



**Steering Committee Monthly Meeting
November 14, 2024**

[Presentation](#)

[Recording](#)

- Passcode: VZ#0W4Q9

[Summary Notes](#)

[Meeting Transcript](#)

Summary Notes

During the Steering Committee Meeting for the California Jobs First program held on November 14, 2024, key updates and action items were discussed. The meeting commenced with housekeeping items, including the attendance form and available resources, followed by an update on the selection of HR&A Advisors as the new sector investment coordinators, with contracts set to be executed by November 22. There was an emphasis on the Steering Committee role in reviewing and providing feedback on the Sector Investment Coordinator Work Plan.

The timeline for the Catalyst RFP release was outlined, emphasizing the importance of conflict of interest forms and steering committee review of the draft. It was announced that a revised deliverable, Activation Work Plan, was due on January 31st. The purpose of the Activation Plan is to operationalize the goals of the Regional Plans Part 2 and serve as a project management tool. Moreover, a virtual vote was announced to select a target sector for the draft Activation Plan.

The committee also deliberated on funding distribution proposals, focusing on equity-based project selection rather than equal distribution across regions. The role of the equity criteria for project proposals was discussed further, with a strong emphasis



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

on incorporating these into the evaluation process. Concerns regarding the Committee's involvement in RFP development were discussed, conflict of interests guidelines and transparency were emphasized.

The meeting concluded with plans for upcoming meetings and a call for members to submit project ideas and feedback, alongside logistical action items to be completed by specific deadlines.

Meeting Opening and Housekeeping (01:01 - 15:42)

- Welcome to California Jobs First program steering committee meeting
- Attendance form link to be shared in chat throughout meeting
- Designated alternate form available for steering committee members
- Agenda item request form available for future meetings
- Resource tracker with important links to be shared
- Comments/concerns can be emailed to chair Andrea Slater
- Phase one invoice being finalized, over 95% of budget spent
- Contract for sector investment coordinators to be executed next week

Sector Investment Coordinators Update (15:42 - 24:17)

- HRNA Advisors selected as sector investment coordinators
- Contract to be executed by November 22
- Coordinator kickoff meeting scheduled for November 25
- Updated work plan to be provided in early December
- Concerns raised about steering committee's role in reviewing work plan
- Clarification provided on contract process and timeline

Catalyst RFP Release Timeline (24:18 - 33:49)

- Conflict of interest form due by end of day
- RFP draft ready for steering committee review by November 22



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

- Steering committee to finalize RFP solicitation by December 12
- Outreach plan development in early January
- Application release planned for mid-January
- Activation plan submission to state due as deliverable

Funding Distribution Proposal (33:50 - 46:32)

- 9 million potential funding with max 400,000 per proposal
- 45% towards exploratory projects, 55% towards last mile projects
- Geographic consideration discussed, moving away from equal SPA distribution
- Focus on equity and underrepresented groups in project selection

Geographic Distribution and Equity Criteria (46:32 - 58:00)

- Discussion on using Justice 40 qualification map for distribution
- Debate on using original SIRF criteria vs. Justice 40
- Clarification on map data sources and criteria used
- Importance of aligning with state and federal funding opportunities

Equity Criteria and Project Proposals (58:01 - 1:05:40)

- Review of equity criteria for project proposals
- Emphasis on pass/fail first tier criteria for all proposals
- Discussion on incorporating equity criteria into evaluation process
- Reminder to submit project ideas to pipeline for collaboration

RFP Development and Conflict of Interest (1:05:40 - 1:17:04)

- Concerns raised about steering committee involvement in RFP development
- Discussion on conflict of interest for those applying for funding
- Clarification on process for reviewing and approving RFP
- Request for transparency in RFP development process

Meeting Scheduling and Voting Procedures (1:17:04 - 1:28:13)

- Proposal for additional special purpose meetings
- Debate on need for extra meetings vs. speeding up current processes
- Discussion on voting procedures and quorum requirements
- Emphasis on submitting proposals and feedback in writing



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Next Steps and Closing Remarks (1:28:13 - 2:10:37)

- Review of project ideas portal and resource tracker
- Next steering committee meeting scheduled for December 12
- Next monthly partners meeting on December 13
- Discussion on submitting alternative frameworks for fund distribution
- Meeting adjourned with Thanksgiving wishes

Meeting Transcript

01:01

Speaker 1

Hey, Armand, can you see the shared screen?

02:07

Speaker 2

Hi, everyone. We're going to give it a few minutes for folks to get logged in.

05:31

Speaker 3

It.

06:27

Speaker 2

Okay, it's 103. Let's give it a couple more minutes and two more minutes and then we're going to get started. Everyone, everyone presenting. Present. Hi, Andrea.

07:17

Speaker 3

Hi, everyone. I'm in my car right now.

07:19



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 2

Okay, great. I was just trying to scroll down the list to see who all is. Thank you. We're at 27, so I think that's critical mass. All right, one more minute. Let's get started. I'm sure everyone is excited to get the ball rolling. Alrighty, let's roll. Welcome everyone. Steering committee meeting. We are rolling down, hitting the end of the year. So we have a few. Just a couple more meetings to go before we are into 2025 and a lot of business to handle. A lot of decisions that need to be made in order for us to get into the next steps and next stages. So let's get started.

08:53

Speaker 1

Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Juan Solorio. I am the assistant program manager with the California Jobs first program. Just some housekeeping items we will be putting in the chat. The attendance link, the attendance form for folks to make sure that you guys can mark that you were here. So please keep an eye out for that. We'll be putting that link, that form in the chat throughout the meeting. So you'll definitely have more than one try at it. If you don't see it in the next few minutes, we'll keep putting that link, that form in the chat. Please, please. That is the way that we keep track of attendance of the steering committee members. So please fill out that form. We don't do any emails or we don't do chat confirmations.

09:48

Speaker 1

In order to have your attendance marked for this meeting, please fill out the attendance form that we will be putting in the chat throughout today's meeting. Also, if steering committee members have not designated an alternate for the meeting, you do have that ability. You do have that opportunity. We'll also be putting in the chat a designated alternate form. We do ask that this form be completed prior to the next meeting. So if you do want to have an alternate on file for the next meeting, we do ask that form be completed prior to our next meeting in December. Next item, if folks have an agenda item that they would like to be placed on the agenda for discussion, we also have a form for that and we'll go ahead and also include that in the chat.



10:50

Speaker 1

So if any steering committee member has any items that they wish to be discussed or placed on the agenda. There is a form for that. Again, we do prefer we do that is the way to do that. We don't accept any chat agenda, request items or emails. We do have a form to request an item be agendaized at other at next upcoming steering committee meetings. So again we will put that in the chat and we do ask folks to use that form in order to request an item, the next item, our resource tracker for student community members. That is something we'll also place in the chat.

11:33

Speaker 1

This has several links from our Catalyst contract to the attendance forms, the designated alternate forms, anything Catalyst California Jobs first that folks want to just, you know, stay up to date with any information that they might be looking for. It will normally be on the resource tracker. We'll go ahead and put that in the chat as well. We definitely encourage folks to bookmark this reference sheet so that if folks have any again information that they're looking for, most of that will be on the resource tracker. Again, attendance forms, designated alternate forms, the contracts, our regional report, part one, Part two, our project ideas portal, our equity criteria, all those things are in that resource tracker. And again we'll go ahead and put that in the chat for folks and we recommend that you bookmark it. So ease of access for our steering committee members.

12:43

Speaker 1

And then lastly, if there's any concerns, comments, complaints that steering committee members would like to submit, we recommend that you email our opportunities department that is chair that is received by our chair, Andrea Slater. Slater. And that would go to her email which will again we'll put in the chat. But any comments, any concerns, anything that you want to share about the operation of the steering



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

committee, please email our chair, Andrea Slater and we'll go ahead and include her email in the chat. And with that I will turn it over to Estefania with ccf.

13:33

Speaker 4

Thanks so much, Juan. Hi everybody. My name is Estefania, program officer with California Community Foundation. I'm going to pass it to Paul first to give fiscal updates from the planning phase.

13:46

Speaker 1

Thanks Estefania. Yeah, just a few quick updates from me. We're wrapping up the final invoice for phase one. Very exciting. That's going to be submitted this week.

13:57

Speaker 5

I'm happy to let the team here.

14:00

Speaker 1

Know that we spent over 95% of the budget. Those remaining funds were just from returns from some of the programs that closed out in the end phase.

14:09

Speaker 5

So we did a great job with that.

14:11

Speaker 1

This invoice, once this is submitted and cleared That'll tie up the work for phase one.



14:18

Speaker 5

So we'll officially be closed out with any of the phase one processes and we'll be fully entrenched in the catalyst thereafter.

14:26

Speaker 1

So with that being said, moving on to catalyst items, we just wrapped up putting together the contract and getting a final draft together for the sector investment coordinators. So we'll be executing that contract come early next week. I believe we'll be tying in with them and get that work kicked off. I think it's Stephanie and LADC will go into some of the details on that. So I'll kick it back. Oh, Louis, I see you have your hand up.

14:57

Speaker 2

Yes.

14:58

Speaker 1

Can you go back one slide please? I was coming for the money. Going back to how much? The total amount that we're returning to the state unused. I believe it's just under 200k. And there's no way we could use that for other things?

15:18

Speaker 3

No.

15:18



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 5

Since we're in the closeout phase, it's.

15:21

Speaker 1

A wrap on that. I mean this was funding that just.

15:23

Speaker 5

Came back in the last couple days from like I said, the sub regional tables, some of the table leads, items.

15:30

Speaker 1

Like that, whether they never executed the agreements or they just had excess funds. So the date set out anyways.

15:37

Speaker 5

Was going to be after our contracting.

15:39

Speaker 1

Process was closed out. So these were funds that weren't really going to have any admissible use regardless.

15:47

Speaker 3

Okay.



15:48

Speaker 1

And then the final question was on the sector coordinators. Maybe I, I, maybe I'm forgetting. When did we approve the contracts for that one? Andre, were you saying something? Yeah, I was trying when the protection coordinators. When did the steering committee approve the contract?

16:09

Speaker 5

Yes, I heard you. I think Andrea was saying something on mute.

16:13

Speaker 2

Yeah, my bad. There was a email that was sent out about the vote and the, and with the information.

16:20

Speaker 1

Yes, thank you, Andrea. What did that go out to the full steering committee?

16:29

Speaker 2

Yes.

16:30

Speaker 1

Yes. Yeah. When did it go out? I'm sorry, maybe I missed it in my inbox. Yeah, I don't have the exact day, Ellie.



16:38

Speaker 2

I know. I was thinking like off the top.

16:40

Speaker 1

Of your head, Charles, or maybe Scarlett.

16:44

Speaker 2

Just because I think we ended up.

16:46

Speaker 1

I know while we're getting five sector coordinators we didn't select going only with one company. I a little concerned about that just because it kind of, it doesn't allow us to compare one. You know, I was hoping we'd have five different groups doing it so that way we compare, you know, who's doing better job. I'm worried that it's going to put us in the same things, but if it's already done. It's already done.

17:08

Speaker 5

Sure.

17:09

Speaker 1

So, Luz, we're going to provide some additional updates on the processes where we're at now with the sector investment coordinators and then LADC is going to tie in a little bit more. So I think maybe we'll go through those details first and then circle back here



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

just so we can have a clear picture of where we're at. That's great, thank you. Okay, thanks, Luis.

17:28

Speaker 2

And if I can emphasize it's one lead, however, there are multiple sector investment coordinators that will be working.

17:38

Speaker 4

Thanks everyone. So a little bit more information about the sector investment coordinator that was chosen for Scarlet's comment here. Two emails were sent with the bid package and the vote reminder. So happy to defer to LADC on that process. So HRNA Advisors were selected as the sector investment coordinators. They have an extensive team that's already done work at the local level. They are an industry leading economic development consulting firm with a lot of experience and wanted to highlight for the steering committee a couple of key dates for their contract. We expect the contract to be executed, meaning all parties signed by 22 November. So coming up next week we also have a coordinator kickoff meeting with HRNA on 25 November with provide insights on their work plan, their outreach plan and just discussing timelines and deliverables.

18:42

Speaker 4

And then in early December, HRNA will provide us with an updated work plan. So it's updated from their proposal that they submitted based on new information regarding timelines and things like that. So moving on to the next slide, speaking about the Catalyst RFP release, Tony, did you have a question about the.

19:08

Speaker 6

Yes. Yeah, I wanted to be sure that the steering committee had a role in looking at the



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

work plan. Part of the work plan is an HR related activity that I don't think is any of our business. But the work plan also will talk about things like how will we know what they're doing, how will they be engaging the steering committee relative to goals, the timelines that get set, once you have them sign the contracts, you know, it would be difficult for it to say, well, no, those dates don't work. So I'm not suggesting we need to review your contract, et cetera, but I believe that a work plan has policy components and since we as a organization don't have annual work plan, we can't say, oh, just make sure it conforms to that. So I'm just wondering how we're going to navigate that.

20:06

Speaker 4

Ladc, did you want to jump in.

20:10

Speaker 1

Tony? Are you referring to the actual pre development activities and when they're going to actually going to be taking place? Is that what you're referring to?

20:19

Speaker 6

Yeah, no, I'm not talking about a timeline. I mean, I'm assuming that we'll know that. It's just that we now have up to five people to do a huge array of different activities and so their work plan of how they will be accomplishing that. So you're going with one contract, right? So somewhere there's a decision that says, well, you know, how often do they meet with you? If we know that they meet with LA EDC staff to get directions, I don't know. On the first Monday of the month, if the steering committee wanted to provide questions or direction, we would need to be sure that's aligning with how you're going to do that.

21:00

Speaker 6

If the work plan says that they're going to spend 30% of their activities on outreach, the



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

steering committee might want to say, well, how will you determine what those outreach activities are and how do we provide guidance in a timely way so that aligns with yours and the fiscal agent's direct engagement with the staff rather than us coming back around the other side and going, you know, well, next Tuesday we need you to do X, Y and Z. And so the workplace plan is a way for us to understand kind of this overall flow so that we can figure out how do we provide what's appropriate guidance, but also at the right times, at right intervals.

21:41

Speaker 1

I think I understand you. And that really kind of seems to go back to the timeline and everything that needs to go into that RFP design. We're working on that right now. The jobs first team, HRNA, which they're supposed to be onboarded by the 22nd, have agreed to kind of jump in a little bit earlier to help design that as well. By the time it's done, the steering committee will have a chance to review that RFP in order to really maybe address some of those issues that you were just talking about.

22:16

Speaker 4

And I can also add that their work plan is also in the bid package. So they submitted a proposal. Of course they're going to be updating that. And so I think that's what you might be asking, Tony, is like the updated information, which yes, we can definitely provide. But you have an insight on what they were already planning to do based on their proposal.

22:41

Speaker 6

So the work plan said, because I was on the committee that helped draft it was to help implement the regional plan. That's a very broad thing. Obviously there are only five people. They only have so much time. So decisions have to be made about relative to implementing the regional plan and advancing catalyst projects. Catalyst projects being part of implementing the plan. You're making calls about the use of staff. So how would



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

you make those calls if the steering committee never provides guidance about what's most important, whether by quarter or whatever. You know, you can't tell. People do things all the time, all the day, every day.

23:24

Speaker 7

That, that.

23:25

Speaker 6

That's what I'm talking about.

23:28

Speaker 1

I'm not still sure I really understand, but what I can say is the work streams that HRNA outlined in their proposal in their application is determined by the pre development activities that need to be done from the state. Maybe we simply just made sure that there was a timeline.

23:50

Speaker 3

It sounds.

23:51

Speaker 2

Charles.

23:51

Speaker 1

Sorry, let me jump in real quick. Tony. It sounds like anything that's. You want to make



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

sure that there is some ability for the steering committee to lean in. Am I hearing that accurately?

24:04

Speaker 6

Yes. And it seems that understanding the work plan would be. We want to be, we want to provide appropriate guidance, not late guidance. That's only disruptive.

24:16

Speaker 1

Absolutely. So yes, what we can do is we can kind of make sure we model, you know, the activities that they're essentially mandated to do based upon the contract and ensure any decision making point. We can put a, we can tie a timeline to that. Charles and team to make sure that the steering committee has a heads up on any decision making points, essentially. So we can kind of, you know, after this call or you know, in our planning meetings, essentially we can kind of identify some of those decision making points to ensure that we include the steering committee in those decision points moving forward so that there's just clarity on what's happening in the scope of work.

25:02

Speaker 2

Can I point out there or. Oh, I guess Jennifer put something in the chat. I feel like there are two levels of conversation here. What needs to be done and two, who is doing it. We, meaning I'm assuming the steering committee should have input on the what and the awardee decides the whole.

25:23

Speaker 4

That makes sense to us. We do include in the contract language on amending the work plan based on mutual agreement with all the parties. So even though there's a scope of work and linked timelines, if the steering committee decides that there needs to be



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

changes for whatever reason, that's something that we would have an opportunity to do based on mutual agreement. Okay, I see that somebody else has a hand Up.

26:01

Speaker 2

Luis, is your hand up from the last time or is this a new question?

26:05

Speaker 1

It's a new question.

26:06

Speaker 2

Okay.

26:07

Speaker 1

Would this be the appropriate time to ask questions about the process on how the recommendation, where did the recommendation come from for the one vendor as opposed to five different vendors?

26:20

Speaker 4

So Luis, I can defer to LADC team to speak a little bit more on that. I believe it was already spoken on in the last meeting. I can just go over this slide so that everybody has a sense of the timeline for the Catalyst RFP release and then we can go back to your question. So, as you all know, the Catalyst RFP we're working towards releasing that application for up to 9 million dollars in funds. So I wanted to provide a working timeline from now until January of 2025. The first item on here is the conflict of interest form which you should all have already received. I believe it's due today by end of day.



27:08

Speaker 4

This is just for you all to acknowledge that you understand that if you are submitting a then you are not eligible to be part of the design of the scope of work and the deliverables for the catalyst RFP. The second key date is the 22nd. LADC is going to have an RFP draft ready for review to the steering committee. So you can expect that language. Then on the 12th of November the steering committee will have the opportunity to I guess finalize the RFP solicitation. So the final language there and then a couple of updates in the next year. So early January we'll be working with HRNA to review and develop an outreach plan to let folks know that there's this opportunity for Catalysts funds. In mid January we're planning to release the application for people to start applying.

28:18

Speaker 4

And then a key date for the state is an activation plan that we're supposed to submit to the state as one of our deliverables for this phase. I'll stop there.

28:33

Speaker 1

As for the Louise's question, that's really. I really prefer for Maria or Jose to answer that call being that it's their contract. But there were certain criteria that through the evaluations that determine why it was one vendor chosen versus several. How many, how many submissions did we get? From my recollection, I believe it's 14 originally, but only five of those submitted late. So I believe it was nine total and that's that those were the nine. Those nine were evaluated. Okay, and then why was the decision not saved for one of our standing meetings for our Steering committee? Why was it done over email? I'M sorry, can you repeat the question? Why was this not. Why was the, why was the selection of the approval of the contract not put on the agenda for one of our standing committees?



29:32

Speaker 1

And why was it done over email instead? Why was the selection of. So why was the contract sent for approval over email instead of being put on the agenda?

29:45

Speaker 2

I can respond to that. This is Maria at ccf. So on the solicitation we had a published timeline that we had to on schedule with. And so we basically were needing to have the steering committee review and approve.

30:06

Speaker 3

In order for us to be able.

30:07

Speaker 2

To meet our contracting deadline that we published.

30:16

Speaker 3

So it was a deadline issue that.

30:17

Speaker 1

We couldn't get it in time. Again, this goes back to an issue that we've had once before. We had recommended strongly that staff take a look at what needs to be done by deadlines to ensure this types of things doesn't happen. It's happened again, I would say I'm very frustrated because this is not something that came up out of nowhere. This is



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

something we should have been planning for. This is something we knew ahead of time. And so the fact that we had something, we had to have it over.

30:42

Speaker 4

Email instead of being just, and just.

30:44

Speaker 1

Scheduled as one of our standing meetings. It's doesn't give me a lot of faith that this is an issue that's.

30:50

Speaker 2

Going to continue happening because future can. Can I interject though that we did actually talk about the process early on and how it was going to need to flow in order to meet up with the timeline. There was actually a lot of conversation about it. So it wasn't like this just came out of the blue. We actually presented at the beginning of the fall what the timeline was and how were going to be conducting, moving, you know, moving through this process. And we did actually discuss it and the feedback and explain how, why it was going to be functioning like this. And it allowed folks in order to be able to examine the information in their own time and process it as opposed to just having it dealt with at a meeting in order for us to stay on the timeline.

31:46

Speaker 2

But we did discuss this at the beginning of the fall.

31:50

Speaker 1

Okay then. Okay. My last comment is I would just recommend that going forward, if



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

there's any major actions that are required, let's do them at the board at the, our standing committee meetings.

32:01

Speaker 5

I'm not a fan of doing it.

32:01

Speaker 1

Over email unless with absolute emergency. That was unanticipated. Thank you.

32:10

Speaker 2

If I could point out, Louise, that when part of the conversations that have been had is that folk do want to be able to get the emailed information, to be able to review it and process it. And we are discussing these things at the meetings before they go out over the email they are being introduced.

32:30

Speaker 1

I'm saying this is the single biggest contract we approved. And it was supposed to go, at least my understanding, was supposed to go.

32:35

Speaker 4

To five different groups.

32:37

Speaker 1

And then instead it went to one that happened once before with the outreach to the



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

minorities and ethnic communities. That was a disaster that were trying to avoid that. And so for this just to be like, hey, it's gotten over email. I just want to make sure that these are major decisions. I'm not. Nothing precludes us from still sending it ahead of time, allowing people time to review it. But I think this discussion for people going back and forth and kind of sharing feedback is helpful in helping people kind of, you know, think of consider issues. And that's the type of thing that's not conducive over email.

33:12

Speaker 2

Thank you.

33:17

Speaker 4

I do want to highlight, Luis, that in the rfp, it said up to five sector investment coordinators. So there wasn't any language that indicated it had to be five. So just wanted to. Just wanted to highlight that.

33:35

Speaker 1

Yeah, I think that's probably real quick, just to clarify for everybody, because there are some new folks. Part of this is Jermaine with ledc. I think the confusion comes with the five sector investment coordinator term. When we're talking sector investment coordinators, we need to ensure that we're covering all of our sectors. But that doesn't mean it can't be just one vendor that is executing the work that needs to be done tied back to our regional plan. So the fact that were able to essentially confirm it looks like hrna, you know, they do meet all the criteria based upon what we put out, and they were the best suited vendor to execute the contract.

34:21

Speaker 2

Okay, if we could. Stefania, are you finished?



34:26

Speaker 4

I think yes, I'm finished.

34:27

Speaker 2

Here we get to. Okay.

34:29

Speaker 4

Apologies that it took off.

34:31

Speaker 2

Oh, no. And, and I. If I could ask just for the flow of information, if we could hold questions until end of the slide, because it may actually answer some of the questions that you all have. Okay, next slide.

34:58

Speaker 5

Okay, yeah, I can give the timeline update here. So for anyone that was on the partners meeting last Friday, it's the same timeline, but here we have that. The. Of course, we're just discussing this. The sector investment coordinator performance period is December of this year, all the way on to September 2026. We do have our two deliverables in the next, I guess they're in the first half of the next year. So we have the draft activation plan that's going to be due January 31, 2025, and then the final submissions of the activation plans will be due June 30, 2025. And that kind of concludes what we have in terms of deliverables in the Catalyst phase of the state. If you look below the axis, we have all the project related deliverables and things on the timeline.



35:53

Speaker 5

So the Catalyst solicitation prep, which includes the steering committee review, that will be taking place throughout the month of November going on to the beginning of December. The Catalyst application period will open January 21, 2025 and be open until March 3rd of 2025. The application review and selections, that'll be from March throughout most of April. And then we'll have the project approval which will be taking place throughout most of May. And then finally the project awards and contracts which we've designated the months of May up until August 1st, when the performance period for those Catalyst projects will begin on August 1st of 2025. When it comes to implementation funding, that's of course a \$45 million pot which we're competing with the 12 other regions for.

36:45

Speaker 5

When it comes to the time of when it's going to open the first period, we only know it's going to be sometime in the first quarter of 2025. So we've just designated that and flagged that. Once you receive any further updates from the state, we will of course provide those and then there will be two following implementation funding periods. Not sure exactly when those will be, so we kind of have just thrown them onto the timeline here. Sometime in the fiscal year of 2526 and then the fiscal year of 2627. So yeah, that's the timeline update.

37:19

Speaker 2

Thank you, Armand.

37:21

Speaker 5

Thank you.



37:25

Speaker 3

Okay.

37:26

Speaker 4

Hello everyone. I will be covering the first portion of our new deliverable, which is the activation work plan that was introduced at our last steering committee meeting, as well as introduced to our partners at the last partners meeting. So we are required to develop project lists as part of our regional plan part two. That was the original requirement that we had in response to just feedback that the state has received, they have revised that deliverable. And so it's not necessarily a new deliverable, more of more yet a revised deliverable in which our regions will now be required to create activation plans for selected strategies.

38:15

Speaker 4

The first activation plan will be due on January 31st, and this will really just serve as a project management tool for our collaboratives to just begin thinking on how and how to begin operationalizing the goals of our regional plan part two as we know it will be. It will have six components, including the target sector overview, the operating structure, resources across the strategy, goals and metrics, and then the dependencies and challenges, which include more of a tactical work plan that we will be developing. And so this first activation plan will be due January 31st.

39:00

Speaker 4

And I think it's really important to also note that based on what the state has been providing in terms of this specific activation work plan and future ones to come, only serve as a project management tool and don't and will not influence funding for other projects, including catalyst or implementation. So we can go ahead and move on to the



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

next slide. And Armand will be covering a little bit more in terms of the current identified tradable sectors for the activation plan and then the requests that we have from our steering committee.

39:42

Speaker 5

Okay, thank you, Scarlett. Yeah. So in the regional plan part two, we identified those seven industries. As a reminder, the seven industries were aerospace, manufacturing, clean renewable energy, transportation and logistics, construction, bioscience, health care, video production and distribution. And so the state, the request from the state was to. Was to choose to send them three of the tradable sectors. So there's that distinction between the tradable and local serving sectors. And the idea is that a local serving sector, the growth is really mostly proportional to the population. While these tradable sectors, since they're able to exchange goods and services outside of the region, they're then able to grow beyond the proportion to the population.

40:34

Speaker 5

When it comes to what is like a tradable sector and what is a local serving sector, you can kind of just think of it as like a tradable sector is something that, like I said, we can trade outside of the region. And then a local sector, I mean, a local serving sector is something we not. So like a meal at a restaurant is. Is a local serving sector. It can be consumed by someone within the region. Meanwhile, if we think about cars, for example, you know, you can build a car in a region and then sell it to someone outside of the area. So out of these seven sectors, we have these tradable and local serving sectors. When it came to out of the seven, which ones are traded, which ones are local, Five of them were considered traded.

41:16

Speaker 5

That was aerospace, manufacturing, clean renewable energy, transportation and logistics, bioscience and video production, distribution. So cleaner renewable energy as



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

a sector is something that's really applicable to Any of the sectors. And it can kind of be found throughout, you know, I think specifically aerospace, manufacturing, transportation and logistics and even bioscience. Peter Production, distribution. And then when it comes to the three that were specifically chosen here, these three are the most established sectors. And when I say established, I'm referring in terms of regional employment. So they use this thing called a location quotient, which looks at the proportion of employment in a sector in a region compared to the country as a whole. And they use that to determine whether a sector is regionally concentrated.

42:03

Speaker 5

And so these three sectors, video, production, distribution, aerospace, manufacturing and transportation and logistics, are the most regionally concentrated out of the four remaining traded sectors. And if you look at them specifically, video production, distribution is very regionally concentrated. That means we have like an employment in that industry that's maybe eight to 10 times the national average. And then aerospace, and transportation, logistics, those two have regional concentrations or employment that is about 1.5 to 2 times the national average. And so that's kind of, you know, using the research and the data to determine that these have established bases within LA county and they can be leveraged for further economic development through these activation work plans. And. Yeah, I think I'll pass it off to Andrea.

42:56

Speaker 2

Okay, so one of the things that, because we know that last time there were a lot of questions about this and how these industries were selected. So definitely want to emphasize that these are based on the regional reports that have gone out, specifically the second one, and then that this is coming from the data. So these are very data driven results that we highlighted in the regional reports, regional planning reports, and that these have already been. That the reports have already been sent to the state after we had our feedback period as the steering committee. And so just want to emphasize that these are in no way going to prevent any other sectors from submitting applications for the process and consideration.



43:49

Speaker 5

Yeah, thank you, Andrea. And I see Sharon has a hand up, so you go ahead. Sharon.

43:56

Speaker 7

Thank you so much for clarifying and putting this out. I love the way that you've presented it, very concrete and very clearly. However, last week, last time we met and again I want to reinforce, we asked, because there was so much question about it, we asked for the table presentation on the comparative factors that were considered when making the recommendation for these three sectors. I may have missed it as I was out for a cut for about a week, but we really need to have information to make an informed commentary or choice. One of the things that two things I'd like to highlight, although I totally agree that These are significant sectors in terms of Los Angeles region's economic past performance. Some of these sectors are in significant decline.

44:48

Speaker 7

We also, and the data that I was able to glean off of the Beacons tool that was created using some of our marketing dollars is that it took a look at the 10 year historical wage base and earnings for these sectors. We're in a transformative period for two reasons. One, we are facing some economic competition around the state. Specifically I'm concerned about the bio sector. I happen to had some feedback and comment from Supervisor Holly Mitchell where she talked about the job opportunities and the wage rates in the Biocom sector being higher than any other. And if we're only looking at the past 10 year concentration of number of jobs, that's not really relevant to what's happening in our growth trajectory.

45:39

Speaker 7

And so there's data out there and there's data that has just been presented by our



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

supervisors on these sectors that we don't have that to allow us to do an apples to apples presentation when we're look, we're either going to do battle and win or lose against Atlanta as the next bio hub in this country and the millions and millions of dollars that are being poured into that are significant. I also would like to have the other thing that I'd like to have some input before we go to vote on any of this, and I see that you're looking for this by the 19th is I'd like some kind of information to understand how much of our economic base is reliant upon federal funding because we are about to enter another cycle of federal ABC policy.

46:32

Speaker 7

I was there working the Hill under Mineta during both Bush administrations and with Wyoming got more transportation dollars than California because there was a blanket anywhere but California investment policy. So the potential risk that we face on our economic trajectory should be factored in when we look at how things are going to roll forward. And I'm happy to put in the, I'll put in the feedback into the chat the data that Supervisor Mitchell did present on the export and the value proposition of the BioCon sector.

47:08

Speaker 2

If, if Jermaine, I'm not sure if you're going to address this, but the activation work plan is essentially just a roadmap. It is not a proposal for us to only be focusing and prioritizing this one area. Correct me if I'm wrong, Armand.

47:28

Speaker 5

Yeah, yeah. So we can have projects outside of these sectors.

47:34

Speaker 2

Yes. They're just asking for us to use this as a draft to show how we're going to be



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

structuring and the components that we're going to be looking for as proposals are being placed and put forward.

47:50

Speaker 1

Yes, and Madam Chair, what I was going to just add is that these are really investment areas, that some of these are really going to be outside of the framework of jobs first, essentially even this program is going to come to an end at the end of 2026. And so the idea here is if we, our regional plan is to cover a 10 year period and beyond. These are some of the industries that essentially are near and dear to LA County. They're driving the gdp, they're tradable sectors and there's job growth there. The cluster study that I have here, this really looks at post pandemic.

48:30

Speaker 1

So if you guys take a look in the chat and you look at that industry cluster study, you'll see all of these three industries and more, all of really are tradable sectors that are driving our GDP here in LA county are listed with tons of information post pandemic. And it's really clear and there's some even in depth information about how we kind of arrived at these three different sectors. And so when it comes to investment, these are key because outside of the Cal jobs process, we're already in conversations with philanthropy, in conversations with venture capitalists, et cetera, to talk about funding projects that are region wide that may fall within one of these cluster areas. And so that's kind of where some of this is coming from. So just wanted to just highlight that.

49:25

Speaker 2

And so just to emphasize and reiterate, this is not eliminating the other sectors. They're just asking us for focus on, to focus one area, to put together a draft plan for how the proposals are going to be evaluated moving forward, what components are going to be prioritized, et cetera.



49:47

Speaker 5

Yeah, thank you Andrea and Sharon and Jermaine. I also see Tony has her hand, but you go ahead Tony.

49:53

Speaker 6

Yeah, I, I appreciate all of the different feedback and I was able to talk with our president of the Chamber. So I'm ready to vote. But the one piece I just wanted to put forward that as we've been looking at this kind of broader evolving nature of the implementation funding and what is being expected of the regions relative to the catalyst time period. One of the pieces that we just wanted to raise up is that we now that you are bringing the sector investment coordinators on that. While it's important to understand what is the top priority and make sure that's done by January, we also want to encourage that Maybe drafts on the other ones also start to proceed.

50:46

Speaker 6

The outside concern is that the state could wake up in January if not December and say if you want to be competitive for implementation money in the first round, we would like to see that it aligns not just with your regional plan generally but with your activation plan whether it's a priority or whatever. And so we've as we work in multiple regions. We've been saying maybe we need to see is it possible to do more than one by the 31st? Obviously only commit to one but that there may be a reason that you want to actually get more of these down the line. My understanding is the 31st is you could still amend things later if you found out stuff. But anyways we wanted to put that out there.

51:36

Speaker 6

Our concern is that states is going to further limit what they're going to do with the 45



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

million and that we may only get projects that are in the in areas where we have an activation work plan.

51:52

Speaker 7

Agreed.

51:53

Speaker 2

Fiona, do you want to speak to that or Jimmy?

52:00

Speaker 1

I can speak to it a little bit. Tony, your speculation, that totally makes sense and that should be a concern of the state change in their mind. One thing that they made clear, well one thing that they stated was that again that one sector is really just kind of to get started and then there'll be more information after the 31st, I'm sorry after January 31st for follow up activation plans. So it, I understand that, you know, you then it makes sense like look, let's just try to present them with more than one up front, you know, so you know, essentially keep them on their toes so they won't just say well you chose this one and you know, you can't have the rest.

52:45

Speaker 1

I understand that concern but almost like those three, these three that's right up on the screen right now, these three priority sectors. Initially when I submitted all of our priorities, tradable sectors, I'm sorry, they came back and said no top three only. So there's no. My, my speculation is that if we submit more than one, we spend the time on doing more than one. They may reject it and just say we only want one. So you know, just my personal opinion, I think that we should, you know, stay strong and put our best foot forward with what they asked for and make sure it's the best that we can actually submit.



53:33

Speaker 1

So if there are any issues down the line when with them changing their mind at least we have you know, a leg to stand on and say hey, we gave you what you wanted under the, you know, under the impression that, you know, we could submit more later on.

53:47

Speaker 6

And I don't mean to be argumentative. The only thing I was in two meetings with Derek. One of them was with a region, but another one, he was meeting with a statewide economic development group and presenting kind of the overall picture. And in that meet and a lot of people on this call were in that meeting. It was, I'm blanking on their name. California Fed, Cal Biz.

54:15

Speaker 1

Yeah.

54:15

Speaker 6

And, and he emphasized that there was. Well, the first meeting he said that the Redwood coast region was going to do all four region, all four traded sectors by the end of January. And I work with them and there's reasons why that makes sense for them. But at the second time I saw him presented, he said not only Redwood, but other regions we're going to be doing more. And I'm like, why does he keep saying this? Like, why? And, and so I'm not, I don't, Charles, I don't disagree with you. I just, it's just, I keep, like, why would he keep emphasizing other regions are doing more than one? So we can only do what we can do. I totally agree with picking one as our priority and heading towards it, ready to vote.

55:00



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 6

I, I just, I'm just feeling like the ground is moving under our feet maybe, and so I had to raise it.

55:06

Speaker 1

Yeah, no, I, I, and I appreciate you. I appreciate you doing it. I'm certainly not trying to argue with you. I agree with you. The state has certainly changed their mind on way more occasions than we want them to. So, you know, it's a judgment call, you know, but as of right now, you know, it's just my recommendation that we put our best foot forward with one. Excuse me. And, and then move forward from there. However, you know, I understand your point and it totally makes sense.

55:42

Speaker 2

Thank you. Are there any other questions before we move forward? And please remember to get your vote in. We definitely need to increase our participation on the voting in order to ensure that we are going with the consensus of the group.

56:05

Speaker 6

Is the link in the chat to vote.

56:10

Speaker 4

We will go ahead and follow up with an email after this meeting sending everyone the. The link to vote. And then we will go ahead and give until November 19th end of day. And I do really encourage our members to please vote. We, we have had very low voting turnout. This is an opportunity to really voice your. Your choice, especially for something like this. Deliverable, which will be very important. So just really encouraging everyone to check their emails and we Will be sending reminders as well as we get closer to the voting deadline of Tuesday.



56:51

Speaker 2

Yeah. All right, next slide. Okay, so we have sent around the conflict of interest form and this is just a reminder for folks to complete it and fill it out today as soon as possible so that we can get these documented and on and move on to the next step. So check your email. Is it possible to put a link in the chat?

57:30

Speaker 1

Yeah, I'll go ahead and do that. Okay.

57:33

Speaker 2

I didn't want to speak out of turn. And so again, these are due today if there's any conflict of interest. We have discussed this over and over. These are, this is these are the guidelines as far as moving forward with the funding proposals that will be evaluated soon and submitted.

57:57

Speaker 4

This is emailed to us?

58:00

Speaker 2

Yes, already. Or it will be. I missed the first part of your question. I'm sorry.

58:09

Speaker 1

Was it already emailed or.



58:12

Speaker 2

I saw a link come in. Okay. Yes. And there is a link in the chat now also.

58:17

Speaker 3

Perfect.

58:18

Speaker 7

Thank you.

58:24

Speaker 2

Okay, next. Any questions? Other questions? Okay, next slide. Sorry about that.

58:30

Speaker 5

Andrea, you have a question from Sharon.

58:33

Speaker 2

Oh, I'm sorry.

58:34

Speaker 7

I noted that there were two put items on the conflict of interest document. Can you bring that back up? And I just want to get some clarity on record for it. The first says that a disclosure requirement that if anyone intends to propose on a catalyst rfp, it



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

should say Catalyst. I'm so hoping and implementation that they would disclose that prior to the steering committee's development of or review of the rfp. I wanted to bring that to the entire steering committee's attention because what is a normal occurrence is we don't get advance notice, adequate notice of the agenda. So if we don't know it's going to be covered in a meeting and there is not advance notice, it is really makes it difficult for the steering committee members to comply with that disclosure requirement.

59:27

Speaker 7

So I would like the certainty and confirmation from our leadership and LEDC staff that they are going to comply with that 72 hour notice and those agendas being out that in 72 hours so that we can know what's going to be on that agenda if someone needs to make that disclosure. So that's the first requirement. The second one, 2A I'm going to pitch that back and again I will do the make sure I comply by today. But Tanua brought up some very, a very clear point regarding transparency and group participation in that review of rfp and she did that two meetings ago. And I'd like those minutes to be put back out so that the recording can be reviewed for that language. Because I believe we had consensus on that item.

01:00:21

Speaker 7

And just so that we look at that exclusion, calling someone to have a conflict because you're bringing forth the RFP information to the entire group for transparency purposes is something that she was pretty adamant about. And I will place a call into her after that. And we kind of all agree that the process would be. Staff would go and get xyz, we would come back with the information. It was to be provided to us for group review. Since we have. Everybody's opted out not to serve on the evaluation committee. But transparency does not represent conflict. And so I want to review those minutes because I do know that was a violent discussion and I do believe. I'm almost certain we had. We had not only a quorum, but the census. So, Scarlett, if you can send that link out, that was two meetings ago.



01:01:18

Speaker 7

And again, I will go ahead and vote on this with a disclaimer. Disclaimer. But I believe that is contradictory to what the steering committee asked for.

01:01:26

Speaker 2

The conflict of interest is not a. It's for us to submit it like.

01:01:34

Speaker 7

It's an eligibility factor under 2a.

01:01:37

Speaker 2

Yes. Okay. Are there any other questions or comments? Okay, let's move to the next slide. All right, so this is basically a summary of the equitable equity, sorry, criteria that we're going to be using for the projects, propose project proposals. And we've gone over this for the, you know, past couple of meetings. The. The subcommittee has met. They have produced their documents. We agreed that we would sign off on what was presented from the subcommittee. And so we just want to remind folk of that as we move into the project proposal process so that we're making sure that we are being transparent and clear. So are there any questions before we move on? Okay. I don't see any hands. Oh, okay.

01:02:58

Speaker 7

Sharon, I just want to. I know that a bunch of our. The people that. Is Brady on the call yet, or Derek.



01:03:06

Speaker 3

Okay.

01:03:06

Speaker 7

They're all in a meeting. There's a conference going on right now. And I just want to be clear because we had a little call this morning. I thought everybody's on the same page that the equity criteria as was voted on. And I think there was only one objection to that. And this is the document. The first section is a go, no go. It's a pass or fail. And so the intention of the committee that brought this forward was that all the proposals that are presented would meet this go or no go first tier criteria. Or they do not move forward to sector investment coordinators or to general evaluation scoring. And so that was. They were pretty adamant about it. I actually tried to get Derek to ask them a couple questions if he was willing to back up off of that.

01:04:05

Speaker 7

And he was pretty adamant about it. I did speak to both Nicole and Benny this morning just to affirm that I had understood what this was when we voted. And that is the way it stands. So my question is, when it comes to. On behalf of that group, when it comes to creating the future discussion around evaluation criteria that we take into consideration and adopt a. A process that respects the decision that has been made for this go or no go, pass or fail vote that screen that happens first and it not get buried so that other factors could overrule the go or no go prerequisite. Because those yeses or nos, when it says required for every project, are kind of a prerequisite that. That the committee, that the steering committee voted on.

01:04:58

Speaker 7

And I just want to put that out there because I did have nobody. Everybody's at this



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

conference, and nobody was available to be on that call. This call, as far as I know. Brady said he was joining late.

01:05:10

Speaker 2

Oh, hi, Pen.

01:05:16

Speaker 3

Yeah. So thank you again.

01:05:18

Speaker 2

I'm just wondering, in terms of the definition of underinvested communities and historically marginalized population, where is that definition? And I guess, again, being an advocate.

01:05:32

Speaker 3

For the Asian American community who's traditionally.

01:05:35

Speaker 2

Many times not recognized, I definitely want.

01:05:38

Speaker 7

To advocate to make sure that they're.



01:05:40

Speaker 2

Included in that definition.

01:05:43

Speaker 3

But where is that definition or who determines that definition?

01:05:48

Speaker 2

We actually will be discussing that in the next slide.

01:05:51

Speaker 7

Got it.

01:05:52

Speaker 2

Thank you.

01:05:53

Speaker 3

Okay, thank you.

01:05:57

Speaker 2

And if I could provide a little bit of context into the go no Go for us to discuss as a group, we did look at the equity criteria and what was being proposed. And if we can take a couple of steps back to the sector table coordinator process that we had and the



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

rubric that we used for the scoring, One of the problems that we ran into when were actually evaluating the applications was that so much weight was put on the. What would be considered the equity factors, that very little scoring was actually applied to the implementation of the work. And that would be one of my criticisms.

01:06:43

Speaker 2

And so points were being given for where the organization was based, the populations they serve, but very little credit was given to the development of a clear and concise work plan as far as how they were going to be getting the work done. And we later saw where that was an issue. And so we had actually, it was a Very heated discussion, talked about once the group had presented the proposal that instead of establishing a whole separate committee, especially since we're having so few people step up at this point because of the conflict of interest and the idea of folk being free to submit that the equity criteria actually be incorporated into the entire evaluation process.

01:07:43

Speaker 7

Madam Chair, you do not have the ability to override a vote of this.

01:07:46

Speaker 2

I'm not overriding. I'm saying that that was the. That that was actually the whole conversation. What was presented was one side of the conversation and not the whole side of the conversation.

01:07:57

Speaker 7

I'm not aware of the conversation, but I do know that we have a motion, a voted a motion that was made, seconded and approved by the steering committee on behalf of that working group. They're not here to defend themselves, so I'll defer to them on this matter. But I'm a little confused if you can clarify. You're saying that the evaluation



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

criteria was heavily weighted based upon not work plan. I was not aware that we had come up with an evaluation criteria yet. I believe.

01:08:29

Speaker 2

No, I'm speaking on our past experience when we were basically using the same type of model when those of us who were actually doing the evaluations and the scoring. One of the things that became very prevalent as we were going through the process was that most of the points were actually awarded based on things that were not related to the actual work plan and doing the work.

01:08:55

Speaker 7

Oh, you're talking about the subregional plans. Yes, I agree with you and that was intentional, but I don't think that has any. I do agree with you on that. I know what you're talking about. I served on that committee with you. You are absolutely correct, but that was intentional because that was the purpose and the definition of what the sub regional tables were intended to be. I don't think that has any relevance whatsoever as we move forward on catalysts and implementation. But I do want to respect that. But I guess. But I just want to understand you. At this moment, we do not have a criteria. And the only criteria that the committee has approved is this equity criteria. Is that correct?

01:09:32

Speaker 2

Which no one is disputing. And that's. And let's make it clear, no one is disputing, putting it into the process. And that the equity criteria both suggested from the state and from the subcommittee, be applied to the evaluation. And that has already been cleared and voted on. But one of the things that we are discussing is the weighting of it. And so. But this proposal has already been approved. So it's not a matter of whether or not the proposal is moving forward.

01:10:06



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 7

Thank you graciously for your clarification.

01:10:11

Speaker 2

Okay. All right, so if we can roll to the. Oh, sorry, are there any other question? Okay, if we can roll to the next slide? All right, so we have had several questions ask about the plan for the funding distribution for the \$9 million. So what we did was went back and we looked at the original language that was submitted with the application with the contract last year. And we, as we all know there have been a lot of changes and changes in movement with the state, changes in everything down to our name. And so we wanted to review and give all everyone an opportunity to see where we are coming from and then go to where, you know, part of what we need to be looking at is moving forward. Oh, go back. I'm sorry.

01:11:18

Speaker 2

So the original contract language, we have the 9 million in the pre development activities. And what was being promoted was the idea of being equal shares to each of the spas for up to 200,000 for the exploratory and last mile projects. So just to define the exploratory is the research and the last mile is the actual planning. So we aren't even at the implementations part yet. And so with that said, this was also going to looking at the technical advisors which we now have incorporated into this sector Investment coordinator piece. And when we're looking at this and looking at the changes, one of the things that became very apparent is that we're no longer this original language is no longer consistent with what is being asked on the catalyst deliverables. And so we have been really brainstorming.

01:12:22

Speaker 2

We had asked for some proposals and then we honestly we didn't receive any moving forward. So what we did was sit down and actually take some time to come up with a



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

proposal that might meet the needs of our underserved and underrepresented areas throughout the region and accomplish the goals that were hoping to aim with this original language. So if we could roll to the next slide. So this is what the chairs have talked about and this is what we are proposing and would like to definitely get some feedback on. So starting with the same \$9 million potential where you're looking at doing one round of funding and the funding is allocated by project with a maximum of 400,000 per proposal.

01:13:15

Speaker 2

When went back and we reviewed like the needs of putting together a viable research project or a last mile slash planning project, the \$200,000 cap actually was not as adequate as was probably thought of. So even at the max, we would still be able to fund approximately 22 projects. That's the max. And so with your proposals, you're of course going to be having your budget put in there. And so the 400,000 is the max that we are proposing as opposed to a 200. And then also one of the things that we have discussed is actually breaking them down into categories, so putting 45% of the funding towards the exploratory and then 55 towards the last mile. And if we could go to the next slide and we'll go back after.

01:14:14

Speaker 2

So I just want to encapsulate all of this so that everyone has a full picture. So were looking at the geographic consideration. We understand the idea of equality in splitting it by spa, but one of the things we realized when we actually were looking at the maps is that they were not equitable and did not align with the values that were being promoted through the work of the committees early on as much as, you know, a year and a half ago. So one of the things that we looked at was the populations where these red areas that are lined with the Justice 40 program and the other initiatives where they align. And so what we quickly began to realize was that the equal measure of dividing it by SPA was not going to actually be equity based.



01:15:11

Speaker 2

If we could go to the next slide. Oh, no, where's the. Oops, sorry. Where's the one with the breakdown of the districts with the yellow. I'm sorry.

01:15:27

Speaker 3

Oh, you didn't use that. But this one, this map actually has the SPA overlay.

01:15:32

Speaker 2

Oh, okay. I'm sorry, I'm on a smaller screen and I'm half blind. So. So yes, if you can, if you actually look at this, I'm trying to expand it now. If you actually look at this, you will see that there are significant areas that are not actually going to be meeting the equity challenges that we're facing as far as making sure underrepresented groups are brought into the equation. And so if we're doing it based on project, one of the things that we can actually make sure is in there is that we focus on the outreach and the engagement and the participants that are being brought into these projects and the job readiness and the job creation. Creation as well as job years. And so using the geography, we can see where a lot of these areas are.

01:16:35

Speaker 2

Basically, we are not going to be hitting the populations that we want. If populated areas are probably going to be needing More assistance. Okay, now I'm ready.

01:17:02

Speaker 3

Tony has her.



01:17:03

Speaker 2

Want to add anything? I'm sorry?

01:17:05

Speaker 1

Oh, what?

01:17:05

Speaker 3

No, I was going to say based on. If were to use the original language from the original Catalyst application and break everything down evenly by the nine spas. That's why we wanted to show this map and show that we. At least from what we can see, we wouldn't be meeting that equity goal if were to evenly disperse it. Just divide everything by nine. And so that's why we're presenting our recommendation, at least the first draft.

01:17:35

Speaker 3

Of course, conversation needs to be had about this, but we have to make a decision on what the disbursement allocation is going to because that information needs to be included in the rfp, which is why we need to have a conversation about it, determine what it's going to be and put a vote out for everyone so that we can make sure LADC and CCDF have that to input into their draft rfp. So Tony has her hand up first.

01:18:03

Speaker 6

So I appreciate the slides. We didn't have that. So when I had a conversation with our chamber, the only thing that I could tell them is that you were wanting to remove the allocation by region spa. So I'll need to have time to go back and then share these slides with what you're proposing. But the. But I want to say is that the eliminating the requirement to distribute it by the number of spas is not the same as changing the



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

criteria to provide greater emphasis for those areas that have greater disadvantage. So I'm not sure that as I interpret this, that there's a one for one. I think what you're showing us now is extremely valuable and helpful, but I don't think that we would be comfortable in just eliminating the requirement for a geographic distribution.

01:19:02

Speaker 6

We would want to see some language that more addressed what you're talking about here and whatever. I need to take that back to the chamber because this is not the discussion we had. So I would not be able to vote today.

01:19:17

Speaker 2

And if I can respond to Tony's statement, what we are actually saying is instead of it just being a flat split, that the geographic area not be considered at all, but that it not be just an automatic split between areas. And so we, as the proposals are being evaluated, we can make sure that there is a component to where we are looking for geographic diversity as well as participant diversity as far as where they're pulling their participants from. And sorry, I talk with my hands. And so I'm not sure how that's showing up on the zoom. But yes, so it's that it's not just a flat split, but that it could still be a component of the evaluation as far as making sure everything is not just being grouped into one area and that it not be rooted.

01:20:11

Speaker 2

Because also one of the questions that came up is the spa, if you're doing it by spa area, is that based on where the business is located as opposed to the population that's going to benefit and be impacted and things like that. So that's why we thought it would be more equitable to do it based on looking at the projects, looking at their job readiness, looking at the outreach components, what communities are going to be impacted, and using those as a more holistic approach to the evaluation of the proposals.



01:20:48

Speaker 3

That's Sharon's hand up next.

01:20:51

Speaker 7

I actually agree with. I appreciate your foresight and going into the original criteria because there are four or five factors on the original definition of disinvested. And what I didn't understand, though, is the chart that you brought up that gave us the number of population, the number of individuals in those disinvested based on disinvested on the spas. I'm not sure how that factors into the other factors. You know, one of them is area median income. And so the percentage of income would be a factor. And that would drive. That's one factor that would drive that disinvested population calculation. But there are other factors in the disinvested definition, are there not, I believe, are there not that make a census tract or a SPA or an area qualify as disinvested?

01:21:58

Speaker 7

And so are we going to be able to expand this table to include all of those so that we could see and have quantifiable data that we consider figuring out how to include in either the distribution strategy or in the evaluation rubric?

01:22:17

Speaker 2

Well, if we go back to the Justice 40 qualification, that's why we're using this map. We did actually look at other maps as far as determining, and this was actually the one that we had to present to the group. But it's very consistent with the same information that were finding using more holistic factors, education level, household sizes, you know, things like that. Because household median income can mean a lot of things, especially when you have more than one person or adult rather, working in the household that raises medium household income, as opposed to some communities may, by and large



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

have one person or two people. Right. That are generating the household income as opposed to four to five adults.

01:23:05

Speaker 2

And so looking at other factors we did bring this in, but we are actually focusing on the Justice 40 because we know that was where the original initiatives are drawn from.

01:23:17

Speaker 7

But that's something that I would object to because we specifically are using the SIRF approved criteria that we agreed to and we did not adopt Justice 40. And I know there's another. There's a Justice 40 map and then there's the disinvested definition of disinvested as per the surf sfp. And we adopted that in our. Excuse me, I'm still talking. Excuse me. We adopted that in our bylaws and we adopted that in our framework when the proposal for SIC was developed and the equity criteria staff did recommend that Justice 40 and they put that language in there. But if you remember, when we took the vote on the equity criteria, we overrode that. And so I would request that we go back and at least very clarify. These are the four points based on the original sfp and this is what we adopted.

01:24:15

Speaker 7

We even incorporated it into our bylaws to be sure.

01:24:19

Speaker 2

Okay, but I think that I just said that we did look at the other maps and that this was the one that actually was very consistent with the same information that was being presented.



01:24:31

Speaker 7

Again, I just would like to see the four categories presented in chart so that we could see the percentages and how they reflect against all four of the state's disinvested populations. I'm loving the principle that you're coming from. I just know that some of the Justice 40 data sets drive on education level. Education level is not part of the disinvested criteria set forth for California Jobs first or in our bylaws. So I want us to stay true to what we committed to and not leave that flexibility to create that mishmash. So if there's a way to do, you know, we've got disinvested population based on income, because that's what this is. But then there's another one based on Cal Environmental Screen. There are four criteria and Alan was really good at reminding us what those four criteria were.

01:25:20

Speaker 7

It'd be helpful, Juan, if you could pull those for us as well. Thank you.

01:25:24

Speaker 3

I just asked Armand in the chat if he can clarify this particular map and where this is from so that we don't have any confusion about what we are referring to.

01:25:35

Speaker 5

Yeah, sure. So this map right here, it takes into consideration the criteria. I'll just quickly say what they are. So the first one was census tracts identified as disadvantaged by the CAL Enviro Screen tool. And then the next One is census tracts with median household income at or below 80% of the statewide median income or with the household income at or below threshold designated by the HUD code. And then high poverty area and high unemployment area as designated by the California COMPETES tax Credit program. And then finally the California Native American tribes as defined by the Native American



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Heritage Commission. So this map here, I mean just going over those four criteria, there are no tribal lands in LA county, so there's no there. There are no tracks that are falling under that.

01:26:36

Speaker 5

And so this is looking at census tracts but also census places. And so the high poverty area and high unemployment area, those are captured here. If were to only look at the Calenviro screen, for example, I don't know if people are familiar with like for example the neighborhood of Calabasas that's in the southwest part of Spa 2. You'll see that entire area is red because it's considered a high unemployment area even though it's not considered disadvantaged by the calenviro Screen tool. And then we also have here the census tracts with the median household income at or below 80% of the statewide median income. So using the latest American Community Survey five year estimate calculated what the statewide median income is and then also the median household incomes for those that are at or below 80%. So that is also captured.

01:27:29

Speaker 5

And then finally merge that with the calEnviroScreen data set. So that's also including the disadvantaged census tracts as defined by Kalin Virus screen.

01:27:40

Speaker 2

Thank you, Armand.

01:27:42

Speaker 5

Thank you.

01:27:47



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 2

Does anyone else have any questions?

01:27:49

Speaker 3

Hi. Penn had her hand up.

01:27:51

Speaker 2

Oh, thank you. Okay. I guess in terms of.

01:27:58

Speaker 3

I think I heard what the criteria was here. So this map is based on the justice something map or is it based on these four criteria that's listed.

01:28:09

Speaker 2

Go ahead, Armando. I'm sorry.

01:28:12

Speaker 5

Yeah. This map is based off the four criteria.

01:28:15

Speaker 2

Four criteria. So the disinvested population is based on those four factors then?

01:28:20



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 7

Yeah.

01:28:21

Speaker 2

Okay, that's good. Thank you.

01:28:41

Speaker 5

Yeah, I think something else.

01:28:43

Speaker 2

Go ahead, Armand.

01:28:44

Speaker 5

I'm sorry, Yeah, I was going to say something else to point out is that there is actually a lot of overlap between these four tools. You'll find that many of the income, the low income tracts also fall under disadvantage. But yeah, there's the added benefit of money due specifically for characteristics such as income. Certain tracts that may not be considered disadvantaged by the countenviro screen will also come up as disinvested when you combine the four definitions.

01:29:13

Speaker 1

And just to add Real quick to what Armand was saying. This map is pretty consistent with the enviro tool that's utilized by the epa. That's important. The reason why I bring that up is because when you're talking about additional funding outside of what catalyst is going to offer and or implementation for that matter, if you are within those epa, essentially hot zones or red zones, which you see right here, all of these are consistent



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

with the EPA tool as well. It's going to leave room for additional investment both privately and federally. So. So it's actually good, you know, the way this map is kind of outlaying everything.

01:30:06

Speaker 3

Sharon, did you still have your hand up or.

01:30:08

Speaker 7

Oh, no, let me take it down. I apologize.

01:30:21

Speaker 1

Andre, you ready to go to the next slide?

01:30:23

Speaker 2

Yeah. Okay. Oh, wait, that's the first one. Go to. I'm sorry, the next one. Okay. So we just want to remind everyone we need to get on the ball as far as getting these projects in the pipeline so that groups can collaborate. Collaboration is very key. There are currently 24 projects. I think a lot of us have some very good ideas on how we would like to move forward. Not like we would like to move forward, but like projects that we would like to move forward. And now is the time because once the application is approved and drops, the timeframe is going to be very short.

01:31:04

Speaker 2

So it's really important that we start pulling these pieces together, pulling partners together, getting budgets together, all of that stuff, so that we can make sure that we



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

have a wide array of projects that are going to meet the needs of our community. Next slide. And the portal link has been dropped in the chat real fast.

01:31:26

Speaker 1

Andre, My hand was raised.

01:31:28

Speaker 2

Oh, I'm sorry.

01:31:30

Speaker 1

It's the background. It kind of blends in there really quick. I didn't want to make this a slide. I know we're tight on time. We only few minutes left, but I've been meeting with different organizations, different areas of the regions to talk about different projects that may be going, may being developed right now. And the Antelope Valley, Drew Mercy over at avh and I believe it's the transit authority out there. They had their inviting this steering committee to do essentially a field trip out that way to look at a couple of different projects that you may want to look at just to see how. How it's integrating with kind of the goals and objectives of California Jobs first. We're still putting everything together.

01:32:27

Speaker 1

We like to at some point get some dates from people on the steering committee to see what works for the steering committee in general. So we can share those dates with them. But it'd be a tour of, I believe, like the wind farms that they have there, maybe the hydrogen hub, a tour of BYD to see exactly how they're deciding to work together, how jobs can be created, potential revenue that can be generated from there, everything that eventually we're going to have to submit to the state of California for a really strong implementation project.



01:33:03

Speaker 1

So we're tight on time today, so, you know, we can table that for the next get together and maybe after the new year, we can plan a field trip for us all to go out there, get from behind these zoom calls, and really start getting our hands a little bit more dirty into this. So I just want to bring that up while Andrea is talking about the projects portal. Thanks.

01:33:33

Speaker 2

Okay. Are there any questions? I unfortunately cannot see hands.

01:33:39

Speaker 3

Oh, well, I just put my hand up so as you can see. I'll let you know.

01:33:43

Speaker 2

Thank you.

01:33:43

Speaker 3

And just as I'm reading through the comments or the chat, I think that we need to get a little bit more clarity as with regards to the RFP process and the evaluation criteria and the disbursement, the decision. Because you're right both to Sharon and Tony. How Tony said the proposed amendment only removes the equal spot distribution. It does not address how the issues illustrated in these maps would be used in the evaluation. And you're correct because we didn't want to make any assumptions and actually write the language of how we would use the, the illustrated maps as our guide as opposed to doing an equal division into nine different spa areas.



01:34:31

Speaker 3

So we do need to have something that can be voted on by the entire steering committee that we all agree to on how we want the distribution of funds to be done or accomplished. Because that information needs to be included in the rfp. So in order to include in the rfp, we need to do our part, write that language, what we would like to recommend and have a vote by the steering committee so that they can keep on the time frame for the RFP completion. Just one thing I wanted to acknowledge and bring up. You're correct, Tony. The other thing I don't seem to. I'm not sure if everyone understands.

01:35:10

Speaker 3

If I want to make sure we don't have a, a big problem blowing back in our face later on is that as you're signing these conflict of interest statements and if your organization that you are representing has an intention on applying for funding from the Catalyst that clearly states that you will be excluded from being able to review and approve The RFP that the LAADC and CCF are currently presenting, which more than likely will bump a lot of people off of the steering committee from being able to actually review that. That's specifically what that conflict of interest says. And so for some reason I'm getting this feeling before we leave this call that not everybody understands that. And a lot of people are expecting that RFP to come back for the full committee to review.

01:36:04

Speaker 3

But if you're signing that conflict of interest and you're going to apply, then you're not going to be able to be part of that review or part of that vote. And I also want to make sure that everybody's clear about that. So I wanted to put that back in your hands. See questions that they have for clarification. I'll lower my hand. I see Sharon's hand is up, so.



01:36:25

Speaker 7

I'm raising my hand on that specific point. Thank you for saying that so clearly, Libby. That's the core issue that I'm really trying to get to. And I actually just was typing into the chat two meetings ago we had a discussion that brought forth on this issue and there was an action request asked of staff and that was that staff go and gather up the applications and the evaluation schedules provided by Multi Byte San Diego, I think it was Orange county in Northern California. That was a request made by steering committee of staff to come back to us so that we would have an open, shareable transparency on what that application content looked like before even getting involved in the rfp. That did not happen. And so we are still waiting for that action to be produced by staff.

01:37:22

Speaker 7

I know you have gone ahead to another step, but what we determined, and that's why I'm asking for the minutes or the recording from that meeting, is that full transparency. Anyone on the steering committee as a whole group, since none of us volunteered for that evaluation, committee would be able to look at the applications being used by the other units and put in our comments on a shareable. And then staff would use that to frame a final proposed application. Tanua asked for transparency of that. There's nothing to hide on that. And then once were in sync on what that was, they would move forward with the rfp. I'm saying staff is deficient and has not done that. I know time is of the essence, but I believe that what we had consensus on that. So I would like to go back to that recording.

01:38:16

Speaker 7

I will call Tanua because again, I recognize the importance of not being able to be a part of creating an RFP while you're by your submitting a proposal, clear conflict. But what how we discussed getting around that was ensuring that were looking at the other region's applications and we would be able to chime in and put our unified input into



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

those applications and staff would use that to create the rfp. That's where I'm seeing the disconnect. So I think there's an action item open that hasn't been resolved and I think that is going to help ally some of the any concerns that steering committee did not have an opportunity to chime into the process. It would ensure that we're included. But those that do have a conflict can opt out and still feel that they were participating.

01:39:10

Speaker 2

If I can address that. One of the things that we did discuss in light of the request for the applications and Libby, you can fill in anything that I have missed or forgotten. One of the things that we did discuss was that when the entire draft goes out that those applications also be included in part of the package instead of bombarding people with a bunch of different steps that we included as one packet and highlight the areas that have been incorporated and then also leaving time and space so that we can review the whole thing at one time and dedicate like a significant portion of the meeting to going over these things so that all the information is presented in one space instead of piecing it out. And we felt like that would be a more efficient use of the steering committee members time.

01:40:02

Speaker 2

It will be sent out prior to allow folk time to be able to review it. They will be able to see where the original documents where things have been drawn from, be able to give feedback, comments, process things so that when we come back to this meeting, yes, time is of the essence and so that when we come back to this meeting to actually discuss the application and the components as a group, everyone has been provided with the information so that we can actually have a cohesive conversation about it. So it's not that these things have been missed or overlooked.

01:40:39

Speaker 2

We were just trying to fine tune the process so that it minimizes the amount of time



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

that the steering committee members are going to have to invest in actually putting all this together as well as LADC and ccs so that we're not having to do a lot of multiple steps and everyone can get the information. It's all in one space and time so that we can process it and look at it.

01:41:04

Speaker 3

Kevin Harbour has his hand up.

01:41:08

Speaker 2

Thank you Libby.

01:41:10

Speaker 3

I just. Excuse my voice.

01:41:11

Speaker 1

I'm fighting my third round of COVID.

01:41:13

Speaker 3

Here just want to make sure that I understand things correctly. So if your organization is considering submitting a proposal for the Catalyst RFP and there's discussion or evaluation or whatever that pertains to the rfp, then it's incumbent upon us to recuse ourselves and or not attend the meeting.

01:41:41



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 1

I just want to know how that's.

01:41:42

Speaker 3

Going to work in terms of process so that we don't end up getting.

01:41:46

Speaker 2

Tripped up or anyone, any member of the steering committee ends up getting tripped.

01:41:50

Speaker 3

Up on the conflict of interest, should that occur. How is that going to be managed?

01:41:57

Speaker 1

Or maybe I missed something here.

01:42:02

Speaker 3

No, you didn't miss anything. That is. So this has been the guidance that we've received from ccf, since they are fiscal, that we need to have anyone who is part of steering committee, the organization, if they're going to submit a proposal, be, not be included and be privy to the review of the rfp. That includes the actual RFP language as well as the scoring rubric and everything that goes along with that. So that in the future, if an organization who is not represented on the steering committee puts in an application for Catalyst funds, they're not selected, that they can then go back and appeal and say, the reason why weren't able to be selected is because the other groups who applied had a leg up on us.



01:42:57

Speaker 3

They had an advantage because they were privy to what the RFP was going to look like and they had input the RFP ahead of time. So based on this feedback that we received from ccf, that's why we came up with the. Or they came up with the Conflict of interest form with that verbiage that you see there. So you are correct. And the question of if we come back on the 12th or when we come back on the 12th to actually review this and approve it, who should be there at that meeting and not. That's a very good question. I would think that during that conversation and review, anybody who does plan on applying would then have to drop off of that call so the conversation can continue with those steering committee members who are not going to apply for funding.

01:43:45

Speaker 2

Thank you. L. Sorry, Kevin. No.

01:43:48

Speaker 3

If you want to further clarify before I give my final response, please go ahead.

01:43:53

Speaker 2

I was going to say, and that was in response to the conflict of interest comments and statements that were actually coming out of the steering committee. If you all recall, we had. We had significant conversation. The consensus of the group was that if you were going to be present or putting forth a proposal that you should not be involved. There were Arguments on both sides. One was if everybody's given the information, where is the conflict? However, the consensus went with it. And so that's where CF was developing the guidelines from.

01:44:33



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 3

Okay, so, yes, so the main.

01:44:35

Speaker 1

So we want to respect that.

01:44:37

Speaker 3

And so with that said, friendly recommendation is probably two things. Getting the agenda ahead of time is going to be critical because that gives us a heads up on whether we should get on the call when we need to drop off. And then secondly, you, Madam Chair, you're going to have a tough road to.

01:45:00

Speaker 1

Ho, as my grandfather used to say.

01:45:02

Speaker 2

On the ranch and making sure that, you know, and you and the CS.

01:45:08

Speaker 3

And the surf team to make sure.

01:45:10

Speaker 1

That you remind folks of this. And then as we manage these meetings, announced that we're getting ready to get into some information that some of you.



01:45:20

Speaker 3

Might need to drop off this call. And that protects us and the investment that we've made and also makes sure that we have the best proposals going forward with those that are interested in participating.

01:45:36

Speaker 2

And I'll leave it at that.

01:45:37

Speaker 1

Thank you so much.

01:45:38

Speaker 2

Thank you, Kevin.

01:45:42

Speaker 3

Tony has her hand up left next. And then Sharon.

01:45:47

Speaker 6

I think Kevin makes some good recommendations. The other piece that I'm seeing in regions is that the agenda is particularly organized, that this item is at the top or the bottom, and that the convener maintain an Excel list of who is allowed to see information about this and that they publish that list. So that there's the option of, you know, you can take your group. Oh, gosh, we just decided. And then that's the only one where that element comes through. And by showing that the convener has the list,



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

people have the opportunity to go off the list. I love your Excel. Your, you know, we had to check the box.

01:46:30

Speaker 6

So now I've checked the box, you're going to show me the list and I'm going to say I see the list that you really set up a much more defensible piece because of course we also don't know if our organization three weeks from now tells us they want to do it. So it's evolving not because people don't plan, but because just things change. But it has worked in other areas. It's a little bit choppy, but, you know, it can be done and there's really not another way around it.

01:46:59

Speaker 2

Anyway, thank you, Jonah. Can Libby, do you see who else's hands?

01:47:05

Speaker 3

Yeah, Sharon's got her hand up and I did put a Note in the @ responding to you as well. Sharon, I understand your point that you want the Steering committee to Review other regions RFPs like Inland Empire, San Diego, the one in the Northern California as examples and to highlight which of those portions are the best practices that you would like to include. I want LADC and CCF to include in their RFP the final draft that we're going to have.

01:47:31

Speaker 2

So I just.

01:47:33

Speaker 7



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

And that's really what we're going. So thank you for that. But it's not only the rfp, it's the applications as well, because that is specifically what we asked for. You know how much we spent significant amounts of time on the prior two committees working on applications and things that should be on them. And we don't always see eye to eye on how those factors should be not only presented, but how they could be scored. And so having the benefit of the other. Excuse me.

01:48:06

Speaker 3

No, I'm just asking what applications. I'm trying to get clarification.

01:48:09

Speaker 7

So there were, there's a. Before the rfp, what the phrase that was used prior is there was an actual application and a criteria that was published that when I know Inland Empire had an application, not just an rfp. And so I'm wanting to have that information, at least that's how Tanua phrased it. And I had to agree with her from those other regions. So were, I was expecting to see like a combined Google Doc or something. So we could then at least as a group have individuals saying, hey, this is good, this is good. And then the staff do what they need to. But so that it just wasn't being created out of the raw based on perception that might not have. Have the same perspective as those of us on the front lines.

01:48:56

Speaker 3

I think I've been interchanging the definition of RFP and application, I guess for me, because that's what I thought you were referring to when you said that the RFPs or the applications that the other regions that we heard about, like the one we heard about Inland Empire, I've been interchanging those. So to me, when I can go.

01:49:15

Speaker 7



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

With that, I can go with that's fine. It's just that it's, it's giving this body their role of respect to chime in on the major factors, contributing factors that should be included prior to. And that's kind of what I'm really kind of driving home. That's what was important to us. That's what we had consensus around and I can appreciate that. But if you're going out believing you're going to have this RFP document by the 12th, I think there's. It gives us a very clear timeline on how much time staff has to get us something and it should be from other regions. We don't want the final document if we are intending on applying.

01:49:50

Speaker 2
Right.

01:49:50

Speaker 3

And I think that's very reasonable task for that. We give you at least those three that we've received from other organizations or other regions that the steering committee can give feedback and say, this is the sections that I think are important and critical that we include in ours and the other areas that aren't really so much because it really isn't applicable to our region. I think that's fair that we can arrange that with. Well, I'm not the chair. I'm the second. I'm way down the total poll. So I'm gonna stop talking and let the actual chair speak.

01:50:23

Speaker 2

I concur. In fact, I'm actually of the mindset nothing is preventing any of the. Anyone on the committee from gathering the information and making suggestions. So I feel like if, you know, there's a consensus or an opinion that things are moving too slowly, I don't see where, you know, it's hard for anybody to go and look at the. Their websites and look at the information and draw from them and make suggestions also. So.

01:50:54



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 3

So can we have staff do that? Put that together and maybe we can put it in our Google Docs and be able to track the comments like we did before when we were doing our bylaws. Staff, I'm speaking to you now. Wait, did all staff drop off? I know Charles had to go.

01:51:23

Speaker 2

Okay, this is a question of bandwidth.

01:51:26

Speaker 7

And maybe they might need to group.

01:51:27

Speaker 2

And it seems like we're asking them to gather a lot of things. And, and I, I mean, I, I would like to hear if they have the bandwidth for this.

01:51:39

Speaker 1

Lou. I, I think I'll. I'll go defer it to. To show them up if she wants to say anything.

01:51:46

Speaker 3

Yeah.

01:51:47

Speaker 2



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Can clarify what the ask is. Because my concern is that there's ask at the ends of many meetings and they're interpreted differently.

01:51:56

Speaker 3

And it's not that the staff is.

01:51:58

Speaker 2

Deficient in any manner. We interpret things differently when we hear.

01:52:02

Speaker 3

Them at the end call. So to clarify is the ask that the steering committee, that the staff, the.

01:52:09

Speaker 2

CJF team, gathers the applications or solicitations.

01:52:14

Speaker 3

And rubrics from the other regions and.

01:52:17

Speaker 2

Shares that with the steering committee ahead.

01:52:20



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 3

Of us finalizing the draft regional R Regions application. Yes, that is it. And it's not saying all of Them. I know that there were a couple in particular that steering committee spoke of. I know one was the Inland Empire and I think the other was San Diego because those were ones that we had some conversations about in the past meetings but that you would be able to share those in a document in Google.

01:52:48

Speaker 3

So that I would imagine to make it the easiest is the way that we did the bylaws where everyone was allowed to go in and put their comments and notes in there so that they'd be able to give that feedback that then you staff would be able to take into consideration and incorporate those comments and those recommendations of what pieces are would be great for us to use into whatever draft that you're going to have developed. And I know that your draft supposed to be done by next Friday. I understand that.

01:53:19

Speaker 1

Right.

01:53:19

Speaker 3

Because this is 22nd. But it's also clear from the steering committee members that they need to have input and not have LAEDC and CCF drafting it without their input and suggestions at the forefront as opposed to at the back end. And it's in our best interest to do that because if we don't, we're going to get end up having a big blow up of people frustrated that this wasn't our doing. This wasn't our say. This was, you know, our conveners taking the lead and taking control when it wasn't our direction that was guiding them. We all know that's what's going to end up happening.

01:54:02



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 3

So if there is some way that you could get at least the Inland Empire in San Diego in a word format that you can put into the Google Drive, send it out in an email to everyone and say we need your feedback. Look at this review it highlight the areas that are most important to you that you think we need to make sure that we include in our application or rfp, I'm using those interchangeably then that's what we are requesting staff to do.

01:54:29

Speaker 2

Okay.

01:54:31

Speaker 3

Oh, just quickly I'll say that there.

01:54:33

Speaker 2

Are a few regions that we've already. We know that their application process is open and available.

01:54:40

Speaker 3

I don't think they're either the IE or San Diego. They were up north regions.

01:54:45

Speaker 2

But what we can do is we'll confer with ccf.

01:54:49

Speaker 3



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

We will see about putting them in one file together. Work with Juan and send that out to the steering committee. We'll, we will check with CCF right.

01:55:01

Speaker 2

After this call to make sure this is okay because we are the stewardship committee combined and we'll send that out to you, if that's feasible. And then what we can do is.

01:55:13

Speaker 3

As you mentioned, have it where the comments are available on the side. There's about three regions I know of, I think we'll.

01:55:20

Speaker 2

Two that I know of that have.

01:55:22

Speaker 3

Where we can link their information.

01:55:25

Speaker 2

This is similar to previously when we.

01:55:27

Speaker 3

Asked you all to provide us with suggestions.



01:55:30

Speaker 2

And so I want.

01:55:31

Speaker 3

I just want to reiterate that is always available.

01:55:34

Speaker 2

The link is in the resource tracker. If you see something, if you already saw something from a region, any of.

01:55:40

Speaker 3

The steering committee members, you could put.

01:55:43

Speaker 2

It in that link and send it.

01:55:44

Speaker 3

To us as a suggestion. And that was suggested a few meetings.

01:55:52

Speaker 2

Ago for the specific reason of dealing.



01:55:54

Speaker 3

With the conflict of interest.

01:55:56

Speaker 2

So we'll go ahead and do that. But I will say we will have.

01:56:01

Speaker 3

A timeline on it end of day.

01:56:04

Speaker 2

Maybe a Tuesday or something, because, yes, the timeline is very tight.

01:56:10

Speaker 1

And just real quick to add to what she was saying, real quick. It just as a friendly reminder, other regions are much different than Los Angeles. So I just want to be clear on that some of the things that you may be reviewing from other regions may not even be feasible here. So just putting that out there so that everyone's aware, because our user is much more dynamic. So our application's gonna have to be a little bit more thorough as a result of that.

01:56:38

Speaker 2

And if I could also add we're over time, but. And I was going to address this as part of the next steps. One of the things that would simplify these, the frustration and the conversations. We've asked repeatedly that requests be put into writing because there's



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

a difference between a suggestion and an actual, for lack of a better word, demand of the staff. And so putting the request in writing actually solidifies, eliminates miscommunication about what you're asking for. Because what I heard was it would be great if we could see what other regions are doing. And so we had discussed actually incorporating that into the packet that was going out. So if we can see requests in writing, that definitely helps us clarify what is being asked for. And then if I could also reiterate that we would really love to hear from multiple voices.

01:57:35

Speaker 2

We do not have spokespeople on the committee. And so if there are concerns that there are a number of ways that you can bring up your concerns and suggestions. There are links where you can add things, you can email the opportunities and send information. I think that we have been really responsive to those requests. And then also the proposed agenda items. I think that will help eliminate. Eliminate a lot of the miscommunication that appears to be happening around processes and moving forward. If we have something in writing, then that gives us something to work from. But there are a lot of conversations that are had during these meetings. And like I said, some of these things are just taken as an FYI or a suggestion. They're not taken as a. Let's move forward with this. Okay. Next slide or past this part? Sorry.

01:58:46

Speaker 1

Did you want me to continue on to the next slide?

01:58:48

Speaker 2

Please go ahead. And thank you. For those of you who are hanging in there, I know that everyone has busy days. Is this me?

01:59:04



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 1
I think Shioma.

01:59:06
Speaker 5
I think.

01:59:06
Speaker 2
Is this okay?

01:59:07
Speaker 1
I think this is Shioma.

01:59:09
Speaker 3
Oh, okay. You know what? This was from the last meeting.

01:59:12
Speaker 2
We didn't need to include this. If anyone has any additional questions though, they can see more details of this or just this exact pretty much slide in the project proposal folder. But this is the holdover from the.

01:59:27
Speaker 3
Last meeting for those who need a clarification.



01:59:30

Speaker 2

And the same with this one with the activities.

01:59:32

Speaker 3

If you need to know the activities, please take a look at the Project Ideas Proposal portal.

01:59:41

Speaker 2

I'm sorry.

01:59:43

Speaker 3

Okay, next steps.

01:59:44

Speaker 2

Next steps. Yes, take a look at that portal. Please keep up with the bookmark. As mentioned, the resource tracker. Because I think all of the necessary important links are available in that resource tracker. If you are interested in just collaboration. Again, that is also a tab on.

02:00:07

Speaker 3

That Project Ideas portal.

02:00:10



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 2

But if you have an idea you.

02:00:11

Speaker 3

Have not included in there yet, please.

02:00:14

Speaker 2

Do the activation plan.

02:00:17

Speaker 3

Yes, I believe an email has gone out while we're on the call regarding the activation plan and a vote that you all will be doing for the one.

02:00:32

Speaker 2

Okay. And yeah, you know, keep an eye.

02:00:37

Speaker 3

Out for any emails from us and please make sure your our emails are.

02:00:43

Speaker 2

Not going to your spam folder. Our next steering committee meeting will be December 12th. There will not be a second one for the month of November or December.



02:00:55

Speaker 3

Due to the holidays. So we have today and then we.

02:00:59

Speaker 2

Have one in December.

02:01:00

Speaker 3

Then we'll see you again in 2025.

02:01:04

Speaker 2

And then our next monthly partners meeting will be December 13.

02:01:12

Speaker 3

So in the chat, Sharon has put a motion in for a special purpose meeting in light of actionables. I am motioning for two special purpose meetings to address distribution fund allocation and activation planning. So she's. She's making a motion for two different ones. One that addresses how we're going to do the decision, distribution fund allocation determination and then a second one on the activation planning for the different activation Plans.

02:01:43

Speaker 4

I would, I would just say we don't have quorum. We've had a lot of our members drop off. So I don't know procedurally how. How you all wish to proceed.



02:01:54

Speaker 7

Thank you for noting.

02:02:00

Speaker 2

Well, we don't have quorum. We've run into this before and during. And the fact that the activation planning selection needs to actually be done. I don't see where there would even be space to meet before. Is it Tuesday?

02:02:16

Speaker 7

So can we. My motion is standing. I would like. Can we put this out to membership of the steering committee? We have some major items that we did not get to that we said were going to meet. If we only meet on December 12, there's no way we can cover distribution, agreeing on distribution, framework on distribution, geographic that we propose geographic discussions. There's no way we can get to that and address the activation planning. That's going to be discussions that are going to be necessary to do the meet the January activation deadline. So I do think we need to have another meeting in December and we need to have another meeting January. So I am requesting two special purpose meetings because of the depth of the work that has been proposed today.

02:03:02

Speaker 2

But we don't have anyone second.

02:03:06

Speaker 7

We vote by email all the time.



02:03:09

Speaker 2

Well, you're making the motion, but the motion doesn't. It hasn't been seconded and we can't vote on it.

02:03:17

Speaker 7

The motion has been seconded.

02:03:18

Speaker 1

There's a second in the chat.

02:03:22

Speaker 2

But we. If we don't have quorum to vote.

02:03:24

Speaker 7

On it, we vote by mail. That's what we're doing on the other thing, aren't we. Aren't we about to vote by mail on the. On the. You have a vote out to mail. We vote by mail. You have one open right now.

02:03:37

Speaker 2

Yeah, but we had already put it out there before the vote. So right now you're. We're asking for a small group of people to determine that there's going to be a vote as opposed. Opposed to before the process that we've actually been told we need to adhere to multiple times is that the information needs to be presented ahead of time.



02:03:59

Speaker 7

No, Madam Chair, when you have a motion that has been printed to the floor and seconded by a member of a committee, it goes out to vote. If there's discussion, we can bring it back for discussion, certainly. But the discussion happens. You know, it. It has been motioned and seconded.

02:04:15

Speaker 2

There's not a quorum right now. May I.

02:04:18

Speaker 7

May I just make an observation? This is a largely silent room, but.

02:04:24

Speaker 2

There's a lot of people who have some opinions and insights. My frustration and I would not vote.

02:04:30

Speaker 7

For extra meetings because we have gotten really good at slowing things down. I'm just going to speak very frankly. We have to figure the timelines.

02:04:39

Speaker 2

Are what they are and we as a committee have to figure out how.



02:04:43

Speaker 7

To speed ourselves up. And so whatever we have to do to make that happen, that's on us to speed up. It's not on us to add more meetings and more bureaucracy when the reality of it is this whole group, this.

02:04:57

Speaker 2

Is for the vast.

02:04:58

Speaker 7

Well, no, some of us, it's volunteer time and we have full time jobs.

02:05:04

Speaker 2

And even some of you who are.

02:05:05

Speaker 7

Getting compensation, you still have full time jobs. So to add more meetings on top of that, I can tell you between now and the January deadline, I can't add two more meetings to my schedule. It's not, it's not possible. And so I wouldn't support it. I think instead of adding meetings, instead of that being our go to posture, we need to figure out a way to speed up.

02:05:27

Speaker 2

And we did actually request all distribution suggestions and report proposal. We've been asking for them for the last few meetings.



02:05:39

Speaker 7

I will submit by opportunity because there was a promise made by you, Madam Chair, on a distribution discussion meeting to Luis Pertill, but he's not here to represent himself. That has been told that we would have a meeting regarding that. I'll put it in. I'll schedule it via opportunity. I know our members aren't here today because they are at a conference. I'll put it in an opportunity. Thank you.

02:05:59

Speaker 2

Okay. Because I do want to emphasize we have repeatedly asked for proposals and it was only because we did not receive any proposals that we took the time to come up with the proposal that was presented today. And we have repeatedly been asking for proposals. And so I feel like I, I'm with Jennifer. It's like this dragging things out when we're not getting the responses to even discuss or evaluate. We made space and took time and you know, and I feel like if we can't get these things in writing so that we can get them out to the group to look at ahead of time, that's problematic. And it doesn't really provide the steering committee with the opportunity to adequately do analysis of items and get the information that they need to make decisions.

02:07:03

Speaker 3

Okay, so we're leaving it where I know, I'm vice chair. I will say this. While we presented you with a framework of what the chairs discuss for the disbursement. It isn't something that is fully fleshed out in a paragraph or written format for everyone to review and to, you know, ruminate over and vote on. So we do still need to get something so that we get that to the steering committee so they can vote on. Sharon, I understand that. I read, I read your note that you want to offer additional framework or ideas on how to do the disbursement and I would have to say that we are open to that because right now there is nothing solid and concrete that we have written to share and to vote on.



02:08:02

Speaker 3

If that were the case, we would have given that today and put that out there for a vote. So in order to I'm trying to find a strike a balance here with taking into consideration what Jennifer has commented. I'm sure many others do feel the same, that another meeting is just not something that's within us to do. But having input in writing that we can all review and then bring back to the full steering committee via email to vote on, we can do because we got to do that before the 12th because they need to have that included as part of the application RFP and we're the ones who have to vote on what that's going to look like. Is that acceptable? So send whatever your alternative frameworks are into.

02:08:48

Speaker 3

I'm stressing staff, I guess to surf or do you want them to come directly to us?

02:08:52

Speaker 2

Andrea, there's the proposal link that is part of the agenda every week that folk are supposed to use.

02:09:04

Speaker 3

Is that I thought that was for meeting agenda. Is that for anything, any comments or.

02:09:07

Speaker 2

Feedback that's for anything that they want to discuss.

02:09:12



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 1

Okay, I can add that link in just a minute. In a second.

02:09:19

Speaker 3

Is that acceptable and doable for us?

02:09:22

Speaker 7

Sharon, I'm gonna, I'm completing the request form now. I will be submitting to one for two special purpose meetings and I'll make sure it goes to all the members of the steering committee who are not here so that they can chime in on whether they want that. I know everybody won't be able to attend, but I think it should be up to the 38 of us whether or not we believe that's important. And then I will proposing a framework for discussion so that committee members can have a viable discussion about what that framework looks like.

02:09:57

Speaker 2

Madam Chair. All right. Unless there are any other issues that need to be addressed, we are ending the meeting at 3.

02:10:09

Speaker 1

Everybody have a Happy Thanksgiving. It'll, it'll all be okay. We'll work through it. I'll take care.

02:10:17

Speaker 3

God bless you.



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

02:10:18

Speaker 1

All right.

02:10:19

Speaker 7

And be grateful.

02:10:20

Speaker 1

Absolutely. Take some time with your family. Self care is the best care.

02:10:25

Speaker 7

Absolutely.

02:10:27

Speaker 1

Talk to you soon.

02:10:28

Speaker 3

All right.

02:10:28

Speaker 2

Bye.



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

02:10:28

Speaker 3

Bye.

02:10:29

Speaker 1

Bye.

02:10:29

Speaker 2

Bye. How do I get out?

02:10:36

Speaker 7

How do I get out?