



Steering Committee Monthly Meeting December 12, 2024

[Presentation](#)

[Recording](#)

- Passcode: wgkAY1!1

[Summary Notes](#)

[Meeting Transcript](#)

Summary Notes

The last Steering Committee meeting of the year discussed several key topics, including fiscal updates and the introduction of the Sector Investment Coordinators, HR&A Advisors, who aim to support equitable community development. HR&A provided an overview of their mission as an organization, outlined their objectives and work plan for the Catalyst Phase.

CCF, the fiscal agent reviewed the conflict of interest policy and the importance to maintaining a fair and transparent process for all participants of the collaborative. CCF provided updates on prior requests received from the Steering Committee and updates on the development of the Catalyst RFP and the RFP Development Subcommittee.

A focus was placed on the transportation and logistics sector for the first activation work plan, with an emphasis on equity criteria in the RFP process. Members engaged in discussions regarding the implications of these criteria, steering committee involvement, and potential timeline delays. Action items included filling out attendance forms, submitting agenda topics, finalizing motions, and preparing communications on the equity proposal. The next meeting is scheduled for January 9th.



Meeting Introduction and Housekeeping (00:26 - 16:19)

- Last steering committee meeting of the year
- Reminder to fill out attendance form
- Questions to be put in chat, addressed at end of each section
- Agenda overview: welcome, fiscal updates, catalyst phase, draft activation plan, project ideas portal, next steps

Sector Investment Coordinator Introduction (16:19 - 25:21)

- HR Day Advisors team introduced: Connie Chung, Jane Carlson, Matt Phillips
- Mission: Create vital places, build equitable communities
- Objectives: Support decision-making, empower disinvested communities, fulfill planning phase objectives, build capacity

Fiscal Agent Updates and RFP Development (25:23 - 35:48)

- Conflict of interest guidelines emphasized
- Catalyst RFP materials from other regions cannot be shared
- Equity criteria and Catalyst Distribution Plan accepted as public comment
- Catalyst RFP Development Subcommittee overseeing RFP development

Catalyst Phase Overview and Timeline (35:48 - 41:33)

- Catalyst phase accepting proposals for development and planning stages
- \$14 million per region for funding
- RFP to be released January 27, 2025
- Proposal conferences and Q&A period planned

Activation Work Plan and Sector Focus (41:34 - 53:45)

- Transportation and logistics sector chosen for first activation work plan
- Five traded sectors identified for activation plans by June 30, 2025



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

- Steering Committee engagement opportunities planned

Project Ideas Portal and Next Steps (53:50 - 01:01:04)

- 32 projects currently in the portal
- Reminder to input project ideas
- Prepare for Catalyst funding release
- Next steering committee meeting on January 9th

Discussion on Equity Criteria and RFP Process (01:01:04 - 01:30:34)

- Debate over incorporation of equity criteria into RFP
- Concerns raised about steering committee's role in RFP development
- Discussion on conflict of interest and fair process

Proposals for Steering Committee Involvement (01:30:34 - 01:48:27)

- Suggestions for steering committee to nominate independent members for RFP subcommittee
- Debate on conflict of interest and fair representation
- Concerns about timeline and legal compliance

Timeline Concerns and Next Steps (01:48:27 - 02:05:34)

- Discussion on potential delays to RFP release and project implementation
- Proposals for additional meetings and review processes
- Agreement to submit formal motions for voting

Meeting Transcript

00:25

Speaker 1

It.

00:50



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 2
It.

01:16

Speaker 3
It.

01:42

Speaker 2
It.

02:07

Speaker 3
It.

02:33

Speaker 1
It, it.

03:28

Speaker 4
Hey Juan, how's it going? Hey, Arman.

03:34

Speaker 3
Yeah, I'm gonna start letting people in. Okay, wait, actually, I can't recall right. I, I, I started the zoom. But when do we start letting people in already or.

03:48



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 4

Yeah, whenever you want. Yeah, I would say just like within the last three minutes of the hour is fine. Two minutes.

03:55

Speaker 3

Yeah. Okay, thanks.

04:30

Speaker 4

Hey Juan, just because I added that one slide, you refreshed it right since the meeting.

04:43

Speaker 3

Let me see, which slide is it?

04:46

Speaker 4

It's just the portal. Okay.

04:48

Speaker 3

Project Ideas portal.

04:49

Speaker 1

Yeah, I have it.

04:51



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 4
Thank you.

04:52

Speaker 3
Yeah, it.

05:31

Speaker 1
It, it.

07:06

Speaker 3
Hi, thank you for joining. We're going to give it a few minutes for folks to get logged in.
Thank you for being on time.

08:30

Speaker 2
Sa.

09:44

Speaker 3
Hi Andrea.

09:45

Speaker 5
Hi everybody, it's Stella.

09:46



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 3

I'm on my phone in the car. Okay, okay, no problem.

09:53

Speaker 5

Thank you.

09:53

Speaker 2

Thank you.

09:55

Speaker 3

Okay, let's give it one more minute and then let's get the ball rolling. And if I could just remind everyone to fill out the attendance form that is in the chat. Okay. Should we get started? Thank you everyone for coming. This is our last steering committee meeting of the year time. Say goodbye to 2024. All right, welcome. Thank you. I see some folks are still popping in. Reminder to fill out the attendance form. December 12th meetings are recorded. We have a very jam packed agenda today. And so as each section is being presented, we ask that questions be put in the chat and we will address the questions at the end.

12:12

Speaker 3

If you're unable to type into the chat, then feel free to raise your hand at the end of each section and we will be acknowledging folks and answering or hearing the questions and doing our best to answer them. Next slide. First slide. Next slide. Who's controlling the slides? Hey Juan, are you there to advance the slide?

12:46



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 6

Yeah, I don't think he can hear you. So let me.

13:06

Speaker 3

Okay, so intro to the agenda. We're going to go through the usual welcome and housekeeping sector investment coordinators are going to be introducing themselves. The fiscal updates. We're going to talk about the catalyst phase and do a brief overview, go over the timeline again. The draft activation plan, the and then talk a little bit about the project ideas portal, next steps and then our upcoming meetings.

13:34

Speaker 6

Andrea, Juan is having issues so you'll probably have to jump off and jump back on. Give me a sec.

13:40

Speaker 3

Okay, no problem. Oh, and just a quick reminder moving forward, any agenda items that you'd like to have heard, please be sure to submit them. There is a form that is available that we post and it's available online for you to submit any proposed agenda topics. Okay. Is he back, everyone? I was having some audio issues and.

14:25

Speaker 4

I can hear everyone clearly now.

14:27

Speaker 3

Yay. Okay, we can go to the next slide.



14:34

Speaker 1

I had a question.

14:35

Speaker 3

Oh, okay.

14:37

Speaker 1

Yeah. There was a number of items that were sent out for vote over email. Are those going to be reported out? Are they. Is there somewhere on the agenda for to share what the results of those were?

14:51

Speaker 3

I thought they were shared.

14:55

Speaker 1

How were they shared?

14:56

Speaker 3

I thought they went out by email and were shared out. The results we can do. We can do a quick summary after we get through everything. All right, housekeeping, make sure again, make sure to submit your attendance using the link in the form. We're going to be putting questions in the chat at the end of each section of the agenda today. And then if you cannot type, then feel free to raise your hand at the end. And we will be acknowledging and bringing people forward based on the order that we see them. If you



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

are a designated alternate, make sure to also complete the form, the attendance form. Make sure you designate that you're the alternate so that we know how to credit your organization.

15:49

Speaker 3

And in the future, make sure that we are completing the form ahead of time so that they know how to designate where folk are and what organizations they belong to. Again, if you want to propose an agenda item, use the Google form and submit your request. And then the CJF team, we have the resource tracker, as many of you are aware, there's the link to it right there. And so it has all of our documents and resources that are related to our steering committee. And if there are any issues that you feel are unresolved, we have the opportunities department where you're free to email me. My email address is right there. And we've had a lot of success so far with it. So feel free to send in any concerns or complaints for us to be able to address them and resolve them.

16:48

Speaker 4

Next slide, quick thing on here.

16:51

Speaker 1

Again, sorry. Were there any agenda items that were submitted but not included on the agenda?

16:58

Speaker 3

No.

17:02

Speaker 1



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

None. So any sub request that was submitted for to an inclusion on the agenda item is on the agenda.

17:09

Speaker 3

We have not received any requests.

17:13

Speaker 4

Actually, Andrea, I think we did receive.

17:17

Speaker 3

One request from Luis and I think we, our team and ccf, I think we might have responded to that via email. And I think we are going to.

17:28

Speaker 1

Address some of that in the meeting today.

17:32

Speaker 3

Okay. I want to make sure, in the future, could you make sure that we see the request also? Because I do ask and I was not given any requests. So I apologize, Louise.

17:45

Speaker 1

That's my concern is that I think we're some. I know my request was not put directly on the agenda, so I wondered if somebody else was. And so I think, at very minimum, the chair should be informed of all requests that come in. And if something isn't included,



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

they should be informed as to why so that they can report out this came what was requested. We did tell them not to, because I think all committee, all standard committee members should have the right to put items on the agenda. And if it's not put on the agenda, there should be at least an explanation as to why that was the case. Thank you.

18:19

Speaker 3

I definitely would agree with that. Yeah. If we could be sent the proposed agenda items before the leadership meeting, then that would be helpful. So at least we know what people are concerned with. Okay. And, Louise, next time, wait for us to call on you. All right.

18:46

Speaker 1

I keep raising my hand, but nobody calls it. So I'm wondering if maybe you're not seeing it on your screen.

18:51

Speaker 3

Well, you. Okay. All right. And honestly, I don't think anybody has the opportunity, but. Okay. I will definitely keep an eye out. Sector Investment Coordinator intro. Right.

19:07

Speaker 7

I think that's my cue. Hi, everyone. Connie Chung. I'm a partner with HR Day Advisors. I will just note that it seems that my Internet is a bit glitchy, so if my face freezes in a weird facial expression, please excuse that and listen to my voice instead. And let me just get a thumbs up from my team that my voice is sounding okay, too. Okay, great. Thanks. We can advance to the next slide. Our goal was to introduce HR Day Advisors as the Sector Investment Coordinator team today. We're represented by myself, Jane Carlson, and Matt Phillips, a name that you may be familiar with. I'll just provide a very



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

brief intro of who we are and our roles, and you'll be hearing from Jane and Matt a little bit later in the presentation.

20:05

Speaker 7

So I'm actually managing partner of our Los Angeles office of HR Advisors. I'm born and raised Angeleno, and my role as managing partner is really to think about and grow our impact in the Los Angeles region. So you can imagine that this is a really exciting moment and project for us to be working with you all and partners with you and CCF and LAEDC in this important work for our region. I'll also mention that I come from a manufacturing family, so I have deep respect for what that means in Los Angeles in 2024 and in decades past as well. Jane Carlson is here. She's a principal in our Los Angeles office. She is our Project manager. So she's someone whose name you should become familiar with. And again, you'll hear from her a little bit later.

21:00

Speaker 7

But I just wanted to say that she's a really important part our project ecosystem and has an incredible depth of knowledge in economic development and project management as well. And Matt Phillips, lastly, you probably don't need to connect his name to his face. You probably remember him from his days from the state working on Jobs first in coordination with the LA Regional Collaborative as well as many other regional collaboratives. Matt is sort of joining forces at HR as an independent contractor and working with us to really be the bridge between the kind of goals of the Job first program in terms of his institutional knowledge as well as being able to help the Steering committee kind of advance in the Catalyst phase. Next slide please. I forgot I wasn't in charge.

21:56

Speaker 7

I just want to bring our mission statement to the forefront and it really explains, I think, why we're so excited for this opportunity to work with you all. Our mission statement



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

really is to create vital places and build more equitable and resilient communities and to improve the lives of people who live in those communities. So it is really part of our mission, ingrained in who we are, that our Los Angeles based team is doing this work alongside you. Next slide, please. And we have just four overarching objectives for our work as serving as Sector Investment Coordinator. First, to really support the Steering Committee's ability to achieve decision making and to provide guidance to you by soliciting, evaluating and then recommending the projects for Catalyst funding.

22:52

Speaker 7

So we want to help you make the really hard decisions and important decisions about what to fund for the Catalyst Phase. Our second objective is really important. To empower historically disinvested communities to participate equitably in the Catalyst Program and thrive as our region transitions. Third, to make sure that the pipeline of Catalyst pre development projects fulfill the planning phase objectives of California Jobs first and also invest in high growth industries that have already been identified. And fourth, we really believe our objective is to help build capacity throughout the region. And we'll do that through a number of methods that Jane will talk about next. And that's really to realize the goals of the LA Regional Plan Parts one and two that you all have worked so very hard on for many months. Next slide please.

23:53

Speaker 7

So we have three aspects of our work plan that will help us realize those objectives. There's a lot of text on the slide and I don't want to read it. To you. But you know, it's really three categories of work. So the first is developing the structure and process for the solicitation and evaluation of Catalyst projects. The second is to build industry ecosystems, and that's through outreach and building out the industry ecosystems in relation to Catalyst project support. And third is to support the existing governance infrastructure that has already been created with the Steering Committee with Ia, EDC and CCF as Stewardship Committee, as well as your subcommittees. I just want to note too that our work plan itself is being finalized at this moment.



25:03

Speaker 7

So once we do finalize that, we will share it with you after it's gone through the review and approval process with the Stewardship Committee. But this content really speaks to the areas of focus and then the objectives on the prior slide. Next slide, please. So just in terms of our next steps, we will continue working with the RFP Development Subcommittee on the RFP and scoring criteria that you'll be hearing about today. We'll support the outreach effort so that we can make sure that folks hear about and understand what the Catalyst Phase is and information about the upcoming RFPs so that they can get ready. We will actually be conducting some Catalyst Phase webinars that will be available to all collaborative partners.

25:56

Speaker 7

And that's really to support the outreach effort because we want to reach people in as many sort of ways targeted to target people as we can and also to make sure that there are multiple ways to access the information. And lastly, we are going to collaborate with the Stewardship Committee with LAEDC on the activation plan draft. The first one of those is actually due at the end of January 2025. That's a state requirement that be submitted and that will also be discussed a little bit later today. And with that we can advance the slide. And I will pass it to Jane. I.

26:47

Speaker 4

Sorry everyone, there's a little mix.

26:49

Speaker 3

Up on my end. Just give me one moment.

26:54



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 2
All good?

26:55

Speaker 7
Thank you, Juan.

27:11

Speaker 2
It.

27:54

Speaker 6

If you can go to the fiscal Agent updates and then we'll go back to the RFP sub Development Committee, which HRNA will be covering. I think there's another slide, Juan. The next one. Okay, great. Good afternoon everyone. Ifania from the CCF team. We wanted to provide a brief update on a couple of things, including recent steering committee requests, as well as insight into the Catalyst RFP development process and the public comment consideration process. So we'll hold off on questions now because we might answer some of these questions as we move through the R update. So wanted to just kind of be in alignment with everybody on what we are defining as a conflict of interest and why it's so important.

29:03

Speaker 6

So wanted to direct your attention to the language that's already been set in place and we'll include it in the chat briefly about conflict of interest and how we're adhering to maintaining an equitable and fair process, why this is important again, to maintain a fair and transparent process for all participants of the Collaborative and then also to operate in accordance with the norms of our organizations. The folks that must have adhered to it are of course everybody on this call, including the Stewardship Committee,



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

the Sector Investment Coordinator who we just met, and the LA Collaborative, which is you all.

29:51

Speaker 6

One thing that we've been stressing so much is that we do want to make this a transparent process to the extent that it does not provide an unfair advantage to members of the Steering Committee meeting, because this RFP process is going to be distributed throughout LA County. So we don't want to be in a position where we're making decisions on something that we're also applying to. So just wanted to kind of be in alignment with that. Go ahead, Nicole.

30:31

Speaker 2

As far as the three main requests we received, the first one on sharing the Catalyst RFP materials from the other regions, after review we determined that the Stewardship Committee cannot share other regions RFPS applications.

30:46

Speaker 6

Can you go to the next slide, Juan, please?

30:52

Speaker 3

Yes.

30:53

Speaker 2

So the first on sharing other Regions Catalyst RFP materials After review, we determined the Stewardship Committee cannot share other regions, applications or scoring rubrics because it would create an unfair advantage for members of the



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Steering Committee. But Steering Committee members can independently obtain publicly available materials and share that feedback with us@sarfaedc.org who made that determination?

31:22

Speaker 2

Sorry, we're going to hold off onto questions that might be answered later on for the second request on the Equity criteria and the Catalyst Distribution Plan, we really want to acknowledge the hard work that went into developing the Equity criteria and since CCF recently joined this discussion, we've decided to accept the document as public comment to prevent any real or perceived conflicts of interest from the Steering Committee and as a result, we will not be voting on any public comments received, nor taking individual questions about the active RFP development process. The Catalyst RFP Development Subcommittee, which is comprised of la, edc, ccf, HRNA and non conflicted Steering Committee members, are overseeing the development of the rfp, including the Equity Criteria Distribution Plan and Scoring rubric.

32:13

Speaker 2

The deadline for Steering Committee members to submit that feedback was on Monday, December 2, end of day via the surf email. For the third request for the Subcommittee participation Steering Committee members not applying for the Catalyst RFP who wish to join the RFP Development subcommittee had until November 26th to submit the Participation Form. Two people submitted the form and one person, being Libby, decided to move forward with joining the Steering Committee. A detailed response to all of these requests was emailed by the co chairs on Friday, November 22, and we attached a PDF in the comments for your reference and finally for your awareness. The scoring process for the Catalyst projects will involve ccf, HRNA and independent reviewers. LAADC will not be a part of the scoring process.

33:03

Speaker 2



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

If you have any questions, please share them in the chat and we'll address them later to avoid cutting into the agenda. Many may be answered as we proceed, but we're happy to follow up on anything unclear. Thank you for your partnership.

33:17

Speaker 3

Louise, do you still have a question or is your hand up?

33:20

Speaker 1

Yes, I still have a lot of questions actually. Okay, and this is actually getting. Let's start off with the basic one. Go back to the previous slide. Who was on the Catalyst, the working group, whatever it is that you said that. Non conflicting members. So who's on that? Libby, who list every member. Who's on that? The Catalyst RFP Development Committee.

33:43

Speaker 6

So Luis, if you can. If you can refer to the PDF that was shared, it's also listed there. And as Nicole mentioned, it's ccf, ladc, HRNA and Libby, who's the only non conflicting member of the steering committee who opted into participate into the process.

34:03

Speaker 1

So where. Where is that? Show me on the paper.

34:05

Speaker 3

Where that in the chat.



34:07

Speaker 1

I have the PDF in front of me, so I'm trying to see where.

34:12

Speaker 6

Okay, we can go through it. It's.

34:14

Speaker 2

It's right there. Number two, it says the Catalyst Subcommittee, including ladc, ATRNA and non conflicted SC members.

34:22

Speaker 1

Who from those groups, who from ladc, who from hrna? Is it five people? Is it one person?

34:27

Speaker 2

It's everyone.

34:29

Speaker 1

So how many actual individual people make up this committee?

34:36

Speaker 2

Maybe nine of us.



34:38

Speaker 1

So if I were to ask for a list of list. Tell me all of the participants, is someone able to provide that?

34:43

Speaker 2

Yeah, it's the H and R reps that you literally just got introduced.

34:47

Speaker 1

People.

34:47

Speaker 2

Yes, I'm saying it's the three HRNA reps you just met. And it's all of the LADC staff that you see here on this call.

34:56

Speaker 6

And the CCF staff members that you see on this call as well.

34:59

Speaker 2

And CCF staff. Thank you. As well. And then myself, the only non conflicted organization from Steering Committee.

35:06

Speaker 1



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

So again, I think this is a pattern of the steering committee setting its policies, setting things it wants to do and people going other ways. So I asked the question who, when they made the determination that no more, you know, providing these materials wouldn't be so like for the determination that we're not going to share Other Series 8 Regions Catalyst RFP materials, which I'm assuming if they're not asking for pre stuff that's in the works, but public who made the determination. So I guess this committee made the determination.

35:41

Speaker 3

Oh, sorry. It's funny, Louise, to go and get the materials on your. On their own. On your own. Each person is able to get the materials on their own and review them if they'd like. However they decided what was decided and I won't say they. What was decided was that would definitely be giving the steering committee an unfair advantage in the application process over the other general committee members. In order, if were to provide those materials out so you're able to independently go and get them on your own, there's nothing stopping you from that. However, this, what was decided was that the reviewers and the people who are creating the application won't be facilitating that for the steering committee members.

36:29

Speaker 1

Okay, So I would say for the steering committee members, I think we're ending our situation where we have been put in a situation where we have no say over any of this. We've allowed outside groups to essentially take over the process, make determinations, not have any way for us to be informed of these determinations.

36:48

Speaker 3

Or constructing because we are being informed.

36:51



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 1

So I'm. So I'm looking at the. And maybe I'm reading it wrong. So were told right now that LA EDC is not on the RFP Development Subcommittee. Is that correct?

37:00

Speaker 3

Yes, that's correct.

37:02

Speaker 1

Then why am I reading the PDF?

37:03

Speaker 2

No, no, what you were told is they won't be part of the review process. They will not be reviewing and scoring any projects, but they are assisting in assembling the RFP itself.

37:14

Speaker 1

So. Okay, so is CCF assisting in developing the rfp?

37:19

Speaker 6

Yes, we are.

37:20

Speaker 2

They have to because they are contractual.



37:25

Speaker 1

That was sent out.

37:27

Speaker 3

And again, so if is our compliance officer. So they have to be involved in the process.

37:32

Speaker 1

I'm not arguing that they not be included. I'm just saying that the email that they put in the stereo as the PDF that reported out whose part of it did not listen ccf. And now you're telling me, hey, no, there's this separate group that now will be judging them. So I'm wondering who is the group that's going to be judging them and who is on that?

37:50

Speaker 6

That has not been decided. We're not at that stage yet. The RFP has not yet been released. We were just trying to provide you information, like forecasting your questions about who will be scoring the projects. We have not selected the final individuals that will be scoring.

38:08

Speaker 1

And I guess my question is, I don't think it should be up to ccf. It shouldn't be up to ladc. It should be up to the steering committee to make that determination of who should be on that.

38:16

Speaker 3



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Can you submit. Can you submit what your concerns are through the opportunities thing so that we can actually look at what specifically your concerns are?

38:25

Speaker 1

Yeah, but I guess my. My biggest concern, the one I had put submitted as an agenda and request, was that we want to make sure that what happened with the outreach to ethnic and minority communities doesn't happen again. Which is multiple events were supposed to happen in each of the service planning areas. None of that happened. Instead, we had one event where one vendor do five events. We tried for the sector investment coordinators. The impression was that, hey, were supposed to get five different vendors. We got one. And I saw myself.

38:55

Speaker 3

That's not what the. Louise, that's actually not what it said.

39:00

Speaker 1

I know. So. But then I'm only seeing three people listed. Is that the three investment coordinators or there are two people missing? Anyways, well, that's a different issue.

39:11

Speaker 3

But yeah, I don't understand. I don't. We're talking about.

39:14

Speaker 1

So, okay, so my concern is. So I want to make sure that every region gets projects, every region gets supported. So my request had been that, hey, every. That the, that the steering committee, that CJF or ALLA county will ensure that every region, every spa



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

gets at least one catalyst project funded within its region. That's it. This is consistent with what we asked for when we did the equity criteria. It's consistent when the. When the steering committee said how much money each project gets. And I'm not sure why. Also, people are saying that's not possible. That's not allowed.

39:48

Speaker 3

I. Okay, so the region issue, we haven't even gotten to that point yet. So I'm not understanding why you're. I, for lack of a better word, upset about something where we haven't even arrived or we haven't even seen anything yet as far as how the money is going to be distributed.

40:06

Speaker 1

Because historically, I know what's going to end up happening. We're going to end up having A few projects that are going to be, quote, unquote, serving the entire county, but you're going to have regions of the county that will be excluded like they've been excluded before. So that's what I'm trying to avoid. So if we simply say every region gets at least one project, every spa gets at least one project, that ensures that doesn't happen.

40:27

Speaker 3

Okay, that is your suggestion. Okay. And so we are. We have taken that. Everyone has recorded all of those suggestions.

40:36

Speaker 1

That's my suggestion to the steering committee.

40:38



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 3

We know, Louise, we know. And that's actually been part of the process of what's been submitted. As far as the comments already. If we could get through the presentation and we can get through the agenda, and then if you still have questions and concerns that haven't been addressed, then we can discuss them. But we're not, Louise, we're not going to get through the agenda. And we've actually already, we've incorporated a lot of this information.

41:09

Speaker 1

On this.

41:09

Speaker 3

What were asking for comments on is each section, like, related to that section. And you've already gone into like, four different areas. So question. And other people may have other things that they would also like to ask specifically about this question. So it's not to minimize your input. It's just that we're trying to stay on track so that all of the members can get all of the information. And we understand you've mentioned this. We have actually discussed it and we've incorporated it and provided some other, also other suggestions that other members have had. And so they're all going to be part of this development process. We're not even there and you're already basically upset about something that hasn't happened.

41:54

Speaker 1

I'm saying that the determination whether we want to do that proposal I submitted or others that others may have shouldn't go to the development committee. It should go to the steering committee. And if the steering committee votes to do it that way, then that's the new policy that the subcommittee needs to incorporate. That's my point, that we should not give up our authority.



42:14

Speaker 3

And it is a suggestion that has been put forth along with the other suggestions.

42:20

Speaker 6

So, Andrea, if I may, CCF is. Is complete with their updates. I want to make sure that HRNA has opportunity to describe more this. More this, more in depth. They might be able to answer some of the questions that Lisa's raised.

42:41

Speaker 3

I think we covered this already. Okay, so onto the catalyst phase overview. We're going to just talk briefly about how this is rolling out. So for those of you who are not familiar, we are in the catalyst phase of this project and we are going to be accepting proposals which is what the RFP is about. So we are looking at projects that are going to be in the development and the planning stages. So the catalyst the pre development projects are listed or not projects but the ideas around them and the mechanics are listed here. So the catalyst funds go through the convener. The convener and the collaborative direct the funding. The convener and collaborative expand on ideas provided by the state.

43:37

Speaker 3

So these are all with the Using the state's guidelines, projects have to align with the existing jobs first priorities of equity sustainability, job quality and access, economic competitiveness and economic resilience. The projects must adhere to the Federal Program specific Justice 40 guidelines. So that is how the lens that they are going to be using and then the state role State will provide recommended guidelines for project criteria. State approval will not be required for projects to move forward. State will provide examples of scoring processes for the region to adapt and then catalyst funding there's 14 million per region to bridge these inclusive economic planning projects and



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

program implementation. Up to 2 million in HRTC operations, up to 1.5 million towards sector investment coordinators and then up to 9 million for the project pre development activities.

44:35

Speaker 3

So looking at and then an additional 1.5 towards the grant administration and compliance. So that's the overhead for the fiscal agent. Next slide please. So these are the pre development activities as they've been outlined for us. These are also available in the portal and all the resource guides that are listed. We have. We're looking at the basic environmental infrastructure pre development, construction and development of long term operations and maintenance plans for infrastructure such as clean water supply systems, wastewater systems, waste disposal systems and pollution control services.

45:16

Speaker 3

So the activities include the feasibility studies, market analysis, environmental assessment surveys and remediation site acquisition site and development plans project designs including permitting, establishing a regional tax increment financing district, the tif, drafting and negotiating community benefit agreements and community workforce agreements, establishing public private partnerships, community development corporations, community development and financial institutions or community development financial institutions. Sorry about that.

45:52

Speaker 3

Revolving loan funds, joint powers and authorities financial planning that includes preliminary budget and construction financing with the goal of establishing long term funding opportunities for the implementation of the planning phase in the regional strategies and then support costs are included for building and sustaining the capacity of project leads and partners such as investments in partner and local staff



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

development funding new and or critical positions, acquiring or utilizing tools and resources to increase partner capacity for project planning and implementation Organizational Capacity activities such as access to financial services or legal review, developing new pilot or demonstration projects and programs participating and or partnership with existing workforce programs providing securing technical assistance for the partners. So this is all available online. Am I doing this part or ccn? No, no, I got it. Okay. Sorry about that. Find the button.

46:57

Speaker 3

Jane Carlson from hrna, the Sector one of the Sector Investor Investment Coordinator team members. So we have talked about this already, but this is the makeup of the RFP Development Subcommittee. And so as mentioned, it's the Stewardship Committee, the Sector Investment Coordinator and any members of the steering committee that did not have a conflict and were available. The overview of the RFP process is that this is a formal RFP to solicit applications for funding consideration. The fact that it is a formal RFP triggers certain conflict of interest rules and you know, not putting anybody at an unfair advantage of hearing anything about the content or the requirements prior to its release. The applications will be scored and the top scoring applicants will be recommended to the steering committee for funding approval.

48:01

Speaker 3

Applicants will be able to access technical assistance at various points throughout the RFP process. We hope to bring details of that process back to you at a meeting, a later meeting, most likely one in January. And HRNA will support outreach and engagement in advance of and during the RFP release. Next slide please. I think Matt is going to jump in here.

48:34

Speaker 1

Yeah, thanks Jane.



48:36

Speaker 3

So the Stewardship committee received about 15 comments from two different letters on the RFP development. And I just summarized. We're gonna, I'm just gonna summarize them here for brevity's sake but in the slides that were sent out before the email before this meeting, there's a more fulsome rundown of those comments. But basically there were two sort of larger buckets. One was around projects eligibility and partnership concerns, making sure that projects focus on both sector specific and sector neutral economic mobility strategies. The, you know, the two sort of main categories from the Regional Plan Part 2 and that eligibility criteria should really, should just be really clear about, you know, how organizations should prove or determine that they're eligible for funding.

49:27

Speaker 1

The second one, and the largest bucket.

49:29

Speaker 3

Was definitely around supporting disinvested communities and emphasizing that you requirements for projects should.

49:36

Speaker 1

Be equity focused and they should really.

49:38

Speaker 3

Be targeting projects that will benefit disinvested communities in LA and not be so broad that they're not able to target very specific communities with specific histories of disinvestment and specific needs. This time, this is the RFP process timeline. So the



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

process RFP will be released on January 27, there will be three proposal conferences in late January, early February. We are still confirming or finalizing the dates for those three. There is a Q and A period and then all RFPs must be or all proposals, I'm sorry, must be submitted by March 10th. They will be reviewed and you know, review and approved between the month of March and May. And awardees will be notified in early June with the contract start date of August 1st. So they will have one year to perform on the contract.

50:52

Speaker 3

And sorry, I did go over, there is an appeal process as well that we are still designing. Next slide in terms of technical assistance and outreach. The goals for the outreach efforts are to share as much information as possible about the RFP process in order to get a good response rate. We want a lot of proposals and we want them to be strong proposals that can be implemented and can be approved for funding. So the goal is to get as many good projects in the pipeline as possible and the outreach can support us in doing that. So There is already one webinar scheduled for next week. That's Thursday, December 19th at noon.

51:38

Speaker 3

In that webinar we will be reviewing the catalyst phase itself so everybody can understand, you know, all the partners who attend can understand the purpose of this funding cycle and this phase of the project. And we will have minimal details about the rfp. Again, not to put anybody at an advantage, but we'll be able to share more information about the RFP at the proposal conferences. So again, just webinar to introduce the concept, get everybody ready, and to make sure that people are pre registering and that they will be then eligible to submit a proposal. The three proposal conferences, as I already mentioned, will occur and we'll have more details about the rfp. They will be held after the RFP is released.

52:26



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 3

And in terms of technical assistance, the goal is to support project applicants throughout the RFP process and to ensure that the process is accessible, but also to make sure that we're maintaining a fair and equitable process. The potential activities for technical assistance. Again, still designing the program and how it's going to work. But there will be sort of various phases of technical assistance, including an application support separate or support related to application submittal separate from the project scoring process, so firewalls and making sure that there are people able to help a project applicant get through the application period. There will also be ongoing support for awardees throughout the catalyst phase as they are performing under their contract. And there will also be implementation support for additionally feasible projects, even projects that have not received Catalyst phase Funding.

53:30

Speaker 3

So a lot of support for projects in all aspects of the industry ecosystem or the various industry ecosystems. Next slide. One second. I was just trying to review the questions to see if there were any that were related to the. Okay, someone's asking the proposal conference, has it been publicized? And then someone else is asking are those one one meetings? And please provide more details. I had the question about I thought the RFP was to be released and then the TA. So I was a little confused because that's January 25th. So am I confusing things? Can you ask your question again? I'm sorry. Okay, I might be confused, so please correct me if. If so. So I thought a technical assistance session is for after an RFP is released.

54:47

Speaker 5

But when I look at the timeline.

54:49

Speaker 3



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

The RFP to be released is January 25th. So what is the technical assistance for December 19th? That. Oh, sorry, go ahead. I'm sorry.

55:00

Speaker 2

The.

55:00

Speaker 3

The webinar on the 19th will focus on. Will focus on the catalyst phase that itself of the project and preparing folks to submit an rfp. There will be very minimal details available about the RFP other than dates to look out for publicly available information. Technical assistance is more of a one one support type of structure in which applicants and awardees and projects in the future can receive support, most likely from, well, from the ecosystem, from people within various industry sectors and also from US HRNA as the Sector Investment Coordinator. So just for the Claire, for clarity is that this piece on the 19th is to say, hey, you know what, when the RFP is released or before the RFP is released, I'm not sure about that TA assistance is available. I just don't understand.

56:05

Speaker 3

Normally there'll be an RFP and then there will be Q and A session, but I'm not so clear on this. Yeah, so this, if I could help. This, this webinar is basically information based, which does happen before proposals are released to kind of let people know that it's happening, talk about what the purpose of the program is, et cetera. But it's not going to be going over the exact proposal. They're not going to be discussing the exact proposal. They're going to be discussing the project. Got it. So it's just to inform and get people prepped maybe.

56:39

Speaker 1

Yes.



56:39

Speaker 3

And then the technical assistance is related to. If you have a well developed draft of your proposal, then that's an opportunity for someone to be able to review it and give you some pointers. Okay. Would that be on the session or after the fact? It's you would schedule your session. That would not be the 19th.

56:57

Speaker 5

Thank you.

56:58

Speaker 6

Yeah. Andrea, if I may add just a little bit more context, I think because we have such a large collaborative of over 600 partners, a lot of them still don't understand what phase we're in. We just wrapped up our planning phase going into Catalyst. So our idea right before holiday season, before the RFP is actually released, is to just catch folks up in terms of where we are now, what Catalysts will look like. But we will not be discussing the rfp. It's basically a pre. Pre ramp to what will be coming in January. So I hope that provides just a little bit more clarification on the.

57:36

Speaker 3

And I think that kind of session is very helpful. So thank you.

57:39

Speaker 6

And it will be recorded. So I know it's holiday season and it's a little bit difficult for folks, but we will be recording it and publishing. And then in terms of answering questions about promotion, the team is currently working on a communication toolkit. So we'll have a promotional flyer, email template to make sure that you can share the word as



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

well as social media graphic tiles. We are really working on trying to get this out by tomorrow. So please keep a lookout. We'll be sharing this information to the whole collaborative as well.

58:11

Speaker 3

Okay, I see that there are two hands up. Are they related to the Sector Investment Coordinator piece?

58:19

Speaker 5

I have my hand up for about 15 minutes.

58:22

Speaker 3

Is it related to the Sector Investment Coordinator piece?

58:25

Speaker 5

It is related to part of the duties that was outlined one of the Sector Investment Coordinator presentation slides. That was probably about eight slides back.

58:34

Speaker 3

Okay, so I saw your comment. Is it on the equity criteria?

58:39

Speaker 5

It is, yes.



58:41

Speaker 3

Okay, so in the interest of time, we all know what the issues are around the equity criteria. And CCF has addressed the equity criteria proposal that was put forth by the subcommittee.

58:53

Speaker 5

Can we put that on the record, please? Because there are at least seven people on this call that were not on that are not informed of that. So again, we had a significant number of our steering committee members.

59:07

Speaker 3

Seven out of 30 something.

59:09

Speaker 5

Well, no, no. Seven out of the 19 that were on the call last time because they were all at a conference that was funding, sir, this initiative. So I would like to bring that issue forward. They did not get to hear that.

59:22

Speaker 3

Can we. Can we please send out the email again so that folks know what. Yes, I appreciate that, but I also.

59:33

Speaker 5

Want to bring it to the floor because again, we are. We do things over holidays, on



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

weekends where people are blind and don't know what's going on and I think it is important that it be clearly on the agenda so that if members of the committee want to be a steering committee, want to voice concern, because we did there was a voted action about that particular issue. They understand it and they don't have. Aren't being asked to go back and search the read and whatever.

01:00:00

Speaker 3

Well, they're not. We're asking that it be actually recent, but it was sent out before the holiday weekend.

01:00:06

Speaker 1

Ma'am, can you quickly just explain what the equity issue is?

01:00:10

Speaker 5

We voted on a equity criteria that exceeded the 40% and that is what this steering committee has put in place for a condition for projects fundable under both catalyst and implementation to go forward under the LA Jobs first hrtc. We made that vote as a steering committee. What I saw on the screen is that the. A reduced criteria is been handed to the sector investment coordinators to evaluate projects against one. I believe we have.

01:00:52

Speaker 3

There actually has not been and nothing has actually been proposed or finalized. So again, we're putting the cart before the horse. They are in the process of developing all of the information as was indicated in the email communication that was sent out on the 22nd was that they received the information. It will be taken into consideration but that the actual proposed criteria in itself represented a conflict because many of the members who were participating in that are part are going to be submitting proposals.



01:01:31

Speaker 5

I think I would put that on an opportunity on behalf of the 13 steering committee members that brought that issue forward for reconsideration. Again, if it's, if we don't want the Sector Investment coordinator implementing something, then the steering committee.

01:01:48

Speaker 3

Oh, this is a big term, Sharon. And so everyone did not decide that. And so we shouldn't be presenting in the meeting that was a conversation that all of the steering committee members decided on because that actually wasn't the case.

01:02:03

Speaker 5

Actually that was Mr. Harbor's final voted action under his tenure.

01:02:08

Speaker 1

Madam Chair, I had a quick question about your comment you just made. You said the sector Investment coordinators would take that under consideration. So do you envision us.

01:02:16

Speaker 3

Actually it's the committee that will be putting the application together as has been stated.

01:02:21

Speaker 1



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

But. Okay, so they'll, they'll take that under advisement. Do you envision that they have the ability to go with a standard different than what was approved by the steering committee?

01:02:32

Speaker 3

I know that according to the email communication that the proposal could not be taken other than under consideration as a comment and a suggestion because of the conflict.

01:02:45

Speaker 1

I would say the steering committee has approved that as a standard and that it is the responsibility of the subcommittee to incorporate that into their. Into their. Yeah. Having a hard time with this issue, that is.

01:02:57

Speaker 3

Well, as I recall, we spent a lot of time and energy and if you all want to go back and review our previous notes and recordings, that there was significant concerns about conflicts of interest and who was participating in which parts of this whole component. And it was brought up several times that based on the information and the proposals that were being put forth, that a lot of people, majority people, are going to end up being conflicted out and not able to readily and openly participate in this process. The committee as a whole decided to move forward with the proposals, which is why we are in the situation now where folks are a little upset, feeling like there's a lack of transparency around this because we are not able to participate when this was actually something that was brought up a long time ago.

01:03:50

Speaker 1

This isn't about conflict of interest, though. This is the steering committee.



01:03:53

Speaker 3

That is what the email said.

01:03:55

Speaker 1

Conflict of interest, am I saying is the steering committee approved an equity criteria. It was.

01:04:00

Speaker 3

The equity criteria was determined that it could not be used in the. In the manner that it was intended because of the conflict of interest that was put out and approved by the steering committee.

01:04:10

Speaker 1

Who made that determination.

01:04:11

Speaker 5

Luis, I think we're going to have to protest that based on the clause.

01:04:16

Speaker 3

And in the opportunities form because we're. We're seriously. We've done over this a lot of times. The decision went out by email. It was not snuck in over a holiday period or anything like that. It was sent out. Everyone had us an opportunity. It will be sent out again. But if we could move forward because we do have a lot of material that we still need to cover.



01:04:36

Speaker 4

I need.

01:04:36

Speaker 1

I have one just presented, though, if.

01:04:40

Speaker 3

You could send in what the issue is.

01:04:43

Speaker 1

No, I want to ask you because it relates specifically to that.

01:04:45

Speaker 3

Well, and I'm saying if we could send it in because we have gone over this a number of times.

01:04:51

Speaker 1

What my question is, we voted on this past week on some funding levels.

01:04:54

Speaker 3

And I already explained that were told that it could not be used as anything other than a public comment and suggestion because conflict of interest by.



01:05:04

Speaker 1

Who said this? Who said we couldn't use it?

01:05:06

Speaker 3

Our compliance officers at ccf.

01:05:08

Speaker 1

So CCF gets to determine what we can and can standards.

01:05:12

Speaker 3

We can provide compliance. Yes.

01:05:14

Speaker 5

Doesn't have a vote.

01:05:16

Speaker 6

So maybe I can provide a little bit of insight and I invite my colleagues Jose and Maria to jump in here. So in the email that we sent out, we acknowledged the thought, time and effort that the steering subcommittee, because my understanding is that it wasn't all steering committee members, it was a subcommittee of the steering committee members, put this equity criteria forth. However, because many of you, the majority of you, will be applying to the rfp, it is a conflict of interest that you are putting the criteria that your projects will be scored against. And so that's why we're treating it as a public comment. That doesn't mean that we're disregarding all the work that you did. It's just



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

that we are treating it as a public comment, integrating it into the rfp, you know, as a public comment.

01:06:09

Speaker 6

So just wanted to relay that. I don't know, Jose, if. And Maria, if you have any additional insight on this.

01:06:19

Speaker 3

Yeah, so I'll go ahead and chime in here. You know, our concern as the entity that's actually administering these dollars is to make sure that we're in compliance with all aspects of these dollars. And as we move into going into a competitive bidding process, we have to make sure that as we develop that rfp, that we're not giving any one entity an unfair advantage in formulating the contents of that rfp, the equity criteria, because again, because the members of the steering committee that were involved in drafting, that are planning to submit applications themselves, were not able to incorporate in the, as it stands into the rfp.

01:07:14

Speaker 3

So as a way to be able to honor the work that the subcommittee members did was to open up a public comment period and give everyone an opportunity to submit public comment into the development of this rfp, including the draft that was the equity criteria draft that was submitted to us. So, you know, as we continue in this process, in developing and putting together this rfp, all of those comments are being taken into consideration and making sure that what we put out is going to be reflective of all of the comments and intent of what the state has envisioned for this, for these dollars, as well as what the. Our local community members are interested in seeing.

01:08:09

Speaker 3



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

So I, I urge you to see this as a way for us to be able to incorporate and really kind of honor the effort that you put forward. But as it was submitted to us and the. I think the intention behind it in terms of having that be automatically incorporated into the rfp, that was not. We were not able to do that. And again, it all goes back to making sure that we are in compliance with our duty as fiscal agent for these funds. Thank you. We can move forward with the Timeline.

01:09:00

Speaker 1

There's a number of hands up.

01:09:01

Speaker 4

There's a bunch of hands up.

01:09:04

Speaker 3

If it's just going to be addressing the exact same thing, can we just have you submitted to the opportunities.

01:09:10

Speaker 1

I'm going to make a motion to the committee that we reject the interpretation by ccf, halt actions on the subcommittee until we can additional participations, clearly outline who's involved on it, and ensure there is a broader scope of voices presented.

01:09:30

Speaker 5

I'll second.



01:09:40

Speaker 3

I'm going to call the question.

01:09:42

Speaker 5

Madam Chair, you have a motion in.

01:09:44

Speaker 3

A second from steering and so is, are we going to be able to get this and can it be written up into something that we can actually read and then send it out with the proposer?

01:09:58

Speaker 5

Please put the motion in the chat. Please.

01:10:08

Speaker 1

Type it in. It might take a little bit, but essentially the motion is. All right.

01:10:17

Speaker 4

While Luis is doing that, I just.

01:10:19

Speaker 1

Want to mention that in the past.



01:10:21

Speaker 4

Organizations that are part of the steering.

01:10:24

Speaker 3

Committee have participated in developing criteria, scoring.

01:10:28

Speaker 1

And evaluation of community organizations that apply.

01:10:33

Speaker 4

For funding to do outreach to be part of the different committees.

01:10:37

Speaker 1

And that's been done in the past.

01:10:39

Speaker 4

So why is the practice different this time around?

01:10:41

Speaker 3

We discussed that and that was actually brought up months ago and it was decided by the steering committee as a whole to accept the arrangement that if you were going to be participating in any of the process that, I mean, if you were going to be submitting a



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

proposal that you could not participate in any stages of the process, this was like an ongoing conversation, debate back and forth for a long time. So. And it was brought up that were going to end up in exactly this space. So. So where were not going to be able to participate. So we did this after we did.

01:11:24

Speaker 1

The outreach and selected all the organizations.

01:11:27

Speaker 3

And after that, after the outreach for the last phase. Yes, this was. This was a conversation that happened afterwards.

01:11:36

Speaker 4

Yes, I missed it.

01:11:37

Speaker 3

Thank you.

01:11:47

Speaker 1

Just about done.

01:11:49

Speaker 3

So, so, yes, we will coordinate how to get this vote out to the full steering committee members and there will probably be some exclamation and put the points of the original



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

equity criteria and what is. And the reason for it being moved to the public comment stage so that folks have a clear idea of what actually is happening. And it's not the notion that we're just rejecting the equity proposal.

01:12:19

Speaker 6

Yes. And if I can just add, I think that there is the notion that we're just rejecting the work that was already put in. But. But the RFP hasn't been released yet. And so there the equity criteria was integrated. We Just can't say how because of course that's providing unfair advantage to folks that are applying outside of the steering committee meeting. But the notion that the equity criteria was not incorporated into the Catalyst RFP is wrong.

01:12:49

Speaker 1

I think this is more fundamental. Madam Chair, do we have a quorum presentation?

01:12:56

Speaker 3

I don't know. Tiama, can you do a quick count? But I think it's important for transparency sake that there that this be an online vote so that people have the information in front of them so that they can actually review it.

01:13:12

Speaker 5

Madam Chair, I disagree. I believe the steering committee has the authority to call for a vote on any motion or at that has been seconded. It is live and in play. Seconded. It is live and in play.

01:13:28

Speaker 6



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

If I may, let me just. If you can give me a few to just review the bylaws. I believe from my understanding is that votes need to be taken virtually through email to allow full participation. But if you can just give me like three minutes.

01:13:43

Speaker 5

Actually Scarlett, you are incorrect. We only did that out of desperation.

01:13:49

Speaker 6

I can verify just to make sure.

01:13:53

Speaker 3

There actually happened a number of occasions where we have said as a committee to that it was to send them out in order for people to review the information for transparency and make sure that folks had all of the information. So this time I think it's interesting that we're actually going the opposite direction. I'm just following the same pattern we've been following.

01:14:13

Speaker 5

Well, last week we last meeting we actually had a live motion that you rejected to bring to vote. But the bylaws call for the authority anytime you have a motion that has been placed and seconded, it is live and in place.

01:14:27

Speaker 2

Can someone in the interest of time from the LAADC clarify if we actually have a quorum on the line?



01:14:33

Speaker 3

Yeah.

01:14:41

Speaker 6

So I am looking at page 16 of our bylaws under steering committee meetings, item number nine voting relevant items that require vote will be adopted under a simple majority vote based on the number of seated steering committee members. Three business days will be provided for steering members to vote and I will go ahead and drop that in the chat for everyone's review.

01:15:15

Speaker 1

Okay, well, since we have time, I'm not sure I will email you a updated and correct motion that we can send out to the membership that would outline my concerns with the current process and what we would be asking the steering committee to vote on. So let's not use the language I hastily typed in from the chat. I will email to email you the motion by 5pm today.

01:15:41

Speaker 3

Thank you.

01:15:45

Speaker 5

Scarlett, can you Give me a paragraph reference. Since I served on the bylaws committee, I'm very much concerned. As you know, this is what I do.

01:15:52



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 6

Yeah, no, absolutely, Sharon. It is on page nine. Oh, I'm sorry. Page 16. Wait, no, I lost it. Give me a second here.

01:16:08

Speaker 3

You put page 19 in the chat, Scarlett.

01:16:11

Speaker 6

Yeah, no, I. Apologies. I think I looked at the wrong page. Just give me a second, please. I know it was item nine. Give me a second.

01:16:26

Speaker 2

It's page 17.

01:16:30

Speaker 6

On my end. It's page 16.

01:16:33

Speaker 2

Really? Okay. On mine, I just went to the link that's in the document link that you guys sent.

01:16:40

Speaker 6

It's section B3, steering committee meetings, item number nine. I'll write that in the



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

chat. Give me a second. So section B3. And then on my end, it's showing page 16. I don't know if maybe for some reason it might be showing a different page for someone else.

01:17:15

Speaker 3

So while you do that, Scarlett, I just want to mention for the record that obviously we had a planned timeline for the release of this rfp and.

01:17:27

Speaker 5

You know, this action will potentially delay.

01:17:31

Speaker 3

Right now, we had a projected start period for August 1st for the.

01:17:37

Speaker 2

For the.

01:17:39

Speaker 3

For these awardees to begin their performance period. So, you know, any delay in this timeline will impact our ability to have the awardees begin and give them about a year to perform their proposals that they outlined in the application. So I just want to mention that for the record that, you know, the timeline will be impacted additionally, you know, whatever is adopted by the steering committee, if the equity criteria does conflict with items that we've identified with our compliance rules and regulations, we will have to, you know, make. Take action on that. Okay, so can we move forward with the timeline? We are at 2:15.



01:18:43

Speaker 4

Yeah, sure. So I'll just be giving the timeline update. If looking at the timeline, the top half of it above the axis. We have not had any changes to the first draft activation plan, which is due January 31, 2025. That plan will be on the transportation and Logistics industry in Los Angeles county. And then we'll be submitting further activation plans in the final version of that one on June 30th. As we all know, the sector investment coordinator performance period has already begun. And if we now move to the bottom half of the timeline, we can see some of the dates just putting everything into context that we've been discussing already. So the Catalyst solicitation prep is something which is currently taking place. The application period, as previously mentioned, is going to open January 27th of 2025.

01:19:32

Speaker 4

Going all the way until March 10th, and then just kind of breaking down some further tasks before the performance period. We have the application review and selections, which will begin March 10, going on to May 2, the project approval, which will be taking place in May from the 6th until 27th, and then the Catalyst Project awards and contracts, which will be taking place from June 3rd all the way to till the eventual beginning of the performance period. When it comes to updates on implementation, we don't really have any update on when that is going to be. And so we're just kind of awaiting further information from the state.

01:20:15

Speaker 1

Thank you.

01:20:16

Speaker 4

I think we can go to the next slide.



01:20:20

Speaker 1

Yeah.

01:20:20

Speaker 4

So then just kind of, you know, moving forward with this activation work plan, we have the vote result. We sent out a vote to the steering committee on which tradable sector to focus on for the activation work plan in January 31, 2025. Of course, that is transportation and logistics. So the CJF activation work plan is going to outline strategic steps to mobilize resources, stakeholders and actions necessary to advance the growth of the sector in the region. And we're going to expand on that in the next slide. Can we go to the next slide, please?

01:20:54

Speaker 1

Thank you.

01:20:56

Speaker 4

So, just to kind of go back to what we've discussed, things that have taken place in the planning phase, of course, we have our seven priority sectors which we identified. These activation work plans are. They're intended to focus on traded sectors. So there's that difference between the traded and local serving sectors. The traded ones are those who predominantly focus on exports and kind of selling services, products outside of the region. And the ones that our research has identified as traded are clean and renewable energy, aerospace, manufacturing, transportation and logistics, video production and distribution, and bioscience. And then we also have our two local sectors, which are industries predominantly catering to the local market. They are, in a way, kind of bound to the population and depend on the population.



01:21:42

Speaker 4

And so we'll be developing activation plans for the five traded sectors by June 30, 2025. And I'm going to hand it off to Scarlett and then I'll come back to discuss some other stuff.

01:21:53

Speaker 6

Yeah. As an important note, I know there has been misinformation in terms of the priority sectors being identified and used as a criteria for catalyst or implementation funding. We do just want to dispel that misinformation. The priority sectors identified for the activation plans will not serve as exclusive criteria for catalyst or implementation funding eligibility. This will include healthcare and construction. This does not take them out of the opportunity to apply for any funding throughout the California Jobs first program, which includes both Catalyst and implementation. So we did just want to make note of that. Moving to the next slide, we will be discussing Activation Work Plan Steering Committee engagement opportunities. So our first work plan is due on January 31, 2025, which is a very extremely tight deadline.

01:22:52

Speaker 6

We have already shared the overview of the activation work plan template that has been provided from the state that was sent, I believe a few days ago as additional documents for review for the Steering Committee to provide just clarification and guidance in terms of what to expect that we will be working on in terms of the different activation plans. For the first activation Plan, we will like to be scheduling public listening sessions, office hours with the Steering Committee to be able to receive your guidance and feedback. If you have expertise in terms of transportation and or logistics, we will welcome an opportunity to receive your feedback based on the template and the overview that we have already shared with you all.



01:23:40

Speaker 6

This will allow us the opportunity to really receive your feedback and create a just, fair and inclusive process which is the intent and goal of our engagement with the Steering Committee. Towards the end of June, which is nearing the deadline, we will have a actual Activation Work Plan draft that we will be providing to our Steering Committee for comments as well as revisions prior to the submission of this draft. I do want to note that this is a draft version of the Activation Work Plan, the final version, along with the additional work plans we'll be due in June. Now the opportunities for the additional work plans that will be due in June, saying that we will have more time to develop, we will be aiming towards a more expanded engagement process.

01:24:37

Speaker 6

So again, continuing these office hours slash listening sessions for those that might have expertise within the traded sectors that we will be working on and then also the consideration for workshops or focus groups for those SC members that are interested in delving deeper into those specific work plan components. Again, we will go ahead and just leverage the expenses experience that we will be conducting in the next month as we work towards the January 31 deadline and then, you know, reflecting on that approach to then integrate to this expanded version that we foresee for the additional work plans that we will be working on. And then currently just noting that the timeline is currently under development for the activation work plans, but we will be sharing with the Steering Committee once finalized. And that concludes this portion.

01:25:34

Speaker 4

Yeah, thank you Scarlett. And on the next slide here, I'm just going to kind of give an overview of partners we've identified that are currently a part of the Jobs Greater Jobs first collaborative and or the steering committee and then also some organizations outside that we've begun to look at. So you know, we have a pretty strong set of onboarded partners that we're looking to engage such as the Port Lacey, Compto,



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Altissi, Metro. We have various city governments. We've recently onboarded the City of Long Beach. We have various other departments within city governments as well. I think we have 16 in total. We have the LA county chief sustainability Office and Department of Economic Opportunity. We have the EDO and economic partnerships that we can also look to engage.

01:26:24

Speaker 4

And then outside of that, there's some other organizations that we're looking to have discussions with and see how they, what input they may have. And that includes the Port of Long beach, lawa, Caltrans, the other airports outside of lawa, the various port terminal operators, other city governments and infrastructure development organizations such as organizations that may assist in the installation and maintenance of electric vehicle chargers, the manufacturing of such vehicles. So this is just kind of an idea. If anybody has input on organizations that they think we should look to engage, you know, feel free to put it in the chat or I'll put my email in the chat box and you know, you can reach out to me. We can go to the next slide.

01:27:11

Speaker 5

I have my hand up please.

01:27:14

Speaker 4

Okay, yeah, go ahead Sharon.

01:27:16

Speaker 5

Thank you so much. As you know, I played a, I tried to play a strong support role as in the transportation sector of the regional plan part two. I am co chair of Transportation for Bizfed Los Angeles and if you can go back to the prior slide, I did have some concerns when I saw the slide and so I twofold. The first is over 70% of the



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

organizations that are listed here are public entities and I personally have an objection to us utilizing our focusing our catalyst or implementation dollars to support workforce development on public projects. Our goods movement sector, if we are talking about tradable sectors, they impact outside of Los Angeles county. It does not consider there's no private sector representation on this list. And our private sector drives transportation logistics all over Los Angeles. We move goods and we move people.

01:28:27

Speaker 5

And when COMPTO did a good first effort but as you know, their presentation of the portion of the regional plan was severely lacking because it only focused on our public passenger transportation agencies. And I know it's not exhaustive, but I do believe in this instance, I mean we've got FedEx, we've got mega transit and movement agencies, private sector in this region and we are not considering any of it. So I would like as I have asked before I put a motion and it has been seconded that as I asked in last meeting, that we establish a working. We have at least one working group meeting of the steering committee in addition to your proposed office hours.

01:29:19

Speaker 5

I appreciate that you offered those proposed office hours so that we as a steering committee can share our thoughts, our ideas within the structure of what should be included in this activation plan and we get clear on what we believe the process should be modified to include. So I have put that I'm asking for that meeting. I asked for an extra meeting last meeting and it did not go to vote. Currently we have a motion in the chat as well as a second and a third and I would like to put that forth because this activation plan has tremendous amount of responsibility and I do not believe that it should be centered with HR advisors, LADC and ccf. It needs to include the voice and ideas of our brilliant steering committee members.

01:30:09

Speaker 5



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

And we need to be able to structure and talk about process as we see it and not just kind of through a guided and controlled dialogue. Thank you.

01:30:18

Speaker 4

Okay, thank you, Sharon. And yeah, I mean, if anybody has other organizations, this is just to kind of beginning list of things that we've seen from our partners. So, you know, like I said, feel free to reach out to me. I'll put my email in the chat.

01:30:30

Speaker 3

How's her hand up also?

01:30:32

Speaker 4

Oh, yeah, go ahead, Tony.

01:30:34

Speaker 5

Yeah, I would suggest that we need to have a draft by like the first week in January of what might be the tactics. So not I'm working on these activation plans in a number of regions. And the reason for that is that the activation plans are a little tricky in the sense they're not every step you're going to do and they're not every step that needs to happen in the next 18 months. They're going to be what are the things that the collaborative believes that they should be facilitating through primarily the work of the sector investment coordinator or a partner in the collaborative that steps up and say they want to do something. So you have to then select. So I think that if we had a draft of what do we think are the proposed tactics for this?

01:31:30

Speaker 5



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Also understanding that we have other industries, right? So you can't spend, you know, all of the time of the sector investment coordinator. So the suggestion is identifying the tactics, identifying the first part of the chart that explains why we chose it and all that piece so that when we go to the listening session, people are responding to something we can't do everything everywhere. So the activation plan is a really key part about selecting and prioritizing. I just feel like that would give us something that would be more productive than simply having a listening forum and collecting, you know, 30 different responses.

01:32:11

Speaker 4
Got it.

01:32:12

Speaker 3
Yeah.

01:32:12

Speaker 4
So Tony, if I understand you correctly, to identify the tactics and then do the outreach based off the tactic.

01:32:17

Speaker 5
Yeah. That that might help us narrow what we're responding to and maybe we identify a gap or maybe a partner, who knows? But yes.

01:32:27

Speaker 4
Okay, thank you, Tony.



01:32:28

Speaker 3

Yeah.

01:32:28

Speaker 4

And we've begun, you know, planning for this activation plan as well. But you know, I appreciate all the insight and I put my email in the chat if anyone wants to discuss further. Just really quickly. Just bringing up the project ideas portal, it's not too late if you have, if your organization or you know, one that may want to collaborate on a project or has a project idea. It's kind of slowed down when it comes to the projects we're receiving. Of course, this is not a formal application. It's just a place to share your idea. So yeah, just giving an idea of where we currently stand. We have 32 projects and we are updating it as we receive more information. Thank you everyone.

01:33:15

Speaker 3

Is this me? Okay for the next steps, make sure you.

01:33:20

Speaker 7

Oh, okay.

01:33:23

Speaker 3

That was like. I thought that was too, but okay. Yeah, okay.

01:33:29

Speaker 2

So yeah, next steps as we near.



01:33:32

Speaker 3

The end of the meeting. Enjoy your holiday break that's coming up. That's first and foremost for those who still have not input their ideas into the portal, please do so we can.

01:33:44

Speaker 2

Have an idea of what to expect.

01:33:47

Speaker 3

When it comes time for the funding to be released. Prepare for the Catalyst funding release. So we have partners who are really have been establishing their collaboratives or their coalitions. And so please make sure that any of your partners and maybe you have your collaborative amongst that looking to apply, make sure that they onboard.

01:34:12

Speaker 2

The onboarding is on the main page.

01:34:14

Speaker 3

Of the website, so it's there for you to easily do. Just scroll towards the bottom of the page. Implementation funding release. As far as we know, it's still early 2025, so we don't particularly know if it'll be January or February or March. No new information there. And then our next steering committee meeting will be January 9th.

01:34:38



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 2
That's all I have.

01:34:39

Speaker 3
Next one upcoming. Other upcoming. And there's a question, Louise.

01:34:51

Speaker 1
This can wait till the end because it relates to something that happened very early in our meeting.

01:34:57

Speaker 3
I think we are at the end.

01:34:58

Speaker 1
Oh, okay. No, so my question was just for clarification. So for the HRNA team, is there certain People that are assigned to work with the LA County CJF as the sector investment coordinators on your team and if so, who are those individuals? Is it just the three that were introduced earlier or is there anybody else?

01:35:17

Speaker 3
Yeah, Louise. So it's the three that were introduced earlier. And then HRNA has a whole team of analysts and folks who are going to sort of support as needed, especially on the industries that their expertise is in. When we're doing the sort of building the industry ecosystem component. The core team right now is the three people you met, plus one other person who wasn't able to join today. But as far as the way that it's contracted with the state and the fact that there's one sector investment coordinator contract, but five



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

were up to five were recommended by or suggested by the state. The CCF has a contract just with LADC to serve.

01:35:57

Speaker 1

So the one is going to just.

01:35:58

Speaker 3

Serve all five roles and it's not going to be five specific people focusing on those industries.

01:36:03

Speaker 1

It's going to, because there's more than.

01:36:04

Speaker 3

Five sectors that LA selected. So there's going to be basically the HRNA team, with myself included, doing all seven of the sectors and sort of working as a larger team on the seven sectors.

01:36:20

Speaker 1

Okay, thank you.

01:36:25

Speaker 3

Okay, and I go on the next upcoming meetings. We have the partners meeting which will be tomorrow morning at 9am and then we have the first outreach that was



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

mentioned earlier, that'll take place next week, December 19th, 12:00pm and then we have the next steering committee meeting, of course, which is January 9th. Okay, thank you again. If we could get those motions written up and submitted as soon as possible so that we can send out the appropriate emails and the voting mechanisms, that would be greatly appreciated.

01:37:12

Speaker 2

As I say, I do think that before we actually close the meeting we need to at least summarize and clarify that there are two different motions that were made and who made the second so that we know to be on the lookout for that. I'm just going through scrolling back up to Luis's to see that was the first one that was made because I've already copied Sharon's, which was consideration and vote. Special meeting. A working group should be convened in January to work out the steering committee criteria for development process for the activation plan. And that was seconded by Linda Kelly just to confirm. And then the first one scrolling way up. Lots of chat today, Luis. Did you end up putting it in the chat?

01:37:59

Speaker 1

I put it in there, but I'm going to type up a clearer Version because I just kind of.

01:38:03

Speaker 2

And who seconded Luis's?

01:38:06

Speaker 1

Drew Mercy.

01:38:07



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 2
Drew, thank you.

01:38:09
Speaker 3
Thank you.

01:38:10
Speaker 2
Okay.

01:38:12
Speaker 4
Okay.

01:38:15
Speaker 2
Antonia, you know what? I have to say that I, as the vice Chair, am feeling unclear about the timing of our moving forward with the RFP and being able to release it on January 27th in order to make our deadline to have the contracts confirmed and the start date as July 1st. Is it July 1st? No, it's August 1st of this year. And so I kind of, I'm walking away feeling a little disconcerting about where we are. And also I know that I believe it was out of CCF or HRNA who made the comment that doing so with the votes that are going to take place, especially if they do pass, pushing things back into January is going to push us off timetable. So I'm just kind of unclear where we are.

01:39:05
Speaker 2
I know the holidays are coming up, so we're more likely not going to have another meeting of all of us together until January. So hate to do that to you, Madam Chair, but I'm just the second.



01:39:15

Speaker 3

Vice Chair, so I feel like I wholeheartedly agree. It was mentioned the fashion in which the outreach group was selected the last time and the quote, unquote, I guess, quality of work that was produced. And a lot of that was due to the time frame being pushed out and why we had to reduce things. So we need to own. We need to own how we are kind of contributing to these issues.

01:39:47

Speaker 2

And I think there were a couple things that were mentioned that I, because I know that the subcommittee for equity subcommittee came forward, they worked, they brought their equity criteria and the whole council voted on it at Kevin's last meeting that he was chairing as Sharon brought up. I do understand that and I'm not sure if it was really clarified from CCF that there were things that were part of the equity criteria that their legal counsel advised would not be implementable for us to use to make this a fair process. And I don't think that was really relayed how. It wasn't so much that CCF or LADC are saying that, no, we're not going to use that, we're just going to dismiss what you said.

01:40:30

Speaker 2

But it was more so coming from legal counsel looking at the objectives and the deliverables and what the state has said, what we had to do and what those conflicts were with, what the equity criteria that the committee came up with, especially when it came to the go, no go, you know, meaning you have to have these before you even get reviewed, if your application even gets reviewed. And I don't think that's been clarified. And I think that we haven't been, I guess, a little bit. I don't want to think of an opaque, but it sounds as if everyone feels it's been opaque and not really clear as to what and how those decisions were made and that we've just dismissed what you had to say and what we approve, that it really isn't the case. It really came more.



01:41:14

Speaker 2

It came down to what legal had advised, what we could and couldn't do. And I know that you guys said very clearly, but we voted and this is what we said we wanted. So we've got to do what we said, but we also have to stick within the confines of the law, at least what we have been told, what the laws are. So I wanted to know that you elected me to your vice chair for a reason. And so I'm trying to make sure that we're being transparent and I'm relaying information, but also making sure that I relay what I hear many of the committee members bringing forward. And secondly, I want to say, as far as the development of the RFP committee, there was really never any input from anyone on who should be there, except to constantly say who you don't want.

01:41:56

Speaker 2

But there were never really any recommendations on who should be included outside of steering committee members who have to recuse themselves because they're going to be applying for money can't be part of the committee. So I take, you know, a little bit of issue with that because I don't know of any others that have been recommended or whether in writing or even verbally. And that needs to be said. If that's what you want, you have ideas, let us know. Because I know that there is some concern quite often about this being led by stewardship as opposed to the steering committee. And I totally agree with you. We're the leaders, we're the ones who are elected. They have to do what we say. But because so much of this is becoming a conflict because you can't apply.

01:42:38

Speaker 2

I mean, because if you are part of the steering or the review or the development committee, it. It puts it to a very small group of people then that are going to be willing to take the time to put in to develop this. But if you have recommendations of people that would and could and want to be part, that can be unbiased, that's great. I would love that. I hate being the only steering committee member on this. I honestly do. But it is what it is I'm doing my job, my part that I signed up for. So I just wanted to share that.



01:43:05

Speaker 6

Libby, I can answer your first question about the unclarity of the equity criteria and why it's not being integrated. And like this notion that were coming in and saying that we can't integrate it into the rfp. The reality and in full transparency, the equity criteria document that was created by this subcommittee was not shared with CCF until a couple of weeks ago. So were not aware that this document existed, unfortunately. And so upon reviewing it, we realized that the equity subcommittee, many of them are going to be applying to the RFP funding. And so it provided, you know, an unfair advantage which we've already stated. But in full transparency, we did not know that this document existed until a couple of weeks ago, which is very unfortunate. And so that's why the outcome is now this.

01:44:04

Speaker 6

We had to receive it as a public comment even though that there was a prior vote. We did not know that the. The document was. Was created or the contents of the document.

01:44:18

Speaker 2

And, and I appreciate you bringing that up because I did in that first meeting with you all kind of chastise CCF and say how come you're just now coming with this? Why didn't you say this sooner? And they relayed, and I saw your note, Sharon, that they were part of that meeting. They were attendants, but they weren't actually given the document. And that was one of the things that we understand now. That communication document was shared with everybody over email and.

01:44:41

Speaker 3

But that wasn't the finalized document because we have actually had. Libby's right.



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

We've had a lot of conversation about this whole thing that the document actually was not finalized. It. We have been discussing it for a long time, but we did not have. But the finalized document actually was not done until later in the game and then that's when it was sent over officially to ccs.

01:45:09

Speaker 1

Tony's had her hand up by a long time, by the way. I just want to point that out.

01:45:17

Speaker 3

Go ahead, Tony.

01:45:18

Speaker 5

I'm sorry, I just put it in the chat again. I wanted to uplift a comment that I made earlier relative to the role of the sector Investment Coordinator. When we look at their objectives, there's four of them that are stated. I'm imagining that the scope of work is being based off of that or there's some connection. The. What I want to highlight is that the project component is only one component of what the Sector Investment Coordinator is supposed to do and the term coordinator is Actually, the substantial piece here, and I was just in a meeting where Go Biz was explaining activation plans and they were very clear that there is both a program project component, but there's also a key element having to do with functional and operational elements, as in coordinating, facilitating, advancing the whole regional plan going forward.

01:46:16

Speaker 5

And right now that seems to be a lesser component of what the Sector Investment Coordinator is being asked to do. Maybe it's just a slide and I've misinterpreted. I can totally go there.



01:46:29

Speaker 3

But.

01:46:29

Speaker 5

But the role that I understand there is supposed to be is to do is to implement the overall regional strategy. The activation plans will be a project management tool, but a lot of it is getting people in the right place, bringing in the resource and not so project focused and for disadvantaged communities. It is that glue part. It's the connecting the dots. It's bringing the people together. That's what we don't have. So I just, I wanted to. I made the comment earlier, I put it in the chat and I would hate for the scope of work for the Sector Investment Coordinator to be too focused on projects which we have very limited dollars and not focus more broadly on delivery of a more prosperous region as defined by the regional plan.

01:47:28

Speaker 7

If I may just react to that. I'm looking to the co chairs for Ascent, but I hope it's okay just to say, Tony, I absolutely hear you. As you know, as the partner in charge of the HR team's effort as Sector Investment Coordinator, I assure you that we probably over emphasize the projects on that slide. I think our focus today is really around the RFP and the related issues because of the time sensitivity. But I assure you that we have a whole other team who is not here today that is focused on how we're going to do some of the other activities, especially related to industry outreach and further support for steering committee on operationalizing the activation plan, if I can say it that way. There are also additional activation plans that are due, as you know, in June of this year.

01:48:26

Speaker 7



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

And so that will be another aspect of our work as well. So I apologize if that was mis. Kind of miss. Framed on. On our slide. But I, I do hear you and.

01:48:39

Speaker 1

I agree and Madam Chair, I do have my hand up.

01:48:46

Speaker 3

Go ahead.

01:48:46

Speaker 1

L. Yeah. So first of all, Libby, thank you for the comments you shared and this is part of my frustration because I think your explanation right now in those few minutes were more of an explanation that I've gotten throughout this entire meeting and be leading up to this. If someone had said, hey, you know, California Community foundation is our legal counsel is telling us this is raising issues for us that this can't be done this way. Fine, tell us. Tell the steering committee. Otherwise, they just said it's like, nope, that's not possible. Why not? And I think that's the frustration if. Because I think, and even then, I don't necessarily agree with that interpretation. I think there is a ways we can still accomplish what we want to do.

01:49:24

Speaker 1

We have made sure that equity is a fundamental principle of what we're trying to accomplish here. And so for the idea that the steering committee cannot have any say when it comes to how the Catalyst project funds are going to be distributed, no, that's, that's completely, I think, incorrect. And I think if were to check all the other regions, they found a way to incorporate that. So I think there's a decrement of that.



01:49:44

Speaker 1

So I think in those situations, the appropriate thing that would have been done was saying, hey, since this was approved by the standard committee, we need to bring it back to them and say there's a problem and have, whether it have somebody from CCF here or the attorney here or somebody from the legal council who can explain, here's the issue with what you're trying to do and see if there is another way for us to be able to achieve it. Because ultimately, at the end of the day, the governor's office is going to be the one who's going to be making the determination as to what projects we get funded. We will send up our recommendation, but if the governor's office does not agree with the project, they are not going to fund it.

01:50:16

Speaker 1

So we're not the ultimate decision makers on this, even for the Catalyst funding. So I thank you, Libby. But I think it speaks to the broader frustration that simple explanation could have made this whole conversation so much easier, so much less frustrating than it has been. And I think that's the frustration, because people are saying, no, it can't be done and nobody can tell us why. When I ask who's on the committee or why not, you can't. There's, you know, we're all grown adults here. There shouldn't be a reason why we can't just speak plainly to each other and kind of say, here's the issues you're running up against and see if there's another way we can still accomplish the same goal that complies with all the rules and regulations.

01:50:58

Speaker 2

Thank you.

01:51:00

Speaker 5

I do know, I know we have a hard stop and I anticipated this battle because we've



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

worked so closely with members of our steering committee and that's why I had called for an extra working group meeting around an extra meeting in December to address this stuff because members feel shut down if they don't have the opportunity to flesh out and understand we have been extremely effective as a steering committee when we go into working group and hash out things and create understanding and have people come reach consensus and most importantly have them feel heard. And that is. And so I anticipated this in the last meeting and said, hey guys, if we don't do this when those other folks come on call, all hell's going to break loose.

01:51:49

Speaker 5

But going forward I'm going to make a recommendation based on what Libby did share and I will put it to the floor as a recommendation before I make a motion to understand. I would like us, I would because we have this tendency to have stewardship committee self appointing and making decisions even though we understand because we have conflicts, we haven't looked at alternatives. And I did pose an alternative in a dialogue with Libby. But I'm going to put this to the steering committee. I actually believe that we should as a steering committee have the ability to appoint individuals, unbiased individuals to the RFP subcommittee as well as an evaluation team that we can make recommendations to by steering committee members for folks to serve on those committees on our behalf that are not biased.

01:52:48

Speaker 5

And I would be very happy to see every steering committee have that member have that right. And therefore we pull out of a hat which ones end up serving on the RFP sub evaluation committee and which ones end up serving along with ccf, LAADC and HR advisors on our evaluation team. I believe it is much more fair if folks get to come forth and make recommendations and have someone that they believe is independent and impartial that can play these roles like we selected evaluators for the other money we gave out rather than just having these decisions made solely by HRNA and our stewardship committee. I just don't believe that's fair. I believe it is decentralized. It's a delegation of power that we never intended to be delegated.



01:53:44

Speaker 5

And so I am asking the steering committee to consider us having a adding a process where we each nominate a member, an individual organization to serve on these committees in our place. And I don't care if we pull them out of a hat, but we come up with a mechanism that respects our conflict of interest policy but provides an alternative and gives people some comfort that there are other eyes and decision makers and evaluators looking at this. And it's not just our implementing stewardship members.

01:54:20

Speaker 3

I'm sorry, go ahead.

01:54:22

Speaker 2

I was going to say our timeframe. So you understand there that we needed to have the final draft of the RFP for CCF to review in terms of their legal counsel next week. So before we leave the holiday, I don't know how we can accommodate this in the next week. I'm not saying that isn't something that we should not reflect to see how we can do that, because I understand that you feel that we don't have the input and that it's being, it's very opaque and that your concerns and your directions and your input is not being considered first at the table. And I understand that it's just a matter of making sure we keep that timeframe because what we can't do is get beyond that one year timeframe for the contract implementation of Catalyst from August 1st till July 31st.

01:55:14

Speaker 2

And so if we think about everything that has to go on before those contracts get signed and actually start in that date, we just got to figure out how we can do that and accommodate that. I'm sorry, Madam Chair, you were speaking first.



01:55:28

Speaker 3

Oh, no problem. One of the things that I do want to emphasize is that we did actually put out calls. And I don't think that nominating people to serve on the committee gets around the conflict of interest. You're basically not picking a representative that could have influence over the process that you are nominating. So that in itself is a conflict of interest in my mind.

01:55:54

Speaker 5

No, it's not. It's the same thing. We did not conflict.

01:55:59

Speaker 3

We did put out a call asking folks to sign up with the eligibility, and we did not get a response other than from two people. That's, that's from what I understand. When I talked about opening it, I was told that only the steering committees could participate.

01:56:20

Speaker 5

Again, somebody's making up rules.

01:56:23

Speaker 3

I, I think it was actually in the steering committee meeting that it was shut down. I asked that it be opened up to the, all the partners and it was shut down. So again, in the interest of our timeline, we're revisiting things right now that we actually have talked about already. It was mentioned that if we move forward that it was going to be out of our hands. And so, you know, what we're asking for is actually something that we talked about already and it was shut down.



01:57:07

Speaker 1

I don't think that was the case, but agree to disagree.

01:57:16

Speaker 3

So again, I actually do have another meeting that I'm already late for. So if I could, after we conclude the meeting and if everyone submits their information to.

01:57:31

Speaker 2

Can I just ask one last thing? I'm sorry, Madam Chair. If when we take this vote that Luis's motion was to reject the interpretation of CCF that required the catalyst and all of that, and that the committee have membership of some sort reflected on the RFP development Committee, if that gets approved by the full board, if there's enough votes that they can get and actually do that, what then is our backup? What would we then need to. And how would we move forward? Maybe that's a question more that CCS would need to tell us in terms of how that would affect the timeframe. But I know that there's a very good chance that could pass and that others feel the same as the vocal people on this call do today. And I.

01:58:14

Speaker 2

I just know we need to be able to address that before we're able.

01:58:18

Speaker 3

I think that when we send out the information, it would be helpful for us to make sure that we include how it impacts the timeline, what the key points of the equity proposal were, why it was determined that it was not that it was out of compliance as a proposal,



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

give very detailed information and then allow folks to have that all where they can digest it within the time frame.

01:58:48

Speaker 2

And Sharon put a suggestion. Could there be an independent RFP review committee to review the staff's draft, meaning the current development committee's draft, that represents the steering committee as a whole and their voice, but not the steering committee. Clearly that an independent rfp perhaps that could be the go between that would satisfy the steering committee members that they actually have some input outside of stewardship and HR and A that's looking and reviewing this since none of them can.

01:59:22

Speaker 1

I think. Well, I think what. Let me clarify. Even if like let's say my motion is adopted, I think that what that if CCF says hey no, there's legal problems with that. Again, they haven't said that. I've heard it from you, but nobody else that what I would say in that situation is let's schedule a meeting with whoever on the steering committee is interested in with their attorneys and talk through. Because I think ultimately this comes down to a fundamental question is can we say we are going to set some additional standards that go beyond what the state has done, whether that's on equity, whether that's on funding, whether that's on distribution, whatever those may be. Does the steering committee have that authority? I think we do because I think we can still Publicize it, share it.

02:00:00

Speaker 1

So it's not something where these, the people on this committee have some unique advantage that no one's aware of. No, this is pretty public. We can make sure incorporated as part of the RFP that this is how much each project can get. Here's how much it's going to be broken down and I suspect that others are going through the same



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

thing. And so my frustration is if somebody says no and then I find out, you know, three months later, hey, every, you know, hey, San Diego did that, they incorporated additional requirements, then I feel like we've been lied to. And so if, you know, so I would want to, if they say nope, it cannot be done, you have to go with what the state said, nothing else can be added. Then I think one of two things has happened. Either we verify. Yup.

02:00:37

Speaker 1

Does everybody other region operating under the same understanding? Okay. Two, is the governor's office in agreement with that? And if so, you know, I'm perfectly fine with us submitting the rfp, working with the governor's office and kind of saying here's what we'd like to do. We'd like to go a bit a little beyond what others, what the baseline requirements are. And I think that's the fundamental question we're trying to answer. Can we as a steering committee set that the sense seems to because so many of the steering committee members plan on applying for that fund, we can't. I think if were to, because we're setting broad non specific policies that, and we're sharing those publicly through social media, through everywhere we can think of that is eliminating any kind of advantage that we would benefit from.

02:01:19

Speaker 3

So can I make it clear the issue isn't about that were adding things to the equity proposal. The issue is what those items were. And so hopefully CCF will be able to clarify that when the email goes out so that it is in black and white for, like I said, for folks to digest and for them to have a clear idea of what they're voting on. So it was never an issue of being able to additional criteria.

02:01:47

Speaker 6

And Andrea. Yeah, I do want to harbor on that. I think there's a conception that we're, that this, the committee is rejecting all suggestions and feedback. That is not the case. I think we can give assurances that they are being considered and integrated within the



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

RFP in its in the appropriate manner. I think the issue was seeing that we cannot just give an unfair advantage to the steering committee that will be applying for these projects. We had to change the mechanism of receiving them as public comments so that later down the line we don't have folks appealing the decision that the steering committee has made in terms of the projects that get funded and approved. I think it's more of the mechanism of how we're incorporating it. We're not rejecting comments. That's not what is being done.

02:02:38

Speaker 6

And so I do want to just really emphasize that because I think that's what folks are perceiving, which is not the case. It's just the mechanism had to change so that later down the road we don't get a appeals or we don't get the rest of the collaborative challenging what the steering committee ends up approving the final product of projects later down the line. So I hope that also provides just more assurances and clarity in terms of the issue that's for.

02:03:08

Speaker 2

Thank you, Scarlet. Okay, well, it's now 2:58. Thank you, everybody who stayed on this long. I appreciate it. I think it was good feedback. I think we're getting there and I hope that everybody feels heard. That's the most important thing that I want to make sure that we all feel like we're heard and that our respective viewpoints. Because ultimately we all want the same thing. Yeah. We want to be able to see some movement and some job creation and some great economic development activity going on in our region.

02:03:39

Speaker 5

So, Scarlett, can you send the chat out to us so that we can loop back and make sure that we capture the necessary motions that we've discussed?

02:03:51



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 3

And Louise, you're still working on type. You're going to type yours up, right? It's not.

02:03:55

Speaker 6

We can send out the chat, but what I would like to request is if we. If folks that are putting motions forward, if they can formally email the motion in its most final and clear form, that would be very helpful.

02:04:11

Speaker 5

That's great. That'll help. It will help because there's. It's a very long chat today.

02:04:16

Speaker 6

Yeah, yeah. So you guys can email that to us. We do have to kind of find, you know, go through all of this, create this email. So it probably will not be out till tomorrow, but yes, we can email that before end of day. Just your final, most clear motion that would help us integrating it into the communications that we will be sending out.

02:04:40

Speaker 3

Oh, okay.

02:04:41

Speaker 5

So I'm clarifying. I want to make sure. Just because I'm just not sure that I understood. What I'm asking is if you could send out the chat right away. That way I can pick up the pieces that were in the chat into that final motion.



02:04:54

Speaker 2

And Karen, are you at your laptop? If you're looking at the chat, if you just click on those three dots at the top.

02:05:00

Speaker 5

Oh, it's not doing it for you. That's why I'm asking. Okay, Yeah, I did it.

02:05:03

Speaker 2

I'll send it to you right now.

02:05:04

Speaker 5

Yeah, I'm having some problem. That's why asking. Thank you so much.

02:05:10

Speaker 2

All right, I guess we can all go now. Yeah.

02:05:13

Speaker 3

All right. Thank you. This is good.

02:05:16

Speaker 2

Thank you, guys.



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

02:05:17

Speaker 6

Thank you. Bye, everyone.

02:05:18

Speaker 3

Bye.

02:05:34

Speaker 2

There.