in terms of my position, I appreciate you all advocating for what you believe is the right thing, but I'm not a desperate, I serve at the pleasure of the consensus rate that is reached by the group. And my job is to lead in conversations with entities like the state government, elected officials, whoever. And so we did have that conversation. Number one, the state said that there's going to be data released on December 31 that would help inform us on the best path to take in terms of table partner leads. That's number one.

52:59

Speaker 1

Number two, that they do not require us to have table partner leads, but they won't stand in the middle and they won't prevent us from doing that if we feel that is the best path forward. And then number three, I'm going to make sure I capture this correctly, because I got my notes here. My notes say that state is concerned that the LA table has a big CBO presence, industrial and investment strategy. People aren't there and that they don't have a seat at the table. And so I helped them understand what the proposed table partner leads were that was being

discussed and those recommended originally by the outreach and engagement. And those are the two areas that are now being discussed. And we're going to have in person meetings to talk about that next week. Okay. So I was a neutral in this.

54:12

Speaker 1

I explained what the consensus of the group was in terms of where we stand, but they made it very clear that we are ahead of the curve with table partner leagues and that it would not be detrimental for us to make a decision until after that data is released that shows us the best path forward in terms of how we're going to approach this and what industries we need to focus on. At the end of the day, we got to make sure that the historically underrepresented groups are pushed forward.

54:53

Speaker 1

And we got to make sure that whoever we choose as an industry or however we decide to go about it, that these businesses are going to hire them and that it makes sense for them to have a policy in place, because some of the people that are in charge of these departments of hiring, they don't necessarily agree with what we're doing. And so if there's a policy, then it doesn't matter whether they agree or not. They have to do it. So how do we get there? So with that said, and the state agreed, they couldn't tell us how to do things. They understood that we reserved the right to make that decision. And I'm representing those of us that will enforce that right, and I will, and I have. So, Andrea, I'm going to flip it to you.

55:48

Speaker 5

Okay. Hi. So we have the list that was recommended by the original Outreach committee, which focused on constituency groups. Then there were additional recommendations that focused on industry. And so the proposed table partners is actually a merger of the two. So when we say industry associations, we are looking at the nonprofit organizations that are usually focusing on marginalized groups within these industries for a variety of reasons, one of them being that they have their thumb on the pulse of these organizations. With current information, I can tell you as the academic researcher, research is great, but by the time it gets published, sometimes it's outdated.

56:33

Speaker 5

Even at the labor center right now, we're having to go back and review a lot of things because the environment has changed, to put it in a polite way, since COVID And so it's made a big shift in a lot of things. So the industry associations are usually not even, usually are made up of people who are working and engaging in these fields at the current time. That's who their membership is and that's who their leadership is. And so they're able to inform us and keep us informed as far as what the actual current trends are. So we figured this was a good compromise between the two.

57:09

Speaker 1

Okay, folks, I have a hard stop that I have to make at 02:00 Stella, if I have to step off, I'm going to hand over the chair to you. Sharon, you had your hand raised.

57:26

Speaker 5

Sharon.

57:27

Speaker 6

Sharon Evans.

57:33

Speaker 5

Okay, we can come back.

57:36

Speaker 1

Okay. All right, folks, the next thing, let's go back to the catalyst proposal. Okay, Sharon, you chime in when you figure out your technology so you can speak. The catalyst proposal is such that the document was released by Julie Zeissler, who is writing the proposal. And there's a comment period starting today, and it will go to November 15. And you have an opportunity to lean in on that proposal, and we encourage you. All the information will be sent out to you. We need to get it done. All your comments or suggestions need to happen before November 15. Wednesday, close of business. Okay. So I just wanted to make you aware of that. And then secondly, I thought I saw Julie Zeissler on the call. Is Julie still here? If you want to say a few words, Julie, keep it to one. I hear it.

58:53

Speaker 1

I don't see Julie. Okay. All right. And then as you all know, we're going to be meeting next Thursday at in person for a working in person meeting. A lot of these areas that we're discussing today that we can't get to finalize, I think there were some comments like, what does best plan mean? I'm only communicating to you what they told me. I can interpret what they meant, but I can't tell you definitively what they meant. At the end of the day, we decide what we want to, you know, and if there are questions that are outstanding that you have, we can get back to them and probably get answer pretty quickly. But our in person meeting will be at the UTLA conference room on 33 Wilshire in LA. We got it for 4 hours from 09:00 a.m. To 01:00 p.m.

59:48

Speaker 1

But we've just been told if we want to start earlier, we can at 08:00 a.m. But we'll leave it at 09:00 a.m. For right now. Of those of you that want to get in early and get settled in, probably not a bad idea to have some sidebar networking conversation. I plan on getting there early and encourage you to do the same if you can. But the official meeting will not start until 09:00 a.m.. Okay, any questions on that, Mr.

01:00:15

Speaker 5

Chair? For those that cannot attend in person, will we provide a call in number?

01:00:21

Speaker 1

Yes. So there will be a Zoom link provided. And, Alan, do you want to comment on that?

01:00:32

Speaker 6

Yes.

01:00:32

Speaker 4

So I believe we did send out. We created a Zoom link already, and we did send it out, but then we'll make sure to finalize all the details once we get settled in the conference room as well. We've yet to see what that room looks like in the layout, but we definitely would like to accommodate for anyone who is not able to attend in person.

01:00:51

Speaker 1

Okay, so you got that answer? All right, I got 1 minute before I got to leave. Benny, you had a quick question?

01:00:59

Speaker 3

No, I'm good.

01:01:00

Speaker 1

You're good? Okay.

01:01:02

Speaker 3

Clearly, we didn't make a decision on the screen. We just saw no decisions.

01:01:12

Speaker 1

Exactly. No decisions have been made unless we as a group make it. I'm not making any decisions for us unless I get your direction to do so. Thank you. Okay. All right, Sharon, I don't see your hand up anymore, so I assume we're good with you. Mr.

01:01:30

Speaker 5

Chair, Sharon did have a question. How does the steering committee get input into the catalyst fund.

01:01:41

Speaker 1

Proposal? The link will be sent around to everybody. All right, so you will all have it. Alan will be sending that out after the meeting. Okay, folks, we have gotten through this agenda. I'm going to hand it over to you, Alan. I got to sign off and leave. Let's see. Can we be clear? The state wants to increase its. I'm not. Okay. All right, Stella, I'm handing it over to you.

01:02:16

Speaker 3

Thank you, folks.

01:02:17

Speaker 1

Great meeting.

01:02:18

Speaker 5

Thank you.

01:02:19

Speaker 1

Take care. All right.

01:02:20

Speaker 6

Thank you, Mr. Chase, real quick.

01:02:22

Speaker 5

I'll hand it off to you, Alan, in just a second. So, Sharon, just to answer your question, the state was suggesting. Okay. And they were leaving it up to us, right? We talked about the work that we had done with our on E efforts way back, and know there were industries that were included in that original list. And so when we presented to them the other day, they said, you guys are ahead of the curve here. Right? You're already identifying potential industries. So it's not that they want us to. It was a suggestion. It was a recommendation. Charles, you want to add anything to this, or am I on point?

01:03:03

Speaker 6

No. Thank you for that, Madam Vice Chair. I think you're dead on everything. I just want to reiterate that the state is not mandating anything. The state is providing guidelines for the regions based on the goals and objectives of surf and the way they see the investment initially to be utilized and leveraged. What the regions ultimately vote on is up to the regions, but know that there are risks for every decision that you make. If it's outside of what the state is anticipating, that's it.

01:03:46

Speaker 5

Thank you. Thank you very much. And Alan, do you want to close.

01:03:51

Speaker 1
This up for us?

01:03:52

Speaker 4

Of course. Let's wrap things up, everyone. Thank you, Stella. So for the Affinity Hub leads table partner leads and subregional table scope of work and progress reports. Previously we did share the link, so you may view that at your own convenience. I'll go ahead and drop that in the chat, in case you missed it last time. And we just wanted to say that further development is in progress. I'm sure that in our in person meeting, that's where a lot of the work will be done as well. So definitely look forward to that. And lastly, for our upcoming meetings. So it did come to our attention that the next steering committee meeting falls on November 23, Thursday.

01:04:33

Speaker 4

So due to the Thanksgiving holiday, since our offices are closed and likely a lot of people will also be closed on that day, we'll be updating the calendar invite with a new date. So you should receive it directly and you'll just have to accept that update. For our HRTC partners meeting, I believe we usually have them on the second Friday of a month. However, we did have to pivot for this month because tomorrow is the second Friday of the month. And so of course, Veterans Day is tomorrow. So we're going to go ahead and observe that and push that to the 17th.

01:05:07

Speaker 4

But again, if you have any questions, I did put in a chat our email surf@laudc.org if you need any accommodations for the in person meeting, just give me a heads up and then I'll hopefully have all the information as soon as possible to everyone. But that does wrap up our meeting for now. Just thank you everyone for your participation today.

01:05:31

Speaker 5

Thank you, Ellen. Thank you everybody. From LAEDC, Andrea, all of the steering committee members, we really appreciate, we know that this is a big chunk of time that we're asking from everybody, so really appreciate your participation, your feedback, your comments, et cetera. So thank you. Have a great holiday, great weekend. Bye everybody.

01:05:54

Speaker 3

Bye, everyone. Bye.