



## Steering Committee Monthly Meeting September 12th, 2024

[Presentation](#)

[Recording](#)

- Passcode: +@43\$L1d

[Summary Notes](#)

[Meeting Transcript](#)

### Summary Notes

The Steering Committee Meeting held on September 12, 2024, commenced with housekeeping items and the introduction of new Vice Chair Libby Williams, who brings extensive experience in economic development. The committee discussed the removal of members with poor attendance, with an email vote pending. Updates on the project timeline highlighted key upcoming dates and deadlines, including the Regional Plan Part Two submission due by September 30. Feedback received from the state on the regional plan indicated its strengths and areas for improvement. The committee engaged in discussions on equity criteria for project evaluation and the establishment of a subcommittee focused on equity and accountability. Despite low volunteer turnout for subcommittees, proposals were made for future actions including drafting applications utilizing examples from other regions. As the meeting ran over time and quorum was lost, a plan to circulate additional information for feedback was set in motion, with assigned action items for various team members to ensure progress moving forward.

#### Opening and Housekeeping (02:36 - 11:15)

- Meeting started with attendance check and waiting for the chair
- Ariel presented housekeeping items:
  - All resource tracker contains attendance link and alternative form
  - Google form for proposing agenda items
  - Resource tracker link to be shared

### **New Vice Chair Introduction (11:15 - 22:06)**

- Libby Williams introduced as new vice chair
- Libby's background: economic development since 1994, worked for LAEDC, LA USD, LA Community College District, Mayor's office, USC
- Currently COO at Vermont Slauson Economic Development Corporation

### **Steering Committee Attendance and Removal Vote (22:07 - 32:52)**

- Discussion on removing members with poor attendance:
- Patrick Hogue (last attended February)
- Salvador Vasquez (no attendance)
- Sam Lewis (last attended June)
- Vote to be taken via email
- Clarification on notification process and deadlines given to members

### **Timeline Updates (32:52 - 42:08)**

- Arman presented updated timeline
- Key dates:
  - Regional plan part two submission: September 30
  - Sector investment coordinator performance: December to September 30, 2026
  - 27 convenings: April and May 2025
  - Implementation SFP postponed to January 2025
- Catalyst projects:
  - Application period: February 2025
  - Selection: March to June 2025
  - Contracting: July and August 2025

### **Regional Plan Part Two Feedback (42:08 - 50:27)**

- State provided verbal feedback on August 30 submission
- Strengths: good analysis, justified industry selection, feasible strategies
- Recommendations: spelling/naming issues, alignment with state strategies, examples of successful programs
- Writing team incorporating feedback and creating tables for each target sector strategy

### **Equity Criteria Proposals (50:27 - 01:00:52)**

- Discussion on equity criteria for project evaluation
- Changes made to criteria based on previous meeting feedback
- Debate on applying criteria to both catalyst and implementation projects

### **Equity and Accountability Framework (01:00:53 - 01:15:06)**

- Proposal for creating a subcommittee for vetting and scoring proposals based on equity criteria
- Discussion on need for monitoring impact on disinvested communities
- Debate on potential conflicts of interest and process for evaluation

### **Subcommittee Updates and Application Process (01:15:06 - 01:31:38)**

- Low volunteer turnout for subcommittees due to perceived conflicts of interest
- Proposal for CCF and LAEDC to compile draft application using other regions' examples
- Discussion on process for developing and reviewing application

### **Time Management and Next Steps (01:31:38 - 01:40:22)**

- Meeting running overtime, loss of quorum
- Discussion on how to move forward with application process and funding strategy
- Proposal to send out information for feedback after the meeting

## **Meeting Transcript**

02:35

Speaker 1

Hello, everyone.

02:39

Speaker 2

Hope you're all doing well.

02:43

Speaker 1

Hello. Hello, LAedc team. I'm just checking to see if.

02:51

Speaker 2

Our.

02:52

Speaker 1

Chair is on the call yet. I don't see her there. Let message her real quick.

03:06

Speaker 2

Andrea.

03:46

Speaker 1

Folks, I just messaged Andrea. I think she just ran just a couple minutes behind. So, Ariel, everyone, should we give her.

03:53

Speaker 2

Like one more minute?

03:55

Speaker 1

I want to be respectful of everyone's time here.

04:02

Speaker 3

Yeah, Estella, maybe we can get started since Ariel needs to do the housekeeping.

04:09

Speaker 1

Perfect.

04:10

Speaker 2

Yeah, perfect.

04:12

Speaker 1

Good deal. Thank you.

04:14

Speaker 3

Okay, well, welcome everyone to our senior committee meeting. We're going to start with the housekeeping items. And as you may know, we have the all resource tracker

where you can find the attendance link, which is very important because we discussing attendance today. And also over there you'll find the alternative form for attendance. In case you're not able to assist any state committee meetings, you will need to fill out this form to provide the name of the person who's going to be stepping in your behalf. Like you said, please remember to submit your attendance. I'm going to be sharing the link here on the chat in a little bit. And if you would like to propose any agenda items using Google form, we'll be updating this Google jamboard to Google form because it allows you to input more characters.

05:15

Speaker 3

Just remember to every time that you're going to submit a, a proposed item for the discussion in the agenda, put your name, your date, and the item that you would like to include on the next state and committee meeting. Like we mentioned, the resource tracker will share the link as well. And if you think there's areas of opportunity, you can always email the opportunities department with Andrea. Her email is later. Slatermanclay.edu. And that's for housekeeping.

05:53

Speaker 2

Thank you.

05:55

Speaker 1

All right, and Ariel, just a note that Andrea is now the chair, so we just need to remove delete device out of there. Just a minor little deal there.

06:08

Speaker 3

Got it. We'll update that.

06:10

Speaker 2

Thank you.

06:11

Speaker 1

Okay, good deal. And Andrea is jumping on right now, so, we can just go to the next slide, I guess.

06:23

Speaker 2

Well, you know what, I can.

06:25

Speaker 1

Go ahead and cover this. This was Andrea's slide, but just.

06:30

Speaker 4

Oh, wonderful.

06:31

Speaker 2

All right, Andrea. Sorry, I was trying to hop from one thing to another.

06:37

Speaker 3

All yours.

06:39

Speaker 2

Okay. Hi, everyone. Apologize for being late. I had to disconnect one zoom for the other. So we wanted to welcome our newest vice chair, Libby Williams, and give her a couple of minutes to introduce herself and tell us a little bit about her and her role and then we're also going to be doing a conversation and a removal vote on attendance for some of our steering committees, many members. So let's start with the good news first. Libby, are you there? Oops, I'm sorry. I've been talking this entire time to myself because I was on mute.

07:36

Speaker 1

Thank you, Andrea.

07:37

Speaker 2

And I want to say thank you to everyone who voted for me. I'm just profoundly grateful and surprised, honestly, that I was elected. I appreciate that and I hope to do everyone proud. My background is economic development. I've been in this field since 94. After I

finished being a coral fellow. I actually worked for the LADC for eleven years and got my teeth cut there. Since then I've worked for LA USD and LA Community College District as the head of their small business office, helping to work with small minority and women owned suppliers and subcontractors to get more work in those different institutions.

08:09

Speaker 2

Worked for Mayor river goes to his office as the head of his office of Small Business work for five years for USC on a grant that was funded by EDA to focus on aerospace and defense suppliers, again focusing on small minority suppliers to help them get more opportunities. And now I'm here at Vermont Slauson Economic Development Corporation. So as the COO. So I'm very proud and happy to be representing community based organizations in this field and the sector. I love La County, I love the work that we do and all of our colleagues in the line because we're all committed to the mission. So thank you for having me. Thank you and welcome again, appreciate you and Stella, and I definitely appreciate the help.

08:50

Speaker 2

Okay, so we do have, as many of you are aware, that we have some members of the steering committee that have not been attending the meetings. And so we are going to be asking for a vote. They've been notified and as you can see on the slide, have been notified. No response. Actually notified more than once. No response. Patrick Hogue. Hog Hogue. Sorry. His last attendance date was in February. Salvador Vasquez hasn't attended any meetings. And then Sam Lewis's last meeting was in June. So given the bylaws, we are going through the process. There's been the notification, waiting for the reply. No reply. So the next step is to vote to remove them. Are there any questions? I can't see the seconded. Was that Tony or Linda?

10:01

Speaker 3

Oh, sorry. Tony has hered.

10:06

Speaker 2

Okay. Okay. So Linda second. Okay. And then Tony has her hand up. Okay. Tony?

10:14

Speaker 5

Yes.

10:14

Speaker 6

Thank you. I just wanted to confirm that in the multiple notices that you sent them, did, were they notified that today were going to be voting for their removal or so. I just wonder if they had noticed that were literally going to take the final action today.

10:33

Speaker 1

Well, Teoma, I'm sorry. This is Stella. Chair, Tioma, you said that the vote would be taken via email. Is that correct? Yeah. To Tony's question, though, I believe I would have to look back at the email that was sent to the members. I believe they were notified that a vote is coming. I'm not sure if it was noted that it's today.

11:01

Speaker 3

It was noted that it was today. They were notified that they had until September 10 to reply to us in order for us not to take any action.

11:12

Speaker 2

That's okay. Yeah, that's what I was thinking. I was like, did it specify the day? But yes. Thank you.

11:18

Speaker 6

Thank you for the clarification. Very helpful.

11:22

Speaker 2

Any other questions? And as was mentioned, it will be an email vote. Perfect. Thank you.

11:34

Speaker 1

Chair.

11:37



Speaker 3

Luis also has his hat and up.

11:40

Speaker 2

Okay.

11:41

Speaker 4

Yeah, I was curious, what positions are they or what roles do they currently fill and how are we going to be looking to fill those positions?

11:54

Speaker 2

Well, then. Oh, go ahead.

11:57

Speaker 1

I was going to say they're so. I believe Sam Lewis is resident, and then Patrick and Salvador are both labor. So the labor is unique in how that role will need to be filled. But according to the bylaws, the. The other positions, it's a general vote. It states in the bylaws, HRTC. The full HRTC.

12:26

Speaker 4

Why is the bylaw specifically outline something different for the labor positions?

12:32

Speaker 1

I don't know that it's in the bylaws that is specific. But since it's labor, my understanding is it needs to be labor seats that are. It would need to be labor that is replaced. So I don't know.

12:47

Speaker 4

I get that, but I guess it's. So I'm wondering, like, so if we have two seats for labor, I'm wondering, why aren't we going through the normal process of announcing it and if there's any labor folks who are interested. Yes, chioma, if I may just step in. That's exactly, I think, the process that's being had in mind in terms of announcing these seats to the general HRTC, it's just clarifying that specifically for those.

13:11

Speaker 2

Two labor seats, you must be a.

13:12

Speaker 4

Representative from labor in order to qualify. But it is something that we would be reaching out to the whole HRTC for these three specific seats.

13:23

Speaker 2

Those two seats have that additional requirement.

13:26

Speaker 4

Thank you.

13:29

Speaker 2

Anyone else? Okay. All right, next slide, please. And thank you, Stella, for filling in. No worries unexpectedly. All right, so here's the timeline, the updated timeline. We've just kind of consolidated and moved past the dates that have already passed. So we have on here. There were questions about the catalyst projects and the selection. So we do have the updated time on here where they're due. And the initial, actually, let me go back up a little bit where the initial ones are in January, and then the final list is in June because there were a lot of questions surrounding that. And so the other dates are pretty, they're basically the same thing that we've been looking at. But I did want to highlight those changes. Madam, should we have Armand talk about this as well? I was just about to say her mom.

14:48

Speaker 2

Would you like to.

14:51

Speaker 3

Yeah, of course. Well, it's good to see everybody. Thank you for joining today. Yeah. So we're looking at our timeline here. This is a very packed timeline, but I added in some of the catalyst stuff that went over maybe two meetings ago on that, on an excel file, and

so I'll just go through it. At the very top left, you'll see the regional plan part two. Currently, the writing team is incorporating the state feedback, and we'll be submitting that on September 30. In the following slide, I'll review what the feedback was. We see that the sector investment coordinator performance period has been added to the timeline. They will begin working in late November. And so I just put it as December all the way until September 30, 2026.

15:38

Speaker 3

One other action item is the 27 convenings that will be coming up next year in the month of April and May. So there will be a solicitation, selection and contracting for those convenings taking place, and that process will begin in December of this year. One very important thing that we have to mention is that the state has informed us that implementation, the implementation SFP will no longer be opening in September 10 of 2024, and it's going to be postponed the opening of the SFP or the release of it to January 2025. We have not received any other updates on the following two periods of implementation rounds, so just kind of have them up as tentatively sometime in 2025 and sometime in 2026. Of course, we've been informed that it'll be about \$45 million of competitive funding for the 13 regions to go for.

16:37

Speaker 3

Some of the other things that we see here is related to catalyst projects. And so there's like, there's the red and a little bit of a kind of a burgundy color. So the Burgundy color is referring to internally, how the catalyst project solicitation will be developed that will be starting in January, moving on to the application period in February. Then the catalyst project eligibility assessment, public review and project selection will be taking place between March and June of 2025. And you will see that overlaps with those 27 convenings, because those 27 convenings will have three per spa, where the public can provide feedback on projects in the months of April and May of 2025.

17:22

Speaker 3

Ultimately, the contracting is looking to be completed for catalyst projects in July and August of next year, and the period of performance will go on until the regional convener closeout date of September 2026. The next deliverables following the regional plan, part two, we will have a initial narrative report of pre development projects that is going to be due in January. So this report will include five to ten pre development projects that we will be presenting in a narrative format to the state. These are going to be projects that at some point, our steering committee and

collaborative, we will need to start deciding on these projects to be included in that report. But that is different than the projects that we'll receive funding potentially, but I mean, hopefully we're moving in that direction towards the ones that receive funding. So that's not the SFP.

18:16

Speaker 3

It's a bit confusing, but we received clarification from the state on that. And then finally we'll have a list of selected projects report that is due in June of next year. This report will have ten to 15 projects across the three different categories that the state has outlined. So that would be ten to 15 projects that are exploratory, ten to 15 that are last mile, and then ten to 15 in the ready to go stage, and so that list of 30 to 45 projects is due in June of 2025. If there's. It looks like Luis had a question, but I don't have anything else to add here. Andrea, I can move on to the next slide if you like.

19:01

Speaker 2

Yes, please. Thank you. Yeah, thank you.

19:04

Speaker 3

So were sent in our first draft of the regional plan part two on August 30 to the state. This state scheduled a meeting to go over their feedback on September 10. And so we had that meeting two days ago. We're yet to receive a document with the feedback, but the state verbally provided that. And so the state told us we did a great job on the plan, and there isn't really anything the state is requiring us to change. But they did provide recommendations. They said that some of the strengths of the report was it had good analysis. We justified our industry selection well, and we had feasible strategies with a good focus on gender equity and benefits to disinvested communities. Some of the recommendations are relating to kind of spelling and naming issues.

19:53

Speaker 3

So they were just saying to spell out of CJF as opposed California jobspruce as opposed to using CJF and some sort of design aspect of moving strategies to the end of the target sectors. And they just gave us some additional things that if we can add it, they would, they saw it as beneficial to our plan, such as strengthening the alignment with the state strategies, how we're aligning with those executive orders, adding some successful examples of guaranteed training programs within transportation and logistics, and then adding additional measures and enhancements of the measures for

integrating disinvested communities and workforce development along with those educational institutions. And so if we go to the next slide, you can see updates on what we have been doing as the writing team. So taking into consideration all that feedback, we've been incorporating those recommendations.

20:46

Speaker 3

We're creating these tables for each target sector strategy to more clearly spell out the strategies and how they relate to the outcomes of job access and quality, equity and climate and alignment with state strategies. And also our financial strategy lead has been meeting with the industry table partner leads to assist in strategy development. And the kind of questions we're asking is how do we keep industry in La county? So how do we prevent people from leaving LA county? How do we advertise it as a good place to do business, and how do we bring employers here? How do we guarantee benefits to disinvested communities within these agreements with employers and industry partners? And then how do we just further develop these industries?

21:29

Speaker 3

So we're thinking of these things, sending the document to the designer on September 20, and we will be submitting the final version of the regional plan, part two to the state on September 30. So in 18 days.

21:48

Speaker 2

Sharon.

21:51

Speaker 5

Hi there. I'm sorry, I hope you can hear me fine. I'm on a phone. Where do you have an opportunity for the community feedback to make it into these strategies?

22:06

Speaker 2

Some.

22:07

Speaker 5

Quite a few of the strategies as I was going through and looking and trying to put support with content was not as much strategies as it was table partner programs that

they wanted to implement in projects. And so we did have a lot of conversation and agreement within the steering committee to bifurcate strategies from project recommendations. So community asked to have input and we wanted to make sure that happened. I know I received a call from one of the assembly members where a complaint had bubbled up and that community members in certain of the assembly districts felt like they had not been allowed to have input because they had not been provided with spa based or district level data and that, and they wanted to be able to respond to that.

23:06

Speaker 5

So how do you envision in the next ten days as you're preparing that you capture that?

23:14

Speaker 3

Yeah, I think that's a great question. So we have sections in the regional plan that reference the comments and feedback that we receive from community, either from the affinity hub leads and the sub regional table leads. I feel like if there's maybe specific strategies that you saw in the draft, if you want, maybe we can schedule a discussion to go over those. I received one request for Spa based data and I supplied that. So that was for Spa six. One other document that we received from the community, I believe it was from BBA, we incorporated those strategies and added it to plan. I think that you will find that across many of the strategies, these equity measures are incorporated.

24:04

Speaker 3

But if you would like to discuss at any time, maybe at like a one one call or anything that you like, you know, just send me an email and we can see how that goes. We are trying to send the content of the draft to the strategic writer by the 20th, so the sooner the better, but I'm available to discuss.

24:23

Speaker 5

Okay. I don't, I know I'm not a lone ranger and I'm not trying to be, but I really would encourage anybody that is concerned about their communities having input be able to kind of participate. And I really appreciate your openness to being able to do that.

24:39

Speaker 3

Yeah, definitely.

24:40

Speaker 5

Thank you.

24:41

Speaker 3

Yeah, thank you, Sharon. Yeah, so I'll just put my email in the chat again. It's just my first dot, my last namedc.org, comma, but I'll put in there and just let me know.

24:54

Speaker 1

Armand, this is Stella. I had a very similar comment question, basically is, you know, will we all be providing with another opportunity to provide feedback on the questions that you have here? How do we keep the industry in La county? Guaranteed benefits, disadvantaged communities, et cetera. So I think it's really important that.

25:16

Speaker 2

We communicate to the steering committee to.

25:19

Speaker 1

Sub regional table leads, the HRTC organizations, if they have any feedback, we're going to need that, you know, within the next eight days or so, you know, just to get it all back to you. So thank you.

25:32

Speaker 3

Yeah, thank you. Thank you, Stella.

25:42

Speaker 2

Okay, next slide. Okay, our fiscal agent update.

25:52

Speaker 7

That'll be me.

25:53

Speaker 3

Yeah, we have phone calls.

25:55

Speaker 4

Yes.

25:55

Speaker 7

Yeah, I'll be taking over. I think Maria's out office today. Hey, folks, happy Thursday. Two quick updates on the CCF side. So I've been working through the sub regional table lead closeout. So in general, I've been working this and the table leads, and we're doing the affinity hubs, as a lot of you guys know. So right now I'm just working to review and recapture as much of the funding that we can, mostly from the sub regional tables. I know a lot of them either didn't use all the grant funding or didn't use all the gift card funding. So I've been working with a lot of those agencies to recollect that. So that'll be worked over the course of probably through the end of this month. Realistically, I have a meeting with our contracting partner over at Paykeeper.

26:46

Speaker 7

The plan right now is to have those funds routed back through Paykeeper and have one payment sent back to the California Community foundation. So the movement of funds will likely be happening towards the end of this month, early October timeframe. So I'll provide more information as we get closer to the month on what that's looking like. So we have the sector investment coordinator timeline here as well, and the website reminder of. Pretty straightforward there. We had a bidders conference earlier this week, LA ADC. I don't know if you guys have the link handy, but if you can drop it in chat, we'll be posting all of our updates in regards to the timeline, expectations, any additional information, updates are moving around, anything like that'll be posted to the website, so please keep that link handy.

27:44

Speaker 7

If this is something that you've been keeping an eye on, but that's it for my end. Tony, I see your hand up.

27:53

Speaker 6

Yeah. Thank you. I'm wondering if when the money comes back, if there are legitimate



things that we might do with those funds. I know we can't move between categories, but to the extent that, say, in outreach, there were additional funds, I'm wondering if this is an opportunity to ask a group of disinvested communities where we would maybe pay reviewers, that we might have particular groups that are very good at that, and obviously they would all be done before the deadline, but this might be an opportunity to get another level of feedback that without compensation, the groups can't afford the time, et cetera. I wasn't thinking our group would be one of them. I did make comments, but I was just thinking rather than sending them the money back, maybe there's an additional level of community engagement that we could fit in.

28:43

Speaker 7

Sure. Thank you. Yeah. So that's something that we've kind of considered already. The opportunities to use some of this funding. Unfortunately, with how things are rolling out, it doesn't look like we'll have a clear number on what some of these savings can be. In most areas, it looks like we're going to meet right on the nose. In some areas, we have deficits, so there's some of that funding is already going to be patching holes on the ship. Since our time is virtually up at this point, it doesn't look like we'll be able to do a lot with the small amount of funding that we may have. You know, like I said, we may meet right on the nose and not have much funding left. When we get to the bottom of this.

29:29

Speaker 5

Last doing committee meeting, we asked for an interim financial report, and I know you were working on that. We don't know where things stand on the project. As far as the planning phase, do you have that available?

29:41

Speaker 7

Sure. Yeah. What I can do is share our most recent invoice because we are one invoice away from pretty much knowing our final numbers that will be shared at the end of this week. So once I receive that and review it, I can pass that along so that you guys can review it and see what we're looking at. We do have some contracts outstanding. I know we're. Like I said, we're in deficits in some area. So this last invoice should give us a pretty clear picture of, you know, the exact numbers that we're looking at prior to close out.

30:15

Speaker 5

Would it be appropriate for something to be considered for us to, as a steering committee on our next meeting, to approve a provisional allocation for the additional community spa based needs input that we didn't get to. Again, it's something that we committed to the community did not get a chance to do, and it is in that same outreach budget for that. Both the car was paid of and the sub regional tables were paid for. That was in our original outreach buzz. Would it be possible to consider a provisional approval at our next meeting prior to the end of this fiscal. That would close it before the closeout of the project with any dollars that would support that being done?

31:05

Speaker 7

Sure. Yeah. As I stated earlier, I think one of our biggest issues with that is the fact that we won't have those numbers until likely well after our end date for this. So I'm working with these sub regional tables now, but a lot of them, there's a lot of confusion, there's a lot of unclearness on what they were supposed to use the funds for if they have cash or gift cards that they're going to return. How exactly? We're going to recapture some of this stuff. From what I've been reviewing, it looks like our deficits. If there's a remotely substantial chunk of that funding, it's going to cover some of those areas. So I don't anticipate there being enough funding. One, I don't anticipate there being enough funding to fund a project. And two, on the CCF side, we're just out of time.

31:55

Speaker 7

We don't really have the means or time to allocate another grant or contract or anything like that.

32:01

Speaker 2

Thank you. Oh, since I came, I have to apologize. But as far as putting things on the agenda, did we discuss the process about the Google form? We have not, no. All right. We can talk about it at the end. All right, next slide, please. Tony had her hand up.

32:32

Speaker 6

I apologize. Just a follow up. You mentioned Paul, you mentioned gift cards. Are you going to. What do you do with gift cards? Is that something that we should be identifying a homeless shelter or something for, or do we go and turn our gift cards in and you get cash and you give the state cash? I don't know how fungible gift cards are.

32:54

Speaker 7

Yeah, yeah. Thank you. That was actually something I brought up with the state for the same reasons. We were like, how are we going to work this oddball situation out? So what it looks like now, I'm kind of trying to delineate folks that didn't use all the funding and have cash. You know, that'll be pretty straightforward, obviously. And folks that didn't use all the funding but already paid gift cards. So our conversation with the state, what they indicated is that we would just take those, essentially lock those up in our finance wall and have them to use on a future project during the catalyst phase. So they will be reallocated somewhere. Where that is, we don't know yet. But just know we do plan to use those in the future for one of our upcoming projects.

33:34

Speaker 2

Thank you. Anyone else? Okay, thank you. All right. Sector investment coordinator, timeline.

33:52

Speaker 4

This was actually just covered by CCF. We just had the bidders conference, and we did post the link on the website where they can view the video.

34:01

Speaker 2

And see more information on the RFP. Next slide. We can move to the next one.

34:26

Speaker 1

Did we lose Ariel?

34:28

Speaker 2

Ariel. Thank you. Yes, I see the mouse moving. Okay. Am I doing equity proposals?

34:37

Speaker 3

I'm sorry, Andrea. I think we can go see. I can kind of introduce it if you like.

34:45

Speaker 2

Okay. Yeah.

34:46

Speaker 3

So we had two documents sent in to the stewardship committee and the steering committee for consideration for adoption by the steering committee. And so we're just going to give an opportunity for individuals that were involved in the various proposals to present on it. We have an equity criteria proposals document and an equity and accountability framework document. So if we go to the next slide. Oh, yeah. So I believe it was Nicole, Luis, maybe some other individuals that were working on this. But if you like to go over your equity criteria, I think we received a finalized version sometime last week.

35:48

Speaker 4

I can speak on it real quick. And so we, as you recall, our last board meeting and last our steering committee meeting, the committee approved the criteria, but recognized that there were some additional changes that need to be worked out. They said, you know, go back and work amongst yourselves, figure this out. We organized a meeting and went through some of the proposals. Some of the changes that I initially proposed got adopted. Others were rejected. What you're seeing, if you'd like, I can send the group the final version that shows the track changes. What's different, or if you defer to the group as to how they'd like to go through it.

36:37

Speaker 2

We could just go over the highlights. I don't think we need to go over the whole track changes in the amount of time that we have.

36:45

Speaker 6

Can we get a link?

36:48

Speaker 4

Yeah, I apologize. So let me actually, you know what? Let me share my screen. Is it, if I can get the authorization to do that, I can just walk through kind of what was different from. And I apologize, I think.

37:00

Speaker 3

Give me 1 second, please. I can make you co host. That way you can share your screen.

37:15

Speaker 2

Okay.

37:16

Speaker 3

You should be able to do it now.

37:25

Speaker 4

So this is, and this will, again, this just show track changes. I'll go through. Just highlight some of the biggest changes we made. It was agreed upon that the includes at least one CBO. We didn't specify the type of community based organization as a co lead was left in the. The project mix of CBO partners must include one or more with an operating budget of less than \$2 million. And we said excluding pass through funds. And that was meant to address some organizations who get large amounts of monies to, let's say, to do, you know, food delivery programs. But it's pretty much a pass through. There's no direct monies that come into the organization. And then we also specified that the project includes a labor affiliated CBO or labor union. And that, and then for the outreach and we.

38:14

Speaker 4

Outreach to marginalized communities was specified that included ethnic media and translations. We switched these two from nos to yes shows a clear strategies for intentional actions we switched them from nose to a scoring for this one as well. Same thing with these two items. We did do a kind of more grammatical change on the process for focusing on career readiness beyond simply workforce development. And that was it. I know since then there was. The form was reorganized to kind of just put the must haves at top, but as a process on here, we still need to go through, and I identify some of the scoring that will go along with some of the required items on here to see how we're going to be looking at that. And I think that's the hope, that's the next step, that we'll be looking at.

39:12

Speaker 4

The other, the broader approach as to how much money fundings are going to be,

projects are going to be eligible for, how are we going to be distributing it out, what type of communities we're going to be targeted, how we're going to be scoring some of those, how many we're going to be sending up to the state. And I think my understanding is that's going to be going through a. Through the. One of the committees to look at that a little bit further. Any questions?

39:44

Speaker 2

Sorry, I was saying. Thank you. Any questions?

39:58

Speaker 1

Just real quick. Tony is asking for a link to the document. So.

40:06

Speaker 4

I submitted it to the CJF team. I don't know if they've uploaded it somewhere.

40:14

Speaker 2

Can you put it in the chat? Are you able to.

40:17

Speaker 3

We have a PDF that we can share, but also I think Scarlett is going to. You're going to share it later today, right?

40:28

Speaker 1

Yeah, I'll go ahead with the vote and the recap.

40:31

Speaker 4

I'll share the document.

40:33

Speaker 1

It was sent through email.

40:34

Speaker 4

So it's in PDF format, but we will.

40:36

Speaker 3

Yeah, everyone should have it. We send it last week over email to everyone in the student committee.

40:46

Speaker 2

Any other questions?

40:50

Speaker 1

Yes, Andrea, in the doc, I think the steering committee needs to review. The members need to review the doc a little bit more before a vote. There's one item, so one I wanted to. Louise touched on it some. So this will be for applicable for catalyst and implementation. So, yeah, as we updated already, the implementation we know will come out early next year. And so for that one, there'll be a letter of support needed. And so, yes, whoever's on that subcommittee, their task will be to look at the. The proposal, because, remember, the application won't come to the region. Right. So for implementation, the application will come from EDD, and then each region applicant will need to attach a letter of support to it. So I'm thinking this might need to be adjusted for implementation, because we'll have to.

41:58

Speaker 1

The subcommittee would have to figure out how to score based on what's been provided for someone who will be applying. So it's like, will the subcommittee want them to present them with a full application to base that on? I mean, but that can be, we have a little time for that because implementation now, we know, is not being released till early next year. But for catalysts, for this to be applicable for catalysts. One piece of feedback I have is in the document, the term, is it disinvested? No, the term. So the term provided by the state. Right. That's given in the original solicitation is disinvested where the state provided us with four sources and ways to determine disinvested. So one thing is, okay, so in the document, you use the terminal under invested.

43:01

Speaker 1

So my thing with changing the term, you would need to define the term. So, I mean, I. That's why I think sometimes it's easier to go with what the state has provided because we have the definitions. But if you want to change the term to under invest it like you have in the document, then applicants will need to know, how is that defined?

43:26

Speaker 4

Sorry, Chioma. I do want to point out that Derek had made a comment in the chat that at the last committee, the steering committee approved the policy, and they said, here's a smart working group, we'll work out the differences. That was, that was done. So I think if it'd be helpful if in that future, that if there was other things that wanted to be pointed out, that we could have had the appropriate people participating from the CJaf team on that.

43:52

Speaker 1

Noted. Noted. Okay. That's all my comments. Thank you.

44:06

Speaker 3

Yeah, I think.

44:08

Speaker 2

Sorry, go ahead. I was looking at. I'm just trying to read. Go through the chat here. Okay, go ahead.

44:15

Speaker 3

Yeah, I mean, I think just to kind of go off of what Shoma was saying for that definition there. Yeah. I do think it's important that terms are defined clearly, at least as it pertains to things like that. I mean, the state used a pretty formal definition for disinvested communities where they had four different things that could qualify a census tract or area as being disinvested. So I do think that's an important point.

44:49

Speaker 2

And then. Okay. And to confirm, steering committee members can vote on this and it doesn't conflict them out from applying for future funding. Correct? Correct. We need



as much participation on the voting side as possible. Our voter turnout has been very low for a civically engaged group. Just saying.

45:14

Speaker 4

Tony has her hand up. Sorry. Tony has her hand up. I don't know if you're able to see it.

45:21

Speaker 2

No, I cannot. Okay. Thank you for that, Tony.

45:25

Speaker 6

Yeah. I don't know what the specific motion is that's going to be on the election, but it would be. I would feel more comfortable if it said that this is a component of. Of the overall criteria. I don't have a problem with it being the equity component of the catalyst, but what I'm concerned is that for implementation, we have no idea what the state's going to say. We may completely disagree with where they're going. And so the LA steering committee may want to have a complete different look or fuller look relative to what we would want to vote yes on. And so we just don't know. I mean, the state changes quite a bit on things.

46:12

Speaker 6

So I guess I would feel more comfortable if I was voting on Catalyst equity criteria only, and that there was a discussion at whatever point you want, that would be about other criteria that we would expect to see on catalyst. But making it very clear, I think some people are thinking like, this is the criteria, and I could be wrong, but this is the equity criteria, and there's other kinds of criteria we would be looking at. So I haven't written the motion, I haven't read the motion. I would just like to see clarity on that. And as I said, that this is not for implementation and catalyst, but that we would do implementation separate now that we know we're not going to see the state stuff until September or until January.

46:55

Speaker 2

Okay, so you're proposing that we actually separate the two at this time what the equity criteria would be?

47:01

Speaker 6

Yes, but only because we just learned today that we're not going to see the implementation until January.

47:09

Speaker 2

Okay.

47:15

Speaker 5

Sharon, I'm walking, so I hope. I don't know. My computer's dead. I think we agreed that this would be our equity criteria. And the criteria. Equity criteria is a first step in the evaluation process. You don't pass equity, you don't go on to other. And what the premise was, and Nicole was very diligently on this, is that this equity criteria. Sharon, can you hear me?

47:50

Speaker 2

You heard that you dropped off. Sorry.

47:53

Speaker 5

I'm sorry. That the equity criteria would be more than what the state was defining. So, although the state has four parameters for disinvested, the equity working group, as they refer to themselves, and I was participating, are asking for more than what the state set as a minimum, and this was intended to encompass that more. Brady's on the line. You or Derek can take it from here. And I'm going to be quiet now.

48:28

Speaker 2

Did you want to add anything? Brady.

48:36

Speaker 4

This is Derek.

48:37

Speaker 2

I'll just add that in the meeting.

48:39

Speaker 4

When were going over this.

48:44

Speaker 2

Sharon is spot on with her characterization, because.

48:50

Speaker 4

We needed to be able to move.

48:51

Speaker 2

Forward with this, because there's a lot of other things we have to tackle.

48:55

Speaker 4

And take care of. We were at a standstill in a couple different parts of parsing out, like.

49:03

Speaker 2

How we should approach the equity proposal.

49:05

Speaker 4

So Louise had done the due diligence.

49:07

Speaker 2

Of, like, giving his point of.

49:09

Speaker 4

View on some additions.

49:13

Speaker 2

So the vote was. And correct me if I'm wrong, you.

49:16

Speaker 4

Know, we got this recorded to move.

49:20

Speaker 2

Forward with the equity proposal after the.

49:23

Speaker 4

Reconciliation between the discrepancies that were brought forward from Louise's point of view and.

49:30

Speaker 2

Also what was already provided by way of the criteria itself as a position.

49:35

Speaker 4

So we voted yes on that.

49:38

Speaker 2

So I understand all the unreadiness on.

49:41

Speaker 4

Moving forward, but then. Then we are. We're doing something different than what we had already agreed to, which is a different motion that needs to have a different vote.

49:51

Speaker 2

That's all I'm saying. Okay. And I'm trying to go back and review my notes. Does anyone recall anything different?

50:15

Speaker 4

Madam chair, just a quick heads up. Sharon and myself have our hands up.

50:20

Speaker 2

Okay, go ahead. And then I'll. Oh, I've got Sharon.

50:25

Speaker 5

My hand should be down. I just. I'm just. I'm just moving. So I just need to get the phone off my ear so I can lower it.

50:32

Speaker 2

Okay.

50:34

Speaker 4

So, yeah, so I think just to recapture.

50:36

Speaker 2

Yeah.

50:36

Speaker 4

We did vote to answer Tony's questions during the chat. We did vote to proof language that wasn't finalizing. Kind of said, hey, go back. And one of the questions asked is, what happens if there's no consensus? And it was like, well, we'll deal with that when we get to it. There was consensus, and so. But I think we need a broader discussion. I think do as much work as we can on how the catalyst funds will be broken out, how we're going to fund those. There was a proposal that I had in our. In the language, in my amendments that the group said, you know, hey, that's a broader discussion. So we did not include that in the final equity criteria. I would ask, you know, so I think one.

51:11

Speaker 4

So the language for the equity criteria, I think we have, but I think it does not. So that is approved based on what will happen at the last meeting, but it does not. That does not preclude us from making additional changes. Should other folks want to propose other changes to it. I would recommend that we assign one of the committees to start outlining the criteria. You know, how much, how much funding projects would be

eligible to apply for how many projects we want to fund, all that stuff to identify and have them all do that and come back, you know, in the next month or so with some of that information. I think we need to get some of that fleshed out, knowing that it could still change depending on what the state does.

51:53

Speaker 4

But at least it gives us a point of, here is what the general group from our region wants to do, and if it conflicts with the state, we'll adjust our process to conform with it. But if it's in alignment, then we're ahead of the place, we're ahead of the, of everything. So that would be my recommendation at that committee. We can also look at this language and if any folks have additional changes they want to make to it, they can propose that as well.

52:22

Speaker 2

Derek, just an add on to.

52:25

Speaker 4

What was just said propose, yes. But I think what the chair would chair, Kevin's point of view was to try to make sure that we can.

52:42

Speaker 2

Move forward as well. So I'm saying that.

52:45

Speaker 4

I'm sure I'm asking so we're in agreement here. And if not, like, just let me know that the equity criteria as we have it right now, because there was some reconciliation, we're moving forward with the opportunity for people to, you know, add to it if they want to it or recommend some things, add to it.

53:06

Speaker 2

For us to discuss it later.

53:07

Speaker 4

But if we do that, it is a new vote. It's not a, it's not just, I have some suggestions.

53:13

Speaker 2

Add on to it. Like, that's not what we're talking about.

53:16

Speaker 4

Right. Because the point is we're trying to.

53:18

Speaker 1

Have this set so we can move on.

53:26

Speaker 2

I'm trying to look, okay. I don't see anyone else's hand. If someone has their hand up, feel free to speak. Okay? So in the interest of moving forward as a consensus, I agree that we did review the language, et cetera. But I think where we did run into a lot of conversation was around the distribution and the allocation of the funding because there were comments about base, there were comments about the industry sectors, like defining which industry sectors, etcetera, and those kind of suggestions, which I think might be a little bit problematic. And at the end of the day, because we're supposed to be moving this forward as a region, and it's going to be looked at as a region. And there are just the reality of is specific industries.

54:29

Speaker 2

And we talked about this a while back, operate in specific areas because of the resources that are available to them in those areas, and because we're working as a region, if we're going to start saying this spa is going to be allocated this amount of money, et cetera, we may actually miss out on a good project proposal just because it's not in the quote unquote spa area that could actually serve people in the spas. And so I remember us having this leading up to this conversation. So I think the funding allocation definitely needs to be addressed at a later time and that we work on that. We actually move forward. My suggestion is that we actually move forward with the criteria minus the funding allocation portion of it, so that we can move, start progressing into the next steps.

55:21

Speaker 4

Just for point of clarification, the funding allocation is not in this proposal.

55:25

Speaker 2

Yes, that's correct.

55:26

Speaker 5

Yes, madam chair, that is exactly what the subcommittee recommended. You are on point. The subcommittee that did meet absolutely. Recommending bifurcating any dialogue or discussion around funding allocations from the equity criteria so that the equity criteria could move forward and that entire broader dialogue could happen separately.

55:53

Speaker 2

Yes. Okay. All right. So next steps for this. If we've already voted and we voted on the language and the criteria, then are we in agreement that this is now closed until the conversation about the implementation and the conversation about funding allocation?

56:28

Speaker 5

This includes implementation criteria as well? It did include catalyst and implementation.

56:35

Speaker 2

But I thought were. We. There was a suggestion made to review the implementation criteria once we received the final information from the state.

56:48

Speaker 5

No, and not as far as equity is concerned. There will be, of course. That's why. That's what I'm saying. We. Equity is a first tier equity criteria. The committees came forward and they came forward with a recommendation for equity screening up front. This is the equity criteria that was flushed out, that across all projects, from catalyst to



implementation, the state may have additional of course requirements, and that will be any additional requirements would then be screened after equity. If it doesn't meet equity, it doesn't go forward. That was really the intent. I was brought in on the back end, so I wasn't in the formulation stage. But it's what the subcommittee agreed to and the command, the steering committee understood.

57:31

Speaker 2

Okay.

57:35

Speaker 4

Madam chair. So to clarify on that, when it came up at the working group on the language that did specify the group, that desire, was it to apply for the implementation projects however, that's not how I initially understood it when we had, we have proved that, discussed it, and approved it at the previous steering committee. So, and I know there's been some consternation from some of the folks on there, I would be fine with having it just apply to the catalyst programs for now with the idea that as that group flushes out all those specific details on the funding, that we need to also consider that this should, if that there's been a, there's a desire for this to, from a significant number of members, that this type of criteria apply also to the implementation programs.

58:20

Speaker 4

But I think in my mind, since that's not something that was specifically called out at the last meeting, I think, I don't think it would be unreasonable to say, let's have a specific discussion on that. So in case there are folks who have concerns that could raise perspectives that haven't been raised, that we can consider them and go through and do a formal approval, that it applies also to the implementation programs. That'd be my thought. But, so I would say for this, in my mind, this has been approved for catalyst programs, for sure. I'm open to saying, hey, since we didn't specifically specify that it was meant to be for implementation, that would be a comeback for a separate vote, I would still support applying this criteria for the implementation programs. But I recognize that wasn't clearly stated last time.

59:09

Speaker 5

Well, it was, and again, when it was brought to me by Ben and Nicole, it was specifically to address all project funding, whether. So again, I wasn't, I was on the back end, but that was the clear discussion that it was across the board. So I think that the members

of that working group need to clarify and if we need to reaffirm a vote here, I think we need to go forward to go back to this, back and forth on a later time.

59:35

Speaker 2

I don't.

59:35

Speaker 5

It would not be, I don't think it would be in our best interest. However, they're the ones that came up with it, so I would defer to them. I mean, both you and I, Louise, kind of came in on the back end.

59:45

Speaker 4

Yeah, but I'm basing as to what was discussed at the steering committee.

59:48

Speaker 5

Yeah, at the steering committee, they did. It was catalyst and implementation. It was very clear.

59:55

Speaker 2

Can I. Oh, I'm. Go ahead.

59:57

Speaker 1

I'm sorry.

01:00:00

Speaker 2

I was, I was going to say that if, since all of the projects are supposed to be moving forward using an equity lens, period, and we're setting what is the minimum standards that I don't see a problem with it also being applied to the, initially being applied to the implementation. But if we need to then adjust anything based on what the state does, that's going to be a mandate anyway because that's going to be increasing what the minimum is. Right.

01:00:31

Speaker 4

I see some of the members have made comments in the chat so that it was meant to apply across the board. I'm fine with that. Again, there's still, if people have concerns with the way the current language exists, there's still time to do future amendments. But this is the criteria as it stands now, so that if somebody has a change they'd like to make, great. We can look at it and bring it up for the steering committee.

01:00:52

Speaker 2

But I think Tony, and Tony, correct me if I'm wrong, Tony's suggestion was made in light of the, that there may be differences with what comes forward at them from the state, from implementation. Not a whole revamping, correct?

01:01:07

Speaker 4

No, I completely agree with Tony's concern, and I think that was one of the frustrations of why we were voting last week, essentially on, were voting to approve language we didn't have know what that was going to be. It was not the best approach, but that nevertheless, that's what we did. I would, again, I would say that's what, this is the language we have, but we still need a formal process for the other stuff. So again, let's set it to one of the committees. I'll defer to the leadership, decide what committee that goes to, and tell those who are interested in kind of flushing out that information on how that's going to be done, to get involved in that committee and bring something back at the next, or possibly the meeting after that.

01:01:49

Speaker 2

I would definitely concur with that. Okay. All right.

01:01:57

Speaker 3

Madam Chair.

01:01:58

Speaker 4

I'm sorry, madam Chair. Tony has her hand up. Again, I apologize.

01:02:00

Speaker 2

Oh, I'm sorry, Tony.

01:02:01

Speaker 6

Yeah, I would say, I hear what everybody's saying, and the vote was whatever the vote was. I just don't. We don't agree. American indian chamber doesn't agree. If you wish to go forward, please just don't describe it as unanimous. That's all.

01:02:16

Speaker 3

I.

01:02:20

Speaker 2

Well, I subscribe to consensus because a unanimous decision is a rare thing to get if we can move forward with consensus, recognizing differences of opinions.

01:02:36

Speaker 6

So is consensus a majority? Maybe. I'm not familiar with the word. I always thought consensus meant people were willing to agree. Maybe I'm not trying to be coy. I mean, I literally thought that's what it meant.

01:02:51

Speaker 2

Well, consensus from my framework means that everyone is not going to get exactly what they're asking for, but that we are moving, that we are able to agree on the process to move forward.

01:03:08

Speaker 6

You do not need to hold up the process, but we do not agree with the process. And I totally get that not everybody's going to be happy, but the process is troubling, which doesn't mean you shouldn't do exactly what you're doing. Just don't describe it as consensus. Maybe, I guess.

01:03:29

Speaker 2

Okay, are we okay to move forward? I'm doing, I'm looking at a time check and we are a little bit after two, and I know folks have other meetings to get today.

01:03:43

Speaker 1

And.

01:03:43

Speaker 2

We solve some other issues. Okay. All right, next slide, please. Oh, well, this was back to the equity Robert Cesanos accountability framework.

01:04:07

Speaker 5

Robert is at, is. Robert, did you make it? Robert is at the, yes, he's gotten back. He is at the biz Fed Institute's resilience forum that's going on right now. So the accountability. I'm operating on the phone, so please forgive me, I'm at a loss. My computer has just died on me. The accountability and equity framework was created out of the result of the presentation made to, excuse me, the HRTC on the Inland Empire's method for ensuring equitable participation and evaluation. Bye. Arm's length by the community, by community representatives. And so what, I think there were six original people that signed on to a letter and then additional four or five steering committee members said, yeah, I'm in. Count me in. We love it. But there was so much positive response from that presentation.

01:05:18

Speaker 5

The desire was to create a framework, meaning a actual subcommittee of the steering committee that would be the vetting agency or the entity to vet and score proposals based on the equity criteria that was approved by the steering committee, whatever that criteria to be defined so that becomes a distinctive body that does that evaluation or scoring and is responsible for ensuring that the project meets that criteria before moving forward. Step one.

01:05:55

Speaker 5

The other thing that came up that was very positive was understanding how, was a need to understand how these projects have a positive impact on disinvested communities so that we could have within the opportunity to have within the steering committee, subcommittee structure a mechanism to monitor impact on the disinvested communities so that we could see the impact of both the project funding, catalyst funding, implementation funding, and we don't get in a situation again, of having just

aggregated data that does not give us the ability to indicate or track how we're the decisions that we're making, the policies that we're implementing are having sustainable impact on the communities that we care about.

01:07:00

Speaker 5

So it was to create a framework and authorize a subcommittee for impact and accountability to deal with that on a later time, and then look for ability to be able to seek funds if necessary to do that accountability, which falls in line with the step four, section four of the strategic plan, part two that asked us to say, hey, how is this going to continue after the initial funding? And that was what section four of the strategic plan asked us to input. So a subcommittee that allows us to track the impact in disinvested specifically would leave no wiggle room that we would get data on those. We'd have a framework for gathering data on those disinvested communities that were recipients of serf related, excuse me, California jobs first related investments.

01:07:55

Speaker 5

So the first would be, the two asks were first to create, use that to create a subcommittee for purposes of screening the equity against the equity criteria that the sub steering committee has approved and then establishing us a framework for us to be able to gather dis aggregated data to know how the dollars are impacted disadvantaged as the project rolls on. That's the best I can give you because I am on a phone and I cannot even see a screen.

01:08:27

Speaker 2

Okay. So this was actually sent out a while ago and a lot of us have had the opportunity to review it. And one of the things that our conversation that has come up is that if we're already going to be using an equity lens as the initial step based on the, you know, this whole conversation that we had, one, I don't think we need a separate subcommittee. This should just be part of the evaluation committee, this equity process. And I do agree that there probably does need to be some level of evaluation, program evaluation, but I don't think that is going to be feasible at, I was trying to actually, like, picture where and how in the timeline outside of the evaluation of the applications where this would be able to happen.

01:09:24

Speaker 2

And again, I think that the evaluation portion of it is probably going to come after,

correct me if I'm wrong, Armand, but the evaluation portion is probably going to come after June. And so if we do need to set up a subcommittee based on folk who are able to, you know, be involved, but we're. Right now, I'm going to be honest, that's actually one of the things later in the agenda is the subcommittee enrollment has been very low, and so requesting all of these subcommittees is probably not going to move us forward. But yeah, the proposed subcommittee for the equity can just be incorporated back into the evaluation portion.

01:10:10

Speaker 5

And I don't, I'm not in agreement with that at all. And the reason we had, you know, we had six on the original and four additional. About almost ten of the steering committee members understand that is the evaluation committee is being restricted to individuals who have no interest in applying for funding. Okay? And that is not true when it comes to equity. Equity has the potential, like we as a steering committee, are, to stand on its own and have projects independently evaluated for equitable purposes, regardless and not impact any conflict of interest. It is very similar in the RFP process when you're dealing with procurement, when you're dealing in procurement and a proposal gets evaluated and scored, and then the budget for that proposal is often sealed in a separate envelope. This is our standard state contracting procurement process.

01:11:09

Speaker 5

And only after the projects have been evaluated and scored and the top performing projects meet their rise to the top are the scoring envelopes opened. So if, for example, in the state of California, we have low bid proposals are awarded based on price. But first they have, they get scored independently out with regard to that. And it's the same what the envision was for equity. These things get scored on equity basis first, just because that is our priority. And those have total free. Anyone can participate on the equity side. However, the other criteria that is developed for evaluation would not. That might cause a conflict of interest doesn't exist when it comes to equity because we're all in it for equity. That was the thinking.

01:11:58

Speaker 2

But there would still be bias. There is still the potential of bias based on the organizations that are applying.

01:12:05

Speaker 5

Not based upon the conflict of interest policies that are set forth by the, that are in our bylaws and that are set forth by the center for nonprofit Management and Public council that popped up conflict policy.

01:12:21

Speaker 2

I would argue that financially on the evaluation, including the equity as well as the project proposal, that there is still a basis of conflict, though, because the groups are identified the. You know, so I don't understand. Unless it's a blind application at the equity point, then there's always the potential for a conflict of interest, though.

01:12:49

Speaker 4

Adam chair, go ahead.

01:12:51

Speaker 2

I'm sorry.

01:12:53

Speaker 4

One, I agree, completely agree with you. I think this is, there is going to be a scoring component on the equity criteria. And so that would inherently ultimately decide what projects are going to move, help play a role in deciding what projects move forward. I think having that evaluation committee do that, part of that is completely in line with it. But I think this raises another issue that's been raised earlier by some of the steering committee members, which is, again, asking to vote on things that nobody has in front of them.

01:13:18

Speaker 4

Can we just agree as a consensus, as a general practice going forward that if something is gift, that the CJF team put together a meeting packet for these steering committees that goes out the day before, at least by noon, that says, hey, here's the pierce, what's going to the agenda for the meeting? If there's any items that are going to be presented, proposals that they be in writing so that people can review them ahead of time. Because, just because on this I'm like, I don't know, like, I don't know what committees exist already, which ones are still active, what they do. Like with all these committees, I hear what Sharon saying as to what they intend to do.



01:13:52

Speaker 4

But again, it puts us back into the same issue, which is I'm hearing it one way, I'm sure other people are hearing another way, and then when there's disagreement down the line while we're trying to recall what somebody said. So, whereas if it's in writing, it makes it a lot more easier to kind of clear, to understand and I think gives members time to kind of look at it. And so I would recommend, if we can just agree, that should be a process change going forward. I would like to have that, you know, that a packet go out on noon the day before the steering committee meetings with the agenda, what items going to be on there, and if there's something that's going to require action that, that be in writing.

01:14:28

Speaker 5

Well, Luis, are you saying that this never went out to the steering committee?

01:14:31

Speaker 2

This thing's never, what he's asking is basically for like a board packet to go out. And that's actually something we had discussed as the chairs that we start sending out the agenda and the information. We did say more than a day. We actually, 2 hours, we actually have a meeting that happens a week prior. And once we settle on the agenda, sending it out for information purposes and then also if there's something, and then doing a call for agenda items also. So we actually have discussed this, and because I was late, we didn't get to do it during the housekeeping session. So I do apologize again. And so that actually has some, is something that we have discussed so that people do have the information in front of them.

01:15:22

Speaker 2

But previously this had been sent out a couple of meetings ago and then was, I believe, sent out again for review prior. But it is helpful for things to all be in one place. So that we know that this is going to be an action item. Here's what the agenda is, et cetera. And so, yes, we have actually talked about that and we'll be implementing that process. Madam Chair, Sharon has her hand up.

01:15:48

Speaker 5

Oh, no, I'm sorry. Please forgive me. I got to figure out how to take it down on this little phone.

01:15:53

Speaker 1

Okay.

01:15:53

Speaker 2

On the bottom part of the screen, looking.

01:15:55

Speaker 5

Thank you.

01:15:56

Speaker 2

Are there any other hands? No, no hands?

01:16:00

Speaker 3

No.

01:16:01

Speaker 2

Okay. Okay. So, again, in the interest of time, it's 216. We definitely do not. I don't think we have consensus to move forward on voting on this item. I don't think. I may be assuming, but it does not sound like a lot of people have reviewed this document that went out for us to make a group wide decision at this point.

01:16:29

Speaker 5

Madam chair, can you call for a group of response from the members on who has and has not seen this document previously? It's a surprise to me from Luis that he had. That it had not been distributed or that he had not seen it.

01:16:45

Speaker 4

In other respect. I do get a ton of emails, so if you sent me something four weeks ago. Yeah, I have no idea what. That's in my inbox.

01:16:51

Speaker 2

I don't blame you. I've got to go back and review stuff here prior to meetings all the time. Can we do a thumbs up for those who have actually had the opportunity to review the information? I'm talking about the framework that was emailed out. Okay. Unless I'm missing something, I'm definitely not seeing a majority.

01:17:25

Speaker 5

Me neither. Why don't we put it in the packet and table it to the next meeting?

01:17:32

Speaker 2

Yes.

01:17:33

Speaker 5

Thank you. All right. And I will speak to Robert when he gets Kevin's event.

01:17:38

Speaker 2

Okay, next slide. Oh, okay. So here we are, subcommittee updates. So we put out a call for volunteers to step up to join these subcommittees, and we have received minimal response. And we believe a lot of it is due to the perceived, and the not just perceived, but actual conflict of interest for folks who are planning to apply to the funded programs. And so one of the proposals that has been made that we can make a decision on and that email vote will go out, is that due to the fact that obviously so many groups are at the table because they are hoping to apply and get funding to move pilot projects and proposals forward? That CCF, our fiscal sponsor, and LAEDC, using the other regions applications, compile an application, a draft application for us as a steering committee to review. We have a.

01:18:46

Speaker 2

We review that application, approve it, give feedback. Well, give feedback, approve it, so that we can move on to the next step in the interest of time and get this application out in a manner. Since we do not have folks stepped up to actually work on these committees at this time. Are there any objections to that?

01:19:10

Speaker 4

Madam chair? I do have a.

01:19:11

Speaker 2

Okay.

01:19:11

Speaker 4

So I'm not understanding exactly what it is that we're. The proposal, because while, you know, if we're, we need to know what the, how are we going to develop an application when we don't know?

01:19:23

Speaker 2

We aren't developing the application. They're going to use, the CCF and La EDC are going to use the other region's applications to formulate a solid draft for draft application for us to review as a steering committee.

01:19:36

Speaker 4

Okay.

01:19:37

Speaker 2

I would, I'm sorry if it sounds like I'm yelling. My hearing is a little off today.

01:19:43

Speaker 4

No, that's fine. I'm okay with that. But I think it's. We need to have that discussion internally from the steering committee. What, how are we going to fund these projects? How many projects we're going to send up? How are they going to be allocated out? Is there certain things, criteria? I think they could be done at the same time. I don't think one has to wait for the other, but I think we need to have that. So I would say as long as we put together, whether it's outreach, engagement, some committee or one of the subcommittees starts working on that to come, bring that back at the next committee meeting.

01:20:12

Speaker 2

Sure. If we can get folks to step up. Here's where we're running. And we do actually have numbers. We have the ten projects that are due the end of the year, and we have the other, correct me if I'm wrong. 15 to 20 projects that are due in June. So we do know how many we should be putting forth.

01:20:31

Speaker 4

Technically, yes and no, but there's still some confusion on that. But Sharon has her hand up, so I'll let her.

01:20:37

Speaker 1

Yeah, Sharon. And then she almost.

01:20:38

Speaker 2

Yeah. Yeah. I was going to say, I thought she almost. Okay, Sharon. Sharon. We can go to Chioma first if you're having some challenges there.

01:20:58

Speaker 5

Thank you.

01:21:00

Speaker 1

Okay. I just wanted to add that. Yeah. For the. So it would be, we could put together, and it would be the stewardship committee, as she said, CCF, the convener, LAEDC. We can create a draft application. It would be based on the information we have from the state. It would be based on. Yes. Other regions that have already put out theirs, you know, theirs vary a little bit, but yes, we could work to get that together because we do need to have an application ready. We would like to have one ready by thanksgiving, by, you know, the last meeting before Thanksgiving. We would like it to be open early next year as aligned in the, stated in the timeline that armand shared. But we would like to have this ready. We would create a draft and then you all could provide suggestions.

01:22:01

Speaker 1

We would not because of conflict of interest, and I know many of you will be applying for catalyst, so we wouldn't be able to show the exact application. But there are components in there that we could state what components are in there. But this is because we received a zero nominations from the subcommittee. We're trying to. If there are other. I see Tanua nodding her head. If there are other suggestions, we are glad to hear, but we would like to get working on this application as soon as possible.

01:22:38

Speaker 2

I was being nice. I said few, but Jim was right. It was zero. Zero.

01:22:45

Speaker 1

So we need to come up with a solution. We need our application. Application. The process to come together. We need this draft application ASAP.

01:22:56

Speaker 2

Sharon, you ready? You're on mute. Still mute.

01:23:04

Speaker 1

Sharon.

01:23:07

Speaker 5

Okay, can we hear me now?

01:23:08

Speaker 4

Yes.

01:23:10

Speaker 5

I would be strongly opposed to the stewardship members of the stewardship committee developing this application or evaluation criteria. I believe because we have the members of the, we have members of the stewardship committee that are already listed as partners on part of the proposed projects that were originally placed on the portal. So that presents, it's just a conflict. It's just a conflict of interest by our members of our steering committee. So for independence purposes, I would suggest that the

steering committee nominate to organizations to serve to assimilate applications from other regions that could compile those questions and then bring them back for review.

01:24:02

Speaker 5

And if we have dollars, and I don't care if it's only \$1,500 in our budget, that we subcontract through an existing contractor by adding a scope without having to go back out to bid to flush out that application and bring us a draft. Independent arm's length is what I would recommend, and I think that could certainly be done within the timeline, that is, that Shioma has recommended. I also have a question, because there is, as my, under my read was, there were ten to 15 proposals that were going to be due to the state by December, and then there was something up to 45 that would be due again by June. I had, I heard Shioma mention the ones that are due in 2025, but I heard no reference to the ones that are due this year. So can you please clarify that?

01:24:59

Speaker 5

Because that would affect our timeline. And from a contracting standpoint, it would be very simple to add a scope, an additional Po to an existing contract, and then identify a third party, independent person to assimilate those applications from various regions.

01:25:15

Speaker 2

Armand, can you go back to the timeline really fast?

01:25:20

Speaker 3

Yeah, sure. I can. I can review it really quickly. So, I mean, the narrative report that is due in January as of right now, with the date may change. It's. We asked the state for some clarification, and it's not like those projects have to have gotten funding, in a sense, like, it's just kind of projects that we're highlighting to add into this narrative report. I suppose maybe the way it'll work out is those do end up getting funding if we're highlighting them, but it's not like we need to have funding distributed for those projects when that report is due.

01:25:57

Speaker 2

Yeah. What is the term that choose road ready or. These are at the concept level. Most of them. And so these are the ones that were originally, we thought going to be due at the end of the year? Yes, it is relatively still the end of the year. It's the 15 January.

01:26:14

Speaker 5

Right. So we need to adjust our timeline to address. That is what I'm asking.

01:26:18

Speaker 2

Well, it has been. It's on the timeline. It was January 15 now.

01:26:23

Speaker 5

Okay. Yes, but I don't want to see a proposal. What I'm concerned about is seeing a proposal criteria developed by our stewardship committee, who are then making these recommendations. To go forward in that, I think we need arm's length, distance.

01:26:38

Speaker 2

Well, the evaluation committee is actually, the evaluation subcommittee are the ones who are doing the actual evaluations and scoring the rubrics.

01:26:49

Speaker 4

Adam chair, a number of folks have their hands up.

01:26:51

Speaker 2

I know. I'm trying to. Yeah, we have Tanua.

01:26:54

Speaker 1

Louise.

01:26:55

Speaker 2

Thank you.

01:26:58

Speaker 1

Go ahead, Tanua. Okay. Good afternoon, all. I actually really like the recommendation, madam chair. I can see the value. If we could go back to the slide that were on and



having the stewardship committee go ahead and put forth an application recommendation. Criteria recommendation. I would say that what I was. My concern is that there is no need for this to be done in any level of secrecy. Every single aspect of the application as it will be presented should be available ahead of time. This is just like with any other, a public process. You know what's going to be on the application. You know what the criteria is going to be. And you often, as community, have an opportunity to have input into what that.

01:27:54

Speaker 5

Criteria is going to be. So there should be no issue or closing off or not wanting to share.

01:28:01

Speaker 1

Some aspect of the application or the rubric with the public in advance.

01:28:06

Speaker 2

And then the other thing is that.

01:28:08

Speaker 1

I think what I would be, would want to also add as a bullet to the activity is a, some level of background rubric, understanding as to who.

01:28:22

Speaker 5

The evaluator should be and who, you.

01:28:25

Speaker 1

Know, should be included as a potential kinds of individuals and organizations that should.

01:28:31

Speaker 5

Be included as evaluators.

01:28:33

Speaker 1

So that's what I want to share. Thank you.

01:28:37

Speaker 2

Thank you. Was Tony next? I believe it was Tony. And then Luis. Correct me if I'm wrong, please.

01:28:47

Speaker 6

So I think that one of the reasons that we didn't respond to the joining the committees, we've been on a lot of committees, is that we felt uncomfortable with that for doing the letter that the, basically that group was then going to do, vote to approve all requests. So essentially, we're channeling off who's ever on. That group is now going to be the kingmaker of what are all applications that are coming through LA that go out to implementation. And we felt uncomfortable with that. And in b, we have something similar where that subgroup is going to write the application, which is not that big of a deal, but doing the rubric. Then they're going to vote and approve their own work, and then they're going to be the evaluators or choose who the evaluators are.

01:29:39

Speaker 6

And that made us uncomfortable that, in how we've discussed it here, a subgroup does certain things and then brings back to the steering committee for comments. I'm not. So I don't. So that was just, that's why we did not respond to a and b. We just felt it was a little.

01:29:59

Speaker 1

Bit.

01:30:01

Speaker 6

Not the way that we would like to see things organized.

01:30:05

Speaker 2

Tony, I will tell you are very altruistic because. Yeah, the feedback that came back was definitely that people were planning to apply, therefore did not want to sign up and exclude themselves from the process. So. Yeah, I appreciate that. And so how do we

want to Chioma, how do we want to address being able to decide whether or not the steering committee wants to move forward with the fiscal sponsor in LA, EDC conveners compiling, because it's really compiling the application there are out there to where we can cut, copy and paste, modify. So it's not like they're having to start from scratch.

01:31:00

Speaker 4

Madam chair, can I hand up.

01:31:01

Speaker 2

Oh, I'm sorry, Louise. Go ahead.

01:31:03

Speaker 4

Can I recommend that we just. There's a number of folks who seem to feel strongly about this. Can we do just a small working group that can hash out all the details and bring back a recommendation for just sharing at the next committee meeting as an item and then approval at the following meeting.

01:31:18

Speaker 2

That's like two months down. That's going to put us further out. And we actually posted this.

01:31:25

Speaker 4

That's a month down.

01:31:27

Speaker 2

Yeah, but by the, okay, so you're saying bring it back, then bring it back again. So that's actually, I want to give.

01:31:35

Speaker 4

Folks time to kind of look at it because I think we want to work out all this specific. What is it that, what, you know, everything we're saying is that where the applications are not going to start coming out to January. So what's the, what's the rush?

01:31:47

Speaker 2

The rush is that it's already.

01:31:49

Speaker 4

September but it's not happening till January.

01:31:52

Speaker 2

Okay. But I know in our, I know on the calendar that looks like a lot of time, but as, actually, as far as our meeting time goes, that's not a lot of time. And so, and if the final application, think about how long it took for the RF p, for the.

01:32:11

Speaker 4

Sector.

01:32:13

Speaker 2

I'm sorry because I've got messages popping up on my computer. I am sorry because I also have another meeting. Think about the amount of time, I mean, just based on the history of how we have been getting things done in the interest of time, we just, I mean, the reality is they're not writing the application. They're just piling the application based on other regions applications, doing some modifications, submitting it to us. But even then have a draft to approve.

01:32:45

Speaker 4

They won't have a, we're not going to have a draft to approve because they're going to be missing key information about the process and about the awards that people can go for. So we're not going to have a finalized application no matter what they do because how are they going to give us an application that doesn't have, that's.

01:33:03

Speaker 2

If, that's, if we move forward with your, with the plan that you proposed that we actually designate ahead of time how much money is going to be allocated for specific projects?

01:33:14

Speaker 4

No, I'm asking how much people, that should be something that people should know. How much can I ask for?

01:33:20

Speaker 5

Madam Chair, if I may bring to your attention, we no longer have quorum. So at this point, this matter needs to be tabled.

01:33:27

Speaker 2

Yeah, that's why I was asking how do, how la EDC, how do, how, what is the best proposed solution for us to move forward on this proposed application process.

01:33:42

Speaker 1

Andrea, can I chime in a little bit? Okay, so what I'm hearing and what we need an application along with the rubric. I'm hearing different things about evaluator recommendations. So we need to compile all these evaluator recommendations that are being said. And we need, so what partners need to know is there was written in the application that was submitted in November. In a catalyst application, there's a narrative that shows how the money can be distributed. So we can take a look at that. The state changed some things after that was written. We had those two to five strategic projects. So we need a funding strategy, an updated funding strategy. We can definitely create a, send out an email for you all to start a working group on that. So we have the funding strategy that needs to be done.

01:34:33

Speaker 1

We have evaluator recommendations that are coming in. We have an application and a rubric. And we have a rubric that was provided from the state that can be, each region can edit. So we have that. We have multiple applications. Well, I know two or three from other regions that have their catalysts already out because they're doing multiple rounds. Our strategy was to do one round. So these conversations need to be happening right now in a working group. So funding strategy subcommittee, you can send in or discuss the evaluator recommendations. I don't know if that would be a separate subcommittee. I wouldn't recommend that. But sending in these evaluator recommendations and the application and rubric, I'm hearing different things on how

you all want to move forward with that. Again, we can compile the rubric from the state, the applications from different students.

01:35:24

Speaker 1

Put that together. But there's different opinions and ideas on the conflict of interest with having steering committees, who will be members, who will be applying, seeing exactly what's in there. I don't know what the consensus will be on that. That needs to happen now. So if we send out for a funding strategy subcommittee, will members nominate themselves to be on that, to have a working group discussion on that immediately? I think that's number one. Yeah, I think that. Can we start there? I think that would be great if we can, because there's no conflict of interest there. How do you want to dish out this \$9 million? We have exploratory, we have last mile. We can do one. Our idea was to do one round.

01:36:15

Speaker 1

So if we send out those nomination emails, will you all commit to, at least many of you, enough of you, to join that subcommittee? We can do that later today and tomorrow, and then the application in rubric. I don't know how you. I don't want to say speak on that. How you all want to move forward with that if you're not okay with the stewardship committee putting that together. And, yes, I'll say you all only meet twice a week, and then once we have November giving come, that's the end of the year. So we know, summertime that attendance is reduced, and we know after the middle of November, attendance is reduced. So we really do not have that much time.

01:36:59

Speaker 2

Madam chair, Tanu.

01:37:00

Speaker 1

I had her hand up for quite a while. No, I put it down. I was hoping that we could move forward with the recommendation. I don't know if voting is in order now. We don't have a quorum, but I certainly would have supported the stewardship committee starting the process and any of the comments from my colleagues regarding concerns about that. We are all actively engaged and can definitely provide feedback accordingly. Once this information is compiled for us.

01:37:33

Speaker 2

Thank you. Okay.

01:37:38

Speaker 1

We are overtime.

01:37:40

Speaker 2

Yeah, we are. We are overtime. We are short people. Chilma, can I call you after my next meeting? Sure.

01:37:50

Speaker 1

And also, I mean, we usually do the vote for you all after the meeting. So even if there's not quorum on this call, is it okay for us to send you all the voting information, at least for a subcommittee, after the.

01:38:08

Speaker 2

Yes. Yeah.

01:38:10

Speaker 5

I definitely cannot call for action or a vote when you don't have a quorum, you just can't do that.

01:38:22

Speaker 2

Well, we're sending out information on the process and getting feedback, so that's not an action item, because we're not asking for a vote. We're asking for feedback.

01:38:48

Speaker 3

If I can chime in quickly, Andrea, I have some time before my next meeting, if you like to, with Chioma and any other jobs for team members, just jump on a quick call afterwards so we can just put together a.

01:39:03

Speaker 4

Best way to move forward.

01:39:05

Speaker 3

We are no stranger to sending out newsletters and different types of polls just to get feedback, and that does not, you know, that should not be conflicting with any of the bylaws.

01:39:22

Speaker 4

So I think the first things first.

01:39:24

Speaker 3

Is just gathering the best way to.

01:39:27

Speaker 4

Put together a little.

01:39:32

Speaker 3

Newsletter that we can send out, with an option to. For, feedback from the. From the steering committee.

01:39:38

Speaker 2

Okay. And I actually am late to another meeting, so it is. Oh, Lord. How about 430?

01:39:49

Speaker 4

We'll circle back.

01:39:49

Speaker 2

We go ahead, because I have to prepare for my meetings as well.

01:39:52



Speaker 3

Like, we always keep in touch.

01:39:55

Speaker 4

We'll find a way to connect.

01:39:57

Speaker 2

Okay. All right. If not, if not today. Then tomorrow morning for sure.

01:40:01

Speaker 3

Sounds good.

01:40:02

Speaker 2

Okay. All right. Thank you, everyone, for your time. Thank you. We're going to be sending out materials ahead of time and all of that moving forward, so we will be streamlining this whole process and hopefully be mindful in getting folks out of here on schedule moving forward. But thank you all. Thank you.

01:40:21

Speaker 3

Thank you all.