



## Steering Committee Meeting April 11th, 2024

[Presentation](#)

[Video Recording](#)

- Passcode: f!4Zv\*E+

[Meeting Summary Notes](#)

[Meeting Transcript](#)

### Meeting Summary

Jose from CCF shared budget insights and cost-saving possibilities, contemplating funding from CCF and reviewing financial strategies

Discussion on translation services was presented by Sejal ( Immigrants Affinity Hub Lead) for the immigrant community, especially concerning Spanish language needs, and requested exploring budget considerations for translation services, emphasizing inclusivity for various communities. Addressing challenges and ensuring language support beyond Spanish was pivotal. A poll will be conducted to reallocate \$25,000 in funding as identified by CCF to provide Affinity Hub Leads with funding to aid translation services.

The Table Partner Lead Funding Opportunity was announced and reviewed. Deliberations arose about the 8th category, around renaming 'funding strategies' to 'financial services' to clarify confusion regarding intent and scope of work. A motion was passed to retract the 8th Table Partner Category from the current RFP related to funding strategy for further examination.

Mutual respect was underscored after contentious discussions. Upcoming meetings will involve partner sessions, affinity hub lead training, and sub-regional table lead selections towards regional planning goals by August 30th. The chair emphasized teamwork's importance amid limited state allocations, aiming for cohesive collaboration despite differing opinions.

The aim is for cohesive work to address community needs effectively, with open communication channels for feedback as they strive towards unified initiatives. Discussions moved to potential

cost savings, seeking funding opportunities, and reviewing financial strategies for clarity for implementation and catalyst projects.

## **Meeting Transcript**

01:22

Happen. I mean, people sort of should be liked. Good afternoon, everyone. Thanks for being on time. Those of you that are, appreciate it. We're going to wait till we get a bit of a more. A bit more critical mass here in terms of participants, and then we'll get started. Thank you. It. Hello, everybody. Hello, Jose. Good afternoon, Jose. Always nice to see everybody. Yes, and it's good to be safe. There you go. Love the. Love the energy, Mister harbor. Love the energy. The feeling is mutual, sir. Thank you. All right, so we'll give it another minute. Okay. I'm going to go off camera for a minute. I'm going to be eating, multitasking. Sure. You're in good hands. Paul. Paul. Paul's got the keys to the. To the ferrari now, so he's got this. All right, Paul. Okay, so we're getting there. Let's.

07:08

Let's give it another few minutes, folks, and then we'll get started. Full agenda today, so don't want to wait too long. Hi, everyone. Hey, Maria. Good afternoon. Good afternoon. How are we today? We are good. The sun is out. That's right. But it's not too hot. Coming up on 103. Let's see if we can get to 20. Give it one more minute and then we'll get started, folks. So I see Matt Phillips here. Hey, Matt. Hey, Kevin. Hey, everybody. See Sharon and. Sharon and Libby Chioma, Ricardo, Cheyenne. You know, you sound like romper room right now. That's cool. That makes me younger. I couldn't see who said that, but I bet it was Libby. Yes, you're right, it was Libby. But I love rumper room, so it's okay. So far back in my memory, I'm not even going to say anything.

08:59

Tell Quentin I said hi. Will do. All right. So, folks, you know, it's about that time. It's 104, almost 105. So why don't we go ahead and get started, Ariel, if you want to. First of all, thank you all for joining today's meeting. Steering committee meeting, April 11. It is now 01:05 and so let's get started. Ariel, why don't you go ahead and give any housekeeping instructions. Can you hear me? We can hear you. Okay. Oops, sorry. Yeah, so. Hi. Welcome, everyone. Just please remember to submit your attendance because it's very important for us to make sure who is participating in the meeting. I don't know if Shioma can help me with the link for the attendance, please. We will be sharing it during the meeting as well as people keep coming in also. Right.

10:07

We have the same committee items tracker, where we post everything that's happened during the meetings in case you want to go check it out. And we also have the jamboard if you want to

provide any ideas that we should be discussing in the meetings, you can go into the jamboard and just remember to put your name and date and the subject that you want us to discuss. And also, we have the opportunities department with Andrea. If you see any areas of opportunities on the student committee in our meetings, just let us know and we'd be happy to bring it up to us and move forward. Thank you. Thank you, Ariel. So we're going to go ahead and get started on the agenda, folks. Again, thank you so much for joining our steering committee meeting for California jobs.

11:04

First, I'd ask that as we move through the agenda items, you will have an opportunity to speak and give comments. But I'd like to maintain decorum by having you raise your hands and you will be recognized. Okay, Stella, I'm assuming you're going to be on, so if there are any pressing items in the chat box, let me know. But I would prefer people to go ahead and come on camera or just speak as opposed to putting things in chat. That way we won't miss it real time. Okay. With that said, we're going to go ahead and move to the first agenda item beyond housekeeping, the fiscal report for CCF. Will that be Jose or someone else giving that report? That'll be myself and Paul. Okay, Maria and Paul. Great. Thank you so much, chair.

11:58

So just a quick update on my end with the contracts that we've been processing for the facilitator, which is with Adelante partners, strategic writer Julie Siesler and the graphic designer Jay Tofolio design. And all of those contracts have been executed. I believe LAADC has begun working with the strategic writer and the graphic designer as of last week. So I think their work is well underway. We just executed the contract with other Atlanta partners yesterday, and so they should be starting to work with side porch on their deliverables as of today or yesterday afternoon. So all of those things are kind of done on our end. I'll hand it over to Paul to talk about the sub regional table micrograntees updates. Thanks, Maria. Hey, can you guys hear me? Yep. Okay, great. I just want to make sure with the earbuds.

13:06

So, yeah, I'm very happy to announce that we have completed the review of the 90 cbos. We had to make some very minor cuts, but it looks like we had a lot of really good applicants come through the list ended up bumping up to almost 100. About seven of those didn't meet our criteria, so they were cut. So all in all, we had to make some very small adjustments. So we're just about all set there. The agreements are ready to go. I just kicked those over to LADC to see if they had any final thoughts. So I plan to share those with Paykeeper along with the list of approved applicants. Hopefully sometime this evening or even tomorrow. Just so this coming week, they can start getting those out and administrating them and prepping them for signature.

14:03

So we're anticipating, I mean, initially were anticipating Paykeeper to take about a week with processing these agreements, but due to the small nature of a lot of these orgs, I wouldn't be totally shocked if there was some delay in that. I'll be working really closely with Paykeeper to try and keep that to an absolute minimum. Of course, since, you know, we're already behind on our anticipated timeline, I don't want to have any more curveballs coming play somewhere in the next week or so. I'll also be setting up some time to discuss the usage policies and procedures for the stipends that we're issuing along with each of these agreements. If you remember, we'll be issuing payment on an 80 20 basis with an additional three k with that initial 80. So it's going to be an \$11,000 payment upfront.

14:51

8000 is per the standard contract language. \$3,000 of that will be a stipend. And again, due to the small size, a lot of these orgs, I want to have a discussion. So we're very clear on what that money is intended for. So I'll be drafting a set of policies and procedures, and then I'll be having some kind of conversation or presentation with them, just so they have a very clear understanding that money isn't part of the standard award and that's only to be used for these stipends. But otherwise, there's no big updates there. We should have some more news in the next coming weeks, just regarding how far along we are in that process. Thank you, Paul. We see. Louise, how's anyone that has a question, please raise your hand. Thank you. Louise, you're on. Thank you.

15:41

So have the organizations been notified of who's been selected yet or when was that happening? No, so we had to, because we, our original list was, I believe, like 95 or so, and we had seven of those removed. We just finished determining who would fulfill that full 90. So we had to get some additional names from LA EDC to fill out that full 90. I think we fell to like 87 or something like that. So we just made that determination as a yesterday evening who the 90 will be and when's the notification going out? I'll have to circle in with La ADC about that. We had discussed earlier this week that they were ready to release some kind of newsletter, but I'll have to have a conversation with them again, hopefully sometime, either the end of this week or early next week.

16:33

Okay, and then the last question. Are we still on in within the timeframe that the state has put for us to be able to meet their deadline? I'll let Jose or Maria speak to that a bit. I'll jump in. I think that's an LAEDC question programmatically. So I'll punt it to them, see if they can jump in and provide that status. Luis. Charles? Yeah. Thank you. Rather than answer that right now, we're going to have a slide talking about the timeline, and we can discuss that then, just so we can stay on track. Okay, thank you. Thanks, Charles. Are there any other questions? Okay, so we're going

to move to the next agenda item, the sub regional table partners. Benny, would you like to give us an update on this in terms of the sub regional table partners?

17:36

I think you just discussed it well. This is on the funding update, so. Yeah. What we could tell you is that last week, LAEDC staff as well as the two co chairs met to support the process of making sure that we were going to get coverage in a fair way across all 90 grantees, to make sure that all spa areas as well as thematic areas were represented. We got a lot of. A lot of folks who applied to a bunch of different spas, as well as thematic areas. And so we had to go through a process that we felt was going to stay in focus, in line with the idea of prioritizing organizations that are best situated to reach marginalized populations in areas where they've already been involved in. So we had to develop a criteria to do so.

18:35

But I felt like after 3 hours plus of going through that, we were able to select a good amount of organizations that fell within the criteria. We actually put together a process for that. I don't know if staff want to go through the four steps that we decided, but the bottom line was that we were giving out one grant to every organization that scored very high. We had to put them in an area where we felt they were best situated based on what they had applied for as well as making sure that all the other organizations that scored very high also had a chance to get access to a grant based on how they score. So we use score area to determine that. And I felt comfortable with the way went through it. Thanks, Benny. I think it's always helpful to hear from the subcommittee chair.

19:24

Well, co chairs did a great job with that. Appreciate it giving us your process. I think everybody feels comfortable with it. There are no questions from Benny. We'll move to the next agenda item. Andrea, did you want to have any words? Are you good? Oh, no, I'm good. Thank you, Benny. Thank you. All right, let's go to the next agenda item, please. So we're going to talk about our table partner leads. Scarlett, I believe this is your category. Yeah, I can go ahead and make the introduction. So, in regards to the table lead category, just as a recap, based on our last steering committee meeting, we did conduct a poll to basically gather direction from our steering committee as far as how they would like to see the direction of the table partner lead opportunity.

20:20

And so there was a majority in favor of option b, which was the open application. And during that meeting, Miss Slater did go ahead and speak to the different criteria and the division for this option. And so the bullet points here is information that was previously presented. But we did just want to show you the results as well as the work that has now been conducted to lead to the launching of the table lead application opportunity, which opened this past Monday. So we can

go ahead and go to the next slide, and if Andrea would like to speak a little bit about the opportunity, she can do so or I can do so. Yeah. Thank you, Scarlett. I think we had a. Andrea, go ahead and lean in from this point on. Thank you.

21:14

Okay, so, as most of you know, there's a \$50,000 grant that is available, and we. The application is open. It's due on Monday the 22nd at noon. And we're encouraging folks to reach out. And what we're looking for, remember, the criteria, is people who have expertise in these areas. Sorry for the background noise. And so these are the areas we're looking at. The clean, renewable energy, aerospace, transportation and logistics, bioscience, video production and distribution, construction, healthcare and funding strategies. Emphasis. Again, we are looking for organizations that already have boots on the ground in these areas. This is not like an opportunity to learn to do outreach in these areas or that, you know, you may have dabbled in this. Definitely looking for folk who are going to be able to inform us and give us feedback on these upcoming projects.

22:15

Thank you, Andrea, any questions for Andrea? Yeah, I have a question. What is, what do you mean by ongoing projects? Andrea? Well, remember, part of the process for us is that we're supposed to be looking at a ten year economic plan. So part of that is developing pilot projects, apprenticeship programs, et cetera. So we need folk who are already on the ground in these areas that may have already started with some of these ideas and able to give us feedback, able to let us know what's going to be feasible, what's not going to be feasible, what kind of trainings are going to be needed, all that stuff. Any other questions? Benny, do you have another question? Yeah, funding strategies, what is that as a table lead partner? Okay, so funding strategies is about government access to funding.

23:06

So once we get the ideas together, obviously we don't have all the resources we need. So we're going to need folk who have experience and resources to be able to get us plugged into these cycles, these funding cycles at the government level, probably like private foundations, things like that, to be able to actually give long term funding strategies and plans moving forward. So the idea here is that an organization, some entity will say, I'm going to submit an RFP because I want to get \$50,000 grant to work with this group to help them plug into future funding opportunities in the public and philanthropic space. Repeat your question? I'm sorry.

23:56

So what I'm saying under funding strategies, you're saying that some entities going to apply for this grant to then sit down with us or tell us what funding priorities are coming down from the public sector as well as philanthropic dollars. Yes, that is my understanding that they're going to

be the groups that are already plugged in and able to get us in these pipelines for funding to have those relationships developed. So let me ask you specifically around the workforce development and things like that. I may have something related to this, if you don't mind, Benny, real quick. Okay, thank you. Absolutely, go ahead. There was a deck that was sent out on the 22 march that listed the industries, but that one listed it as financial services, not funding strategies.

24:40

So I don't know if maybe there was a, it should, it's meant to be financial services. I don't know if there was a change since then. Yeah, because I asked that reason because we have a bunch of people providing us support on the funding strategies. I mean, LA and zinc is in the space and they are all about making sure that community organizations are resourcing their work through federal and state dollars so I don't see why we would give somebody \$50,000 to do what we already have a partner at the table, and so if Lisa's point is around financial services, and that's a serious typo. No, it's. No, it's actually not a typo. And if there is a member of our partnership, then they can apply to be a tape partner lead for this position.

25:26

Remember, that was the whole point it was about going with the open application process, was that if we have folk who are able and have these expert levels of expertise and resources, then that's who we're encouraging to apply. They're not excluded unless they're already a funded partner. Okay. Thank you, Charles. Yeah. Let me just make sure that Benny was your question answered. If not, then I can explain. I don't agree with giving somebody \$50,000 to a consultant, basically, to tell us where the funding is coming from. I mean, that's what our whole collective job is. That that, to me, makes no sense. But if that's how we want to spend \$50,000, then so be it. I guess I disagree with it. I want to just make that note. Okay, so in the final regional plan, part two, there needs to be a way.

26:25

All of the affinity hubs and the groups within are going to be talking about different pilot projects. Excuse me, but that will help the region. How do you connect those dots? Let me back it up. The funding that may come out of this process, let's say there's \$185 million. Let's say we get, I don't know, 40 million from that. Okay, the pilot projects that you guys may be proposing, more than likely, that's not going to be enough funding. So how do you take the philanthropic dollars that may. That may be out there? Other federal and state funding opportunities, new market tax credits, the governor's executive orders that need to be implemented. How do you fuse all of that together if you have an. Or if there's an organization out there that understands that? Okay. Benny Torres and his.

27:30

The constituents that he serve in the consortium that he's working with has this specific type of

pilot project, and it may cost, I don't know, \$15 million. But you may not be aware of other funding sources out there to. To pair with that. That's essentially what that bucket is supposed to be for, is to really kind of help the region connect the funding dots. Great. Before we move on, there was just an outstanding question, if I could. I just want to get some clarification myself. I know that we had talked about financial services or the financial, in previous discussions for the table partner leads. Did that go away now having a. We talked about reserving a spot for them. Is that no longer in play now or. I'm just wondering how that evolved. Going back to Luis's question, can anybody answer that?

28:39

Or financial services? If you're talking about banking, I. Well, no, well, anyway, I wasn't talking about banking. I was talking about having someone that would guide and direct us on financial strategy for the table partner lays, I thought. Yeah, that's what I meant. If it didn't come across that way. That's exactly what I was trying to convey. The message I was trying to convey is having a financial strategy to essentially connect the dots, all of the different funding sources, the dots with the pilot projects, with the governor's executive orders. So would there be any objection to maintaining consistency and maybe keeping that name the same as opposed to funding? But that's just my thought, I think. Tanoya, you were up next. Thank you, chair. And essentially you started moving in the direction that I was moving in the sense that.

29:42

Thank you for clarifying as well, Charles. It's helpful to hear what you were thinking. It's got to. Funding strategies convey something very different from financial strategies and solutions. We really need to be clear that we are looking for someone not just to identify sources, but to be able to take those sources and apply their actual experts, the uses to the kinds of projects and programs that are coming up. And so it's not just, you know, handing us, handing the region a list. It would be an entity that is actively involved in ensuring that the capital stack for those specific projects is viable and that there is a strategy to get that capital for those projects.

30:32

I find the term funding strategies to be very confusing and would prefer as well if went back to providing, as a compromise, at least financial strategies for this particular table. Partner lead. Thank you, Genoa. Luis, you're up next. Yeah, going back again, I would just recommend if you can take a look at the email that was sent out by surf on Friday, March 22 at 444. I had a PDF again, that one specifically said it has the exact same list of categories, all eight, except the last one is financial services rather than funding strategies.

31:17

I think this might be just a typo where somebody mixed up the just, you know, maybe inadvertently put it that way, because I think when I'm looking at these industries, it's kind of



meant to be like renewal energy that's growing industry, aerospace, logistics, biosciences, financial services, seems to be one of those industries. Funding strategies is something completely different. So I would say if you can just take a look at that and just verify that if that is not a typo, that. What was the thought process in changing that? I think it makes more sense to just keep it with financial services. Luis, I was thinking. I think we said the same thing. I'm just trying to understand how funding strategies as an industry, that's it for me. Or industry sector, but maybe if we looked at it. Well, anyway.

32:02

All right, and let's go with Armand. Yeah, so I just wanted to kind of provide some clarity. So the way that the financial industry is defined with the industry cluster research is as financial services. That's how the cluster is defined. We had this idea to have this eight seat reserved for an entity that would be carrying out the tasks that Charles was talking about. So were calling that as like the financial services. But then we kind of came to a conclusion as a team that funding strategies is a better name for that specific table. And that's how the name came about. And that's why there was a change with the. With the name sometimes. And when you say team, do you mean what team? The. Yes, it was just whoever was working on the application. So we just.

33:00

That was me, and I went from the original. From the original. And so after we talked, that's where we learned. That's where I learned that it needed. That I actually did not put in the right thing, so it was me. You don't have to beat around the bush. I was operating off of an old slide. Okay, so I'll have some comments after everyone finishes. Thank you, Armand. Tony, thank you. Yeah, I do think it's confusing because the others are industry sectors. So the question is, are the tables supposed to be industry sectors and that the person, the group or individual, is going to come back with? What are the needs, priorities, gaps, challenges for that industry sector? Very specifically. So we've been collecting general stuff, we have general data, but we're going to do deep dive on clean energy.

33:54

That's what I thought the purpose of the table was, the funding strategies. Sounds to me, as it's now confused with the catalyst funding, where we are going to have five industry experts. And one of the specific things they're supposed to do according to the catalyst funding is to be looking at gaps in funding opportunities. I think all these things are valid. I'm not judging that they are not good. I just feel like we are meshing things together without necessarily breaking them apart in a way. That everyone else knew about. Thank you, Tony. Jessica. Hi, everyone. Good afternoon. Yeah, this is really complicated. So what I heard from Tanu and then what I'm hearing from Tony.

34:44

So my understanding what this initiative is about is really looking at these different nonprofit who's providing industry training in the different various areas that we're trying to uplift their capacity or get them to a place that they can receive federal, state foundation dollars. So hopefully they can increase their operations to provide this training in our communities and sectors. I mean, am I all wrong with that? And, you know, identify gaps or how they can upscale currently what they're doing in providing these, you know, this service in the various communities. Yeah, I'm confused about the role as well, too. Okay. Thank you, Jessica. Andrea. Actually, what Jessica mentioned was what I was going to bring up is that they're also, remember, these table partner leads are also showing us how to get people into these areas.

35:55

And so this is identified as a opportunity for growth and for employment. And so part of the role is going. Is going to be doing just what Jessica said, helping us, I guess, inform folk as to the opportunities that are also available and how do they get plugged in. Okay. So that makes a little bit more sense because I think as we're trying to identify all these different industries that we know they're going to be high growth, better paying jobs for our community members. I think the gap is having those folks who do this training or apprenticeships or workforce development in our different areas. So if that's what we're trying to do, is really identify these different sectors. And of course, they're being led by nonprofit organizations. How do we uplift?

36:52

How do we help them develop, grow to be able to expand, to provide that training? Because I know as we, you know, here in Long beach with our colleagues, we're talking about these are all great to have all these, you know, high aspirations of these good jobs. But there's not a lot, enough training places for our community members to go to. To upscale. To upscale their. Their skills to be able to get these jobs. For example, we talked about safe Beach, Space beach. But where can somebody go to get training for Space beach or any of the new logistics programs that they're going to be having at the port? So it's like, who's going to be providing that training? Okay, so we're going to go to Linda. Okay. So I think.

37:48

I think because I'm on the fence with Benny, that we already have someone, a part of our collaborative, that does exactly what funding strategy does till they do that, they go out there and they find all the different pots, they put them together, and then they're supposed to bring them back to us to help us to identify who could qualify for what and then to help them qualify for. So we already have people at the table like that already. So why aren't we not already using them for that instead of a different category to say, we need to pay somebody \$50,000 to identify it when they're already here identifying pieces like that. Am I right, Benny, that. That they're already here, right? The people that we're talking about, from what I understand, they're not a funded partner, though.

38:51

This is an opportunity for them to apply, to become. But that's not what the table leads responsibility is. You are talking about industry clusters here that can provide jobs. Financial services is not identified as an industry cluster that can provide jobs that are green, that are going to mitigate the problems that exist in our communities, at least not in any discussion we've had. I'm recommending we eliminate that category altogether. And those \$50,000 to one of the original identified industry or targeted communities that were looking at, it makes no sense to be in this category as it's being described or as it's being defined on this page. Thank you. So. So, Benny, I think in past discussions we had. We had financial in there. But you know, what I don't want to do is beat this horse to death.

39:42

We have only a few more minutes because we have a lot more to go through. And if we get through the rest, we can circle back to this, but let's get every voice heard. Matt Horton, just a point of clarification, and we don't need answer now, but in terms of the research scope and in figuring out the gaps analysis in terms of jobs potential, infrastructure funding, infrastructure need, how much of that to you, Ariel? I need you to mute. Ariel, we can hear you. Ariel, we can hear you. Can one of the hosts just mute them, please? You have the ability to mute people. Ariel is the host. Thank you.

40:38

Just in sum, I think it'd be interesting to see in the existing research work that's being conducted how much of the capital stack funding and industry gaps analysis is being performed in that already. That may inform some of the funding and financial work that needs to be done on the back end. So does anyone on the CCF or LAeDC team want to take that question? Yeah, sure. I think that's a really good point. Currently, the research doesn't really connect. It very clearly with the various state strategies in the way that it's currently written. So, to Tanua's point, as an industry sector, we're going to need some municipal financing heft here for us to figure out, you know, where we can plug in holes in the capital stack, and that does become a capacity in terms of personnel issue. Okay.

41:59

All right, so any other comments to Matt's point? All right, we're going to move to Libby. Hi. Thanks. All I wanted to know, I was looking at that email that came out regarding the table leads, and just wondering, in that whole slide deck that defined the table lead partner discussion they had, where did we get the initial industry cluster list that defined the eight to begin with? Where did that come from? Because maybe that could solve the question of how we got financials into funding instead. Well, financials was part of the original discussion, but I believe Beacon economics did the primary industry cluster work. Correct me if I'm wrong, Kevin, if you want, I

can speak to this, please. Yeah, sure. So that was like, the way that financial services is defined in the industry cluster report.

42:59

We were using that same wording here, but this is not referring to financial services in the sense of the industry in the same way that the other seven are. That's kind of like what Charles was speaking to earlier and also like the points that Tanu and Matt were making about trying to connect the dots with the funding strategies. So then. So that's kind of a differently. It's defined in a different manner, and it's not really referring to an industry per se. Earlier, were using financial services, but we're no longer using that term. Can I ask you a question?

43:31

So then on that March 22 meeting, when the table partner leads discussion, that's when you guys chose to change it from financial services to funding opportunities, basically, is that when the change was made, it was always referring to the same scope of work, like what we expect to get out of that 8th table lead, it was always referring to a similar, you know, objective of what we want to get out of that, you know, connecting the dots with the funding. We just changed the name. So you're saying the purpose was the same. It's just the name that changed. Right. So that. That's. That's the. That's the 8th one. And then the other seven. The other seven are. They're either coming from the industry cluster report or they're coming from, you know, state strategies and whatnot.

44:18

So, because I don't want to take up too much time, but I could go over each seven, if you like. No, no, don't need to go over the seven. It's really good. This is what threw me off personally right in the primary industry cluster document, page ten, it has highlighted industries and it does say financial services and number four. So that's what threw me personally. But I think we all have our concerns and maybe that requires further discussion. But, folks, we are like 90% there, and I'm going to take these last three questions and then we're going to move on.

44:57

Kevin, since you were still on me, I understand that the applications are due on Monday, but the question still is, if the expectation is different than what it seems like the syrian committee members are believing it was supposed to be focused on, then how are we going to select someone for funding if that's not what our initial intent was for that 50,000 use of funds? Good question, Libby. And then we got two more people behind you. But good question. And by point that I just made, I don't have a recommendation, me personally. So, you know, maybe Andrea can lean in after the next two people get recognized. Zahira, thank you. I actually just had the same question that Libby asked, just in terms of process, based on if there is an issue, what happens with the RFP? Does the whole RFP get pulled back?

45:52

Is it just because it's hard to edit an RFP midstream, just from a process perspective? I don't know if the LAEDC team has thoughts on that. My other question, and one of the things I'm a little bit confused by, based on this conversation, is that it sounds like there's a lot of sort of back and forth related to this, funding strategies, financial strategies, whatever that piece may be. And the way that it's being described in some parts is as if it's something that would support everyone. So if this particular one would be. So if you're doing clean, renewable energy, you would also need to be connecting in with the financial strategies because they're going to give you a tailored list and direction related to funding that's available for you.

46:49

I guess part of what I'm wrestling with is that seems, is that a table that comes together for that, or is that just support to make sure that it's there and that it's happening? Maybe it's a table of people who are going to discuss all those different pieces, but that would be one question that I have. But I do think it seems as if we need more time with this. My recommendation would be that we do need to have something like that's public, related to the RFP and the changing of it, because otherwise we've had people respond to a solicitation that is inaccurate and we won't get the right people applying to that last category, or we're changing that last category and we have to release the solicitation in order to get people for that change.

47:39

But I do think there's like a process issue that we're going to have to wrestle with. Thank you. Okay. Thank you, Zahira. Appreciate your comments. Libby, your hand is still up. I'm going to move to Matt? Yeah. I think this is, again, the challenges in the semantics here, but to me, this is about capacity and technical assistance. So, I mean, if we have to reframe it in those sense, I mean, the pre development implications here around, like project readiness, all deal with funding and financial solutions challenges and having to deal with that from a project pipelining standpoint. So whether that fits in the industry sector or from some other type of bucket, it's definitely something that we need to think about in terms of how do we get competitive on our projects and the initiatives that we want to see get investable, developable.

48:41

All of that means we need some pre development heft here that the current apparatus doesn't support. Thank you, Matt. So, Andrea, you've heard a lot from the steering committee. Are there any comments that you'd like to make? Yeah, I'm definitely listening and hearing what's being said. I didn't make this up. And so we approved the process. So that's why we're moving forward with it. I feel like we've gone through this for the past three months, going over and over again, and we approved the process. And so it's time for us to move forward and start getting these

pieces together so that we can move on with actually getting to the job creation portion of it. So I guess your position is that we stay with the name funding strategies. Is that what you're saying?

49:42

I thought the clarification was to make it clear that we were not looking for people who were in the financial planning, like personal planning, that were trying to make that distinction so that when people were applying, they knew what it meant. I am not familiar with this area, so I don't know what the tag words would be to get an organization or a group to, but apparently this is how it is identified. And I think the fact that most of us are not familiar with this area is exactly why we need to be getting more people of color into this industry so that it isn't a foreign concept to us. That's my two cent. Okay, is Charles still on the call? I'm still here. Okay, so Charles, what are your thoughts about what you've heard today and next steps to resolve this?

50:33

So I looking towards the end, and the end is to have a strong regional report, part two that the state is going to look at and say, hey, LA has done their homework. They paid attention to the executive orders that the governors put in place. They've, you know, obviously collaborated together to come up with pilot projects. They found a way to collaborate different pilot projects together. They've looked into philanthropic dollars to pair with the monies that may come our way and as well as federal and state dollars. And now, how do we make sure. Did they do their homework in making sure that every stone was unturned? Sorry about that. So I think it would, LA would be doing an extreme disservice to itself if you did not call it whatever you want. Financial strategy, funding strategy.

51:33

I think financial services was listed one time and I do believe that was a typo. Regardless, the intent was always to be financial strategy. Just so La can look extremely strong that we've done our homework to really pair, not just take the monies that we may get from surf, but taking that money, pairing it with other financials, with other funding sources, and finding a way to make, turn that into an investment that is generating revenue for this region where 510 years, we're not going back out with our hands out asking for more money. If we can do that through a financial strategy hub, I think that you would be doing yourself a really good favor by keeping that there. That's just my take on it. Well, you know, what you just described is not new.

52:27

We have been talking about this for at least since the beginning of the year, but we just didn't call it funding strategies. And clearly having a financial strategy that transcends all these industries is important. There's a lot of truth from my experience that the state doesn't like to be alone. The feds don't like to be alone in a funding. The county doesn't like to be alone. And it, and when we show that they're all involved, they tend to give more money. And that's just been my experience,

of course, with good work, of course with a good plan and all the things that are supposed to be in place. What I want to do here is to be able to move forward and, you know, regardless if we, you know, I know. I'm looking at the primary industry cluster document. I remember the past slides.

53:27

I'm seeing this. I hear what you're saying, andrea, and I'm in agreement wholeheartedly. I hear what you're saying, Charles. But, you know, we need to choose this last table so that we can move on because we don't have any time, more time to waste. And I do know that Matt Phillips is on the call if he wants to lean in, because I do know that the state wanted to see more industry involvement. There was no mandate. Nobody can tell me. There's not any meetings I've been in that the state mandated that we do anything the state recommended based on their analysis that they need to see more of an industry presence.

54:08

But recommendation and mandate are two different things that me, in terms of common sense, if the state is going to recommend, it probably makes sense for us as a group to pay attention to that because that's going to allow us to score higher, get more funding, and have a different, you know, perception of us as a group and even perception when we turn in these proposals. So I'll leave it at that in terms of my confidence. Maria, you had your hand raised. We can't hear you if you're speaking. Can't hear you now, still can't hear you. So let me ask this in just, I've had my hand up and hasn't been recognized. Oh, you know what, I couldn't see it in the background, the other background. Sorry about that, Benny, go ahead. Oh, good.

55:15

Why can't, so hearing the need to be strategic, to be smart, to develop a good proposal to the state to show the state that we're on it. Why wouldn't we just pull out the 50,000 and this funding strategy category and develop another RFP that speaks specifically to what that position needs to do to support all the industries and the projects that we're talking about. Why would we do something half ass? Because I believe this is half ass decision making when we are not all clear as a steering committee of what we need to do. Are we limited in rfps that the state tell us or are we supposed to use the money to most effectively reach our goal?

55:54

I just don't understand why we want to just put the category in because we're rushing to get something into the state without meaningfully understanding that we're going to confuse a lot of people that are going to submit rfps that have nothing to do with these table league partners. It just makes no sense to me. And I'm wondering what is the reason why we can't do something that's a little bit more strategic. Thank you. Thank you, Benny. Can I add, the groups who are experts in this area do know the verbiage and so we wouldn't be confusing the people who are

actually doing this work. You mean that funding strategies for you is a very clear verbiage in terms of table lead partners. Sorry, Louise, listen, this is going to be the last comment. Yeah.

56:47

Because we got to get through the rest of this agenda. It's also important. Go ahead, Louise. So I would, again, I just, I think financial services does make sense. It's a clear, it's an industry that does not have a, it's not a carbon, not carbon polluting industry. California has always been known as financial hub for the nation. It's something that's always going to be continuing to grow a growing industry and it should be something that we're trying to foster more of in La county. So it seems to make sense to me that would be one of the industries we want to have as our clusters. So I would just urge like, yeah, we should be having financial services as a clear industry where, that we're trying to develop, grow even more than what we already have. Thank you.

57:26

Well, Louise, I, you know, even though, regardless of how everybody else feels, I, you know, your point is well taken. It does have zero carbon footprint, is something that is an industry that could provide thriving careers. It is an area that a lot of disenfranchised populations do not have a presence in. That's why redlining has been such a big issue in black and brown communities, but in particular black communities in several different ways. So in my opinion, it's been something that we've been talking about for the last three months. So to push back on that now doesn't make sense to me. That's just my opinion. You don't have to agree with me, but that's just my opinion.

58:22

So if we had named, if we had put financial strategies in there since we've been talking about it, then, you know, because that could also encompass other things. You know, financial strategy. A financial industry has a lot of sub value verticals. Now. That's just not one monolith, you know, one flavor. There are many different flavors to that industry and that can be used to leverage our efforts. That's my opinion. So, you know, I'm not sure what to go or how we go forward, but, you know, maybe as steering committee leadership, we need to talk about this, maybe hold, use that hold that we have for tomorrow. So I'll leave it at that. We got to move to the next agenda item, please, because we're almost at 02:00 is anybody going to look at the chat dialogue that's being had?

59:20

I mean, what's, what are we doing here, folks? Just trying to move the agenda along? Are we trying to make decisions? Well, no, benny, we can't. We're not yet. We're trying to move the agenda along because we only got so much time. This isn't the only thing that I have to discuss here. So let me run the meeting. But it's been clearly identified. But there's been clearly



identified, mister chair, that there are two different distinct situations here. So how do you suggest that we solve it here, how do we solve it here and now without sacrificing the entire agenda? Please tell me, sir, let's vote. How about we vote? We can vote. I have no problem with that.

59:59

So let me ask you this, for those that are on this call, do we, better yet Ariel or Armand for raising it, can we put together a straw poll here right now and do it at the end of the meeting? I think we can line it up. Please, let's get through the rest of this agenda, please, because we've got to get this other work done. Thank you, mister chair. Just really quickly, what are we, what are, the vote is whether we are to keep funding strategies as a category or should we look at another category and that other category should be financial serve financial strategy, or we can have a box for other and people can fill in with that. Other is, does anybody have a problem with that?

01:01:01

No, I do have one more, but I'd like to be able to put it in the chat so you can move on. I think I could, I might be able to help with some of the summary and if I can put it in the chat and then that way you can move on and we can come back to it when we have a moment to look at it. I'm willing to do that. Sure. I just put one version that you might want to consider or edit from. Okay. Okay. Can we get the, let's go to the convenings, please. I believe that, was that the next agenda item? Did we skip research updates or is this one first? Well, this was, this is next in the, on the agenda.

01:01:57

Okay, so Armand, you can go ahead and hit that one and then go in and then I'll make a few comments, say Jaal has to give her comments along this line and then we move to research. All right, so, yeah, I just want to give an update on the Affinity hub league convenings. We've had a number of our Affinity hub leads now complete their first convening. A couple of them have also done their second one and have their third and fourth planned. I'm not going to go over the outputs again because I know we're kind of short on time, but, you know, it's just basically the point of the meetings is to get information that we can include in the regional plan part two.

01:02:38

So there's a specific thing we wanted to discuss today, and it's based off of the immigrants convening, and I think Sejal wanted to speak to this. So, you know, Kevin or Sejal, please take it from here. Well, Sejal, are you on the line? Yeah. Hi, everyone. You have the floor. Thank you, mister chair. Thank you, Armand. So when I was going through my presentation for the affinity hub lead convenings, I realized as the lead for immigrants, that the presentation materials and frankly, all the documents should be translated into Spanish. And that for my particular group as

well, I would need to have interpretation for those meetings. And this is just how we lead our meetings at rising communities in general. And so there is, however, a cost to that.

01:03:40

And so I've been asking LAEDC if they have a means to support any translation and interpretation needs. And what, you know, we've been going back and forth. They've been very helpful, and we talked about Google translate and Zoom translate within a Zoom meeting. But those we, as an organization, don't always rely on those because we want to have translation that really speaks to the communities that we are identifying and targeting. And Google Translate and Zoom's not very good at all, really. And Google Translate just doesn't, you know, we always have, we'll translate the presentations in that just to be, just for, like, ease, but then we'll always have somebody go over it and make sure that it is, you know, has good verbiage.

01:04:41

So then I've been talking to many of you, and one of the steering committee members brought up that in San Diego, the convener there, actually had this in their budget. So they had five languages, including, I think, an african language, an Arabic, and Spanish, and asian languages that they had already identified in their region to translate or provide these services. And we did not, you know, we did not include that in our budget, so. But this is La, right? So we do need Spanish. At the very least, we do need Spanish, and this shouldn't just be an immigrant issue, table lead issue. It should be for everybody, right. All of the affinity hub leads because for inclusivity, we should be providing this level of service. And so I know Charles had provided a couple of, I was looking for those.

01:05:47

I'm not on my computer, but I know Charles had provided a couple of suggestions last night, and we thought we would go over that with you. I don't know, Charles, if you don't mind providing those suggestions. Thank you. Oh, sure. Seijo. So the suggestion, one of the suggestions is simply, this is talking with the steering committee members, reaching out, finding if there's anyone on the call who may know who may have a solution for Sagel for translation services. We, this California job service team, we looked into translation early, over a year ago, and it's really expensive to, you know, get a human or some of the top digital versions to do it. And it wasn't budgeted throughout the initial plan. So we just didn't have the money.

01:06:46

So as I was stating to Seijo, other regions that may have had it budgeted, they may not just have the same expenses that we have. So that's maybe why they could afford it. But if there's anyone on the call here who may know of a solution or know of someone who knows of a nice solution, that is one of the asks. The other thing is if CCF is still on the call to see if there are any extra, any savings up to this point that could be used for translation services. Of course, the steering

committee would have to approve that if there are any extra savings. But those are my two solutions. Start with the free stuff first. You know, if there's anyone on call who could help, she's all ears. We're all ears. If not, then CCF.

01:07:41

If there are any extra funds, let us know. And then the steering committee, if you want to approve the use of those funds for translation services. Yeah, and if I just stop. Thanks, Charles. If I can just. So we have those, we already have people that we utilize. The point is that we essentially are fronting the costs for this. I am very happy to provide the presentation that, the first presentation that I've already translated, not myself, but we had to get somebody to translate it. So. Happy to provide that. Happy to share the resource, for sure. We've already done it. But for all of the other ones, again, we've been fronting it so far, but it should be something that's shared. Okay, folks, so thank you for that. Sejal, thank you for your words. Charles Sahira has her hand up. Thank you.

01:08:45

And thank you for bringing this issue. I have two comments. My first one is that, yes, we should definitely have it for Spanish, but we are la, and if we're not using at least translating and interpreting in at least one of the asian languages, it's not clear to me how we're capturing, like, the full population. So I don't think this is just a spanish question. And we have so many languages. We have hundreds of languages that are spoken in this county, and we cannot just leave it at hopefully having just Spanish and English and even Spanish being difficult to do. So I do think this is something that we need to find a very robust solution around. My number two comment is that this is a money question.

01:09:31

So all of those tools that can be used, I think for those of us who hold meetings frequently where we need to focus on translation and interpretation, we have to use real people to be able to do it. Especially because we're talking about things that are live updates, we're talking about complicated concepts, and they have to be appropriate in the language in order for someone to fully understand it. I don't know if other people have another solution, but we have not found that you can just press a button and you're going to get some information in terms that's relevant for what you're trying to convey. So I really do think this is a money issue, and in terms of who can solve that, this may be. I know we're talking about limited budgets all around.

01:10:19

I'm going to guess that CCF or whoever we're thinking of doesn't have additional resources to be able to pull into this. Maybe they do, but this may be a place where maybe we go to the county and ask for some discretionary resources or a line item of resources in order to help pay for this. But I do think it's a critical issue, and I'm happy that we're talking about it. But I do very much

want to stress that I think we cannot limit the outside of english languages to just Spanish. That's just, it's not reflective of our county. Spanish is critical, but we do need to make sure that we have other languages covered as well. Thank you. Thank you, Zahira. Okay, so we gotta move on to our next agenda item before we go on, by the way, folks, for the affinity.

01:11:10

Oh, we have a hand up. Give me 1 second. Jessica, I didn't see your hand up there. I just put it up. Chairs. Okay, let me make one quick comment to this. To the affinity hub leads those of you that have not started your convenings, or if you have only done one, want to encourage you to go ahead and get those done as soon as possible. We are going to hold off those of you that have already completed two, we're going to hold off on the third ones until the table partner leads are announced. At the sub regional table partners are announced so that they can join in these meetings. Okay. All right, Jessica, I just want to also say that most cities and counties have adopted language access as a policy within their government organization, so they are providing resources.

01:12:05

I know when were doing some of the surf information tables here in Long beach, we had the city of Long beach provide translators, so they contributed to the language access needs that we had. So, you know, I don't know where Sigel is doing the meetings at, so I don't know if it's a city or the county, but possibilities maybe the city might support. And I do agree, you know, it needs to be in other languages than Spanish, so. Absolutely. Joel, you were next. And then we're going to go to Jose. Yeah, I had mentioned just Spanish at the very least, but so what I think the recommendation is that we do ask CCF to see if there is funding available for this for all of us. I believe that's where we're at.

01:13:08

Before we move on, I just want to make sure that is where we are at. I see, Jose. I'm sorry, shadow. You're absolutely right. Jose, maybe you can speak to that, please. Yeah. Thank you, mister chair. Hello, everybody. So just want to be clear. We can do analysis year today. And again, Charles, I know you asked, we can look at the programmatic and see if there's any identified savings. So far, everything has been pretty much accounted, meaning all of the major strategies, but there were some budgeted items for services that LAEDC has incurred. So we can do a year to date analysis and definitely share with you all any type of savings with the actual dollar amount of savings that we currently have, and any suggestions of moving any budget line items, see if there's any cost savings that we can draw from.

01:14:01

So we can definitely provide that analysis in short form to you guys. I don't know who you know, mister chair. Who do you want us to share that with, but we can definitely have something to you

by Monday, the latest. We would hope to have something maybe by tomorrow, but I don't want to over promise. But Monday, end of business day, I think it's fair for us to provide that analysis to you all. So, Jose, share with the steering committee. And this is a steering committee meeting, so just be transparent, share with everybody, and then we can go from there. All right, Maria, will do. Thank you. Maria. Can't hear you, Maria. Got to get that gremlin out of your computer. Yeah, sorry about that. Okay. All right. Maybe you could put it in chat. Okay.

01:14:59

I said May 15 is a deadline to submit budget amendments to the state. That's right. I'm sorry, mister chair, I forgot. If I can be recognized real quick, there is a May 15 deadline as to when we can do our last budget modification. Thank you, Maria. I totally forgot about that. So I just want to make sure that everybody's aware that whatever we decide, that we need that information, you know, with at least the week anticipation, so we can put that budget modification together. That's going to be our last shot to do any type of budget modification. So I want to use that as a deadline platform that you guys all know that if there's any other identified shifts that we need to know before the 15th in order to submit it, because that's the deadline. Okay. So is Stella still on the call?

01:15:46

I can't see if. Yes, I am. All right, so is there anything out of chat that I need to pay attention to? Yes, absolutely, there's. But it goes back to voting on the term funding strategy. Did you want to cover that now? Well, I think we have a strategy, and we'll cover that in a second. Let me do this. First of all, Ariel, I need you to go back a slide, please, because we. We got to get to research. Yeah. So we'll stay there for right now. I think Jose just spoke. Tony, you're up. Yeah. I think that turning in a plan to the state that says that it's centered on equity, and that it. That the development of the plan includes populations that are historically been excluded.

01:16:39

Excluded from the planning process, and that we have not provide interpretation that the state might find that the plan in and of itself would be lacking. So I just point that out. That seems to be very important to the state, and I think that they might be concerned in a report that basically excluded part of Los Angeles. Thank you, Tony. So you have CCF on the line. I'm assuming that point has been heard. All right, Armand, let's go over the research updates. Thank you. On the regional summary, civil is sent in their final draft. The industry cluster analysis will be getting the final draft by the end of the week, along with the accountability data tool. That's very neat. Actually, it has an interactive map that you can use to see employment data by Spa and also some other demographic indicators as well.

01:17:43

So that'll be available soon. There's no updates to the swot analysis, of course. We have, as Maria

and Paul noted, we have a strategic writer and graphic designer that I'm working with for the regional plan part one to finish the rewrite that is due in 19 days. And lastly, we will be just in anticipation for the regional plan part two that's going to be due in August. We're going to try to just begin getting some feedback from our partners and getting them more engaged. So we're going to have this survey open for the next three months starting tomorrow after the partners meeting, for partners to send in feedback and any pertinent information that they feel could be applicable to the regional plan part two. Thank you. Thank you, Armand.

01:18:30

Okay, so before we go into upcoming, I want to get back the circle back to this. We got to resolve this strategy or this funding strategies or financial strategies or however you want to title it. We got to solve this first. I think we need to get this business item cleared and moved past so that we can move to move on. So, Ariel, where are we with that in terms of being able to do a vote? We got 27 people still online. Yes, we do. Sharon, if you could just hold off, it'd be great. You could vote. Someone just left. Mr. Mistakes Parmesan. There's 26 now. Someone, I guess. Yeah.

01:19:20

Well, we still have enough folks, so can we go ahead and put something, have you been able to put something together to vote on this issue, whether it's going to be funding strategies, financial strategy or other, and they could write in whatever other is there funded charities, financial and other. So, chair, I put the note, I put my notes in the chat, as promised. Can you share with us? So there was, there were four items that it seemed to me that were part of the discussion. The first was what is the difference between financial services and financial strategies? That was, that's a discussion item. I define each of those terms in terms of motions. We could take any number of motions, and I believe it up to anyone else to share if they want to take up one of these motions or another one.

01:20:33

One motion could be to maintain the current category as funding strategies. Another motion could be to change the title of that, of funding strategies to financial strategy. And another motion could be to pull back the current RFP that has funding strategies, conduct additional analysis and clarification, and reissue the RFP. There you have it. Folks, it was just on the last. That last one was my item. It's just the only pullback. Financial strategies, not the entire RFP. Right. That's what I meant. Sorry, did you get that? Ariel? So, the question, fair chair, would be if there is appetite to vote on or to. If there's anyone who wants to make one of these motions. So why don't you make it? That'll make it real easy. I deferred to the body. I had done my role in summarizing for everyone.

01:21:39

If someone feels strongly about one of these areas, I would encourage them to make the motion.

I move this is Libby. I move for that last one that we pull back just the funding sources when we're funding. Whatever it's called. Just pull back the funding one and reissue. So the motion. They got a second. Any. Any discussion? Any further discussion? No hands hearing? None. Okay, so we could either vote in the chat, or we can vote. Ariel. Matt, is the motion just on the last. On just the pullback or the whole array, but it's pullback specifically for the portion of the RSP that are related to funding strategy. And what does that. What would that do? Can we hear from staff? What would that do with our timeline or any externalities on delay? Yeah, sure.

01:22:48

Well, I mean, yeah, we actually didn't get a chance to go over the timeline today, but it would definitely delay us. You know, it certainly would if we have to reissue. To what extent? Like, what are the implications on delay? You want to pull up the timeline just so it could be visually shown? Sure. We're done with this category, so, I mean, this agenda item, so we can dedicate the rest of the meeting to this. Well, so. Okay. As it currently is, we have the table partner convenings. Yeah. Okay, so the table partner convening is beginning in May sometime, and then going all the way until June. Of course, we want to get all the material to the strategic rider by July 1.

01:23:35

We still have some other things that, you know, the steering committee needs to address the geographic events and whatnot, so, I mean, Tony. Tony has said one week in the chat. I can't say, like, specifically how long it would push us back, but it's. We're at a point right now where we can't really. You know, we can't really delay. Part of the discussion, mister chair, is we're just trying to get clarity and get this right so it makes sense that's not. It's not a delays tactic, because we don't think it's important. When I consider that. But my discussion point to this would be that we're trying to get this thing right. You know? We got to get it right. We got to get it right. Benjamin, there's. You know. I hear you. So how can we. How can we do that and not delay?

01:24:24

That's my question. I would say. Let me ask you. Go ahead, Matt. I would say, just in terms of clarity, you know, from a municipal finance, like the concept of pre development is kind of clear. I would make a counter motion to leave the process as is. Well, we have a motion on the floor that's been sucking it. And what you're asking is for a. I guess a replacement motion, if you will. Well, if the replacement motion gets a second, then we would have a different problem. I call the question on the first motion mister chair. Yeah, we got a vote on the first motion on the table. So we have a first, we have a second, we have discussion. Those that are in support. We got 25 people sell your. You're going to have to count. Those are in support of this motion.

01:25:34

You need to put yes in the chat box before we go any further, Armad, I just had a question for

Tanua, or I think that was Tanua who put the comment of the options for the poll. The second option says change the category title only. So that's just changing the name. It's not referring to financial services industry, is that right? It was changing the name to financial strategy, but that's not what we're voting on. You just wanted to capture for posterity. So let me ask you this to know. Would you take a friendly amendment? Oh, no. No, I didn't. I did not make the most. It was Libby. It was Libby. I was the one who made the most. Can I have order, please? Thank you, Libby. That was my mistake. Yeah. We've already called for a vote. You did make that.

01:26:33

Make the motion. The motion was seconded. There's been discussion. There's still room for a friendly amendment to your motion. Not after we offer the vote, sir. People have already voted. Mister chair, people are already voting. You can't amend it now. All right. Okay. The people are voting. I get it. Yeah. Point well taken. Okay, so we got how many people? I got how many yeses do we have? Eleven, so far. Anyone but you have to. Minus la EDC staff. Correct. We should get the nose as well. That way you could do yes and no or abstain. Let me. Let me. Can I carry this out, Benny? Sure, sir. Thank you. I need to know the number of eligible voters? I have eleven. Yes. How many. How many are eligible to vote? Can you give me that, Ariel? I'm trying to get it. It's either.

01:27:42

If Jose is on the call, it's nine people. That's should be 20 without us. We also have CCF, so CCF can't vote. So we have three from CCF, five from LA. So then the motion passes. Yeah, the motion passes. Okay. All right. All right. So the next agenda item is upcoming. Upcoming meetings. Hold on 1 second. Matt, are you still. You still have a question? Charles, you have a question? Comment? Yes, I think maybe the same thing that Armon is going to ask. So are you guys. Did you guys just vote to remove financial strategy slash funding strategy, whatever you want to call it altogether? And so what are you replacing it with? It's a retraction of. Oh, chair, may I be recognized? Go ahead, go ahead.

01:29:02

The retraction and of the RFP that's currently active and out on the topic of funding strategy with the intent of bringing it back for further clarification and revision, and then a reissuance of the RFP, whatever that might be. We don't know until that clarification is done. And to answer Teomas question in the chat, that is what my motion was. She just stated it, so. Okay. Did you hear that, Charles? Yes. All right. Upcoming meetings, Ariel. Yes. Sorry. So, yeah, we have the next committee meeting on Thursday, April 25, and tomorrow we have our partners meeting at 09:00 a.m. This month we had a significant increase in partners, so hopefully they're all going to be joining tomorrow for their first partners meeting. And also we have the second affinity training tomorrow at 01:00 p.m. And I believe all the affinity helps are attending. And.



01:30:21

Yep, that's it for the upcoming meetings. Okay, next steps, chioma. Oh, okay. Hello. I was trying to write in the chat. Can someone write in the chat what the actual vote is for? I was trying to write it. It's in the chat, but I was trying to restate it. Okay. Okay. Sorry, mister. Oh, I have a question from the last slide. Ariel. You had stated that everybody is going to be in attendance, but I am not for the Friday, and I was hoping that. I asked if it was going to be recorded, so I couldn't listen to it. Is that going to be the case? It will be recorded, yeah. Yes, it'll be recorded Friday. Was there any other questions? I said that everyone was attending because I saw the invites. They all accepted.

01:31:33

Well, I mean, there was no declines sorry, there was no decline, so I assumed just everyone was attending. Okay, so for any affinity hub lead who has not RSVP, please RSVP or, you know, accept the invite or, you know, it will be recorded on Friday so we can send it to you afterwards if you will not be able to attend. Okay. Were there any more questions? I think I'm closing this out. Well, almost. No, I do. I have some comments I want to make. Okay, so I'll just say quickly, sure. Our next steps. We have the affinity hub lead tomorrow afternoon. We have the partners meeting tomorrow morning at 09:00 a.m. Please attend. We'll have the recording for that as well. If you are unable to attend. And then we have. I'm sorry I didn't update this one, but sub regional.

01:32:31

So the sub regional. We heard from Paul already. We'll be finalizing the list and hopefully get it out early next week on who are all the selected sub regional table leads. And then, yes, we still have. Catalyst is set to begin. We don't know anything differently than May 1 from the state schedule or attend your affinity hub lead convenings. So those who would like to attend, please attend. But we'll talk more and we'll have Andy from side porch at the affinity hub lead meeting to talk more about the affinity hub lead convenings. And yes, August 30 is still the date for the part two of the regional plan, and we are working towards that goal. So no other new updates from the state. That's all I have. Thank you, Chioma. I gotta make some comments here today.

01:33:26

I've been chairing meetings as a leader since my undergrad days in several different venues and spaces. And I gotta chalk this one up just in terms of the personal disrespect I felt as a chair today, it's unacceptable and I'm not gonna tolerate it. You know, there are a lot of suggestions on the table, people talking out of order, making suggestions before I had a chance to speak. There's a way to say things in a way that's supportive and in terms of bringing information forward, but to make statements as if the meeting is not being run correctly, I could take umbrage with that, making statements like, what are we doing? What do you think we're doing? We're trying to do something to build our community.

01:34:18

Having this internal discussion where it's disrespectful, you know, I think this is probably the worst meeting that I've chaired since I've been here. And if the group feels that I am not confident or that I am not fit to run this. You always have the option of calling my leadership into question and I'll gladly step down. So I want to put that out there. I'm doing my best to keep order. I'm doing my best to move these agendas forward. I'm doing my best to make sure that everyone's voice is heard, and I think I've done that consistently. But to tell you that I'm happy about today, I'm not. Now, I am happy that you had a chance to hear what was said and what was presented. There were some things on the presentations that I wasn't prepared for.

01:35:20

And also in terms of getting the vote done and how were going to do it and making sure we had the right numbers, we can do that all collectively as a team. We're all trying to work together, but to have a condescending attitude and tone, that's not acceptable. And if I'm going to chair it, I'm not going to tolerate that going forward. Want to be clear, I respect all of you and I demand respect for myself. If anybody has a problem with that, you can talk to me directly. So I thank you. Those of you that have that leaned in and that contributed to this discussion, I'm not happy about having to delay this forward because you guys didn't go to Sacramento and heard what they had to say about us. And I'm not happy with that visit either and what they had to say.

01:36:14

I'm not happy about the amount of money that they allocated to us as a county and 10 million people versus some of these counties of 300,000. That is ridiculous. That they would give all of us \$5 million if they did it correctly. We'd have more resources to do some of the things and get. And even in the timeline that's involved here, we have a lot more variables to deal with than other counties do. So, you know, it's like I can't fight in front of me, behind me and each side, either we gonna pull together as a seamless team or they're gonna look at us as being unable to function, that we are dysfunctional. And I hope that's not the case. So that's all I have to say.

01:37:10

I hope you all have a great rest of your day and week and let's go ahead and adjourn this meeting. Thank you, mister chair. Thanks everyone. Thank you everyone. Thanks, Kevin. Thank you Mister chair. Really appreciate it. Thank you.