



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

## Steering Committee Monthly Meeting January 14, 2024

[Presentation](#)

[Recording](#)

- Passcode: Cge@4=rG

[Summary Notes](#)

[Meeting Transcript](#)

### Summary Notes

The Steering Committee Meeting held on January 14, 2025, addressed several key agenda items, including a discussion on various motions and a solicitation for input to the Steering Committee aimed at supporting regional recovery efforts following fire incidents. The committee reviewed and approved a Catalyst RFP Development Subcommittee expansion. Due to the regional wildfires impacting the Los Angeles region, a 30-day extension for an activation work plan related to the Transportation and Logistic sector was granted. The meeting also included discussions on refining the RFP process in light of state feedback regarding potential conflicts of interest and the establishment of a tiered funding system. Members emphasized the importance of internal process improvements and communication, particularly regarding proposal submissions and voting procedures. Closing announcements highlighted upcoming meetings, including the next Steering Committee meeting scheduled for January 23rd, and the release of the Catalyst RFP on January 27th. Action items were assigned to specific members to facilitate follow-up on various initiatives and best practices.



### **Agenda and Meeting Structure (00:04 - 12:29)**

- Agenda shifted to address all motions at one time
- 30 minutes allocated for discussion
- Andrea supporting the team and keeping track of time
- Housekeeping reminders: attendance form, designated alternate form, agenda item proposal process
- Resource tracker containing relevant documents shared
- Feedback on Steering Committee operation to be emailed to chair

### **GoBiz Request for Fire Response (12:29 - 21:59)**

- GoBiz reached out to support regional recovery efforts
- Proposed initiatives: impact analysis, community resilience fund, sector coordinator efforts
- Suggested asking for \$500,000 to support advancing efforts
- Discussion on leveraging existing data and coordinating with county and city efforts
- Focus on helping smaller businesses and workers affected by fires

### **Timeline Review and Past Motions (21:59 - 31:47)**

- Catalyst RFP Development Subcommittee expanded
- Activation Plan and work plan for transportation and logistics voted on (64% approval)
- 30-day extension granted for activation work plan
- Working group meeting rescheduled

### **RFP Process and State Response (31:48 - 42:11)**

- Outreach to other regions for best practices in RFP process



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

- Bay Area's approach: separate subcommittees for procurement design, scoring, and voting
- State flagged proposal to establish 4-tier funding system due to conflict of interest
- Discussion on flexible tiered language in RFP

### **Motions and Amendments (42:11 - 49:37)**

- Sharon proposed revised motion for defined tiered funding levels
- Discussion on steering committee's authority and decision-making process
- Concerns raised about implementing policies without majority agreement

### **Process Improvements and Communication (49:37 - 58:06)**

- Internal review of proposal submission process underway
- Plans to enhance agenda item submission form and process
- Request for written communications with the state to be shared with steering committee

### **Voting Process and Conflict of Interest (58:06 - 01:06:34)**

- Discussion on how to handle voting on motions that may create conflicts of interest
- Proposal to include flexible tiered language in RFP
- Debate on steering committee's role in defining equity criteria

### **HRNA Advisors Work Plan (01:06:34 - 01:17:40)**

- Work plan includes 5 work streams with technical assistance hours allocated
- Opportunities for steering committee input throughout the scope of work
- Survey to be sent out for feedback on outreach approach

### **Closing Announcements (01:17:42 - 01:29:43)**



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

- Partners meeting scheduled for Friday at 9am
- Three meetings with RFP Catalyst Subcommittee this week
- Next steering committee meeting on January 23rd from 1pm to 2:30
- Catalyst RFP set to be released on the 27th
- Staff changes at LAEDC announced

## Meeting Transcript

**00:03**

**Speaker 1**

I think the minimum discussion is subjective, so I'm not sure. I know that we are shifting the agenda a little bit, as you all saw, where the motions are all going to be addressed at one time, but. Sorry, the discussion time. Sorry, that's the problem working at home. I'm sorry, you just.

**00:34**

**Speaker 2**

Just broke up.

**00:43**

**Speaker 1**

I. Oh, sorry. Okay. So what I was saying is that the agenda has been shifted a little bit to where the motions are being addressed all at one time. But the idea of least amount of conversation that's subjective. We can never really predict that. We have 30 minutes though, if that helps to get that back down.

**01:07**

**Speaker 2**

Yeah, we could.



**01:08**

Speaker 3

Let's just try to frame it and really be diligent about people sticking to.

**01:13**

Speaker 2

Being as brief as possible.

**01:16**

Speaker 3

Don't have that kind of time today.

**01:19**

Speaker 1

I can fully support that one today. Thank you.

**01:24**

Speaker 4

Hi, Andrea. Also, I just wanted to say that I'll be supporting the team and keeping track of time for the discussions today. So I'll just be providing reminders.

**01:36**

Speaker 1

Appreciate that. Sorry, I'm at home today with the. With a repair and the dogs are acting stupid, of course. So I'm going to keep it on mute as much as possible.

**01:59**

Speaker 5

In the essence of time, we can go ahead and move forward. First off, I do just want to



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

acknowledge that our whole region is being impacted in just many different ways. And so we do just want to thank everyone for making time today. To ensure that our programmatic deliverables stay on track. We will go ahead and submit the time attendance time in the chat. But with that, we'll go ahead and just move forward. And thank you, Andrea, for letting us know that you're having issues at home right now. We'll go ahead and facilitate as best as we can. Juan, if you could. Oh great. You'll go ahead and cover this part, Juan. Thank you.

**02:43**

Speaker 6

Well, dude. Good afternoon everyone. Just some regular housekeeping reminders. We will be putting in the chat the link to the attendance form. So just want to remind folks to please submit your attendance for today's meeting. We get to get. We normally have votes folks chat us that they're here or they rely on the accepting the calendar invite. I do just want to make clear that the way we keep track of attendance by student committee members is through the attendance form and we'll be providing that link through the chat throughout the meeting. So we will go ahead and do that throughout the meeting. If there are any questions throughout the today's meeting, feel free to add them and submit them in the chat. We will do.

**03:40**

Speaker 6

We are going to do our best to just record those questions and answer them at the end of, you know, today's meeting or at the end of a giving presentation. So feel free to submit your questions in the chat and we will go ahead and address those at the end of a presentation. Next is the designated alternate form. Steering committee members, you can designate an alternate to attend the Steering Committee meeting. In case you are not available, we will go ahead and put that link in the chat as well. But if you haven't taken advantage of that kind of ability, Steering Committee members can designate an alternate. Both links, the designate alternate form and the attendance form is in the resource Committee tracker that we have for the Steering Committee.



**04:40**

Speaker 6

So we'll also go ahead and link that resource tracker in the chat throughout the meeting. But if you have not done so and you do want to designate an alternate, you can, you just have to submit the designated alternate form. Moving on, to propose an agenda item by any Steering Committee member, we also have a Google form for that. We have a Steering Committee agenda request form. We will be touching on that form later today. We'll be announcing some updates to that form and other updates to just actionable items by the Steering Committee. And so we'll share those updates later in the meeting.

**05:23**

Speaker 6

And once again, we have a resource tracker that has just all the documents that are relevant to the goals and objectives and processes of our Steering Committee, whether it's the regional report, part one, part two, whether it's our bylaws, whether it's any of the RFPs that we've released previously, you can find all that relevant information on our Steering Committee resource tracker. And again, we will be putting these links in the chat so that the Steering Committee have those resources readily available. And lastly, if any Steering Committee has Steering Committee member has any feedback, any concerns about just the Steering Committee in general or the operation, or any suggestions on the operation of the Steering Committee, we invite you to email our chair under Slater with those feedback for those concerns. And you can see her email right there on the slide@slatermcla.edu.

**06:32**

Speaker 6

So thank you and with that I'll turn it over back to our chair.

**06:41**



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 1  
Next slide.

**06:51**

Speaker 5

So for announcements, we do have Jermaine who will be talking about a request that we did receive from Gobiz in terms of advancing our efforts here in LA county in response to the fires that we are currently being impacted by. Jermaine, if you'd like to go ahead.

**07:06**

Speaker 3

And take this item, thanks Scarlett and afternoon all. Thank you all for taking time to meet Today, given the obvious challenges in the region, I mean, we all know that there is a lot going on, and we are not even to a point where we can even really begin tactically discussing recovery, but we know that it's on the forefront. That being said, as we get through these fires, Go Biz did reach out and offered a hand in supporting the regional recovery efforts. Some of that conversation really revolved around what can the California Jobs First Collaborative do to basically support their recovery efforts by essentially really leveraging work that we're already doing. So, really, one of the first things that came to mind, obviously, was updating our regional plan.

**08:03**

Speaker 3

I know that right now we don't have an abundance of information in that plan that's supported by data and research that really revolves around disaster recovery and or prevention. So one thing that we could essentially do, if we have the funding in place, is one, do an impact analysis of the region and how these, you know, essentially these fires that are transpiring are going to impact our region. And not only these fires, but, you know, LA county as, you know, I mean, there's going to be additional, you know, disasters potentially. Right. And so how do we, you know, basically take data and put in





Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

some preventative measures as well to kind of minimize some of the challenges in the region?

**08:49**

Speaker 3

And so these are things that we could basically integrate if we have the research in place, into our regional plan that can then be leveraged, which we know obviously is going to tie back to the county SEDS process. So that's the comprehensive economic development strategy for LA County. So we can leverage that and kind of integrate that and update that information. You know, the other piece is a community resilience fund, maybe. You know, we know that a lot of our neighbors are going to have a lot of needs during these difficult times. And so what can we do to pull together, you know, maybe a subcommittee that really looks at different ways that we can provide, you know, small denominations of assistance to individuals, could go to businesses, et cetera. These are all things we'd have to obviously work through.

**09:40**

Speaker 3

But these are things that we discussed with Go Biz, essentially sector coordinator efforts. Right. You know, how can we basically take the expertise of hrna, who's already in place and going to be doing work for CJF, and basically build some more capacity so that they can assess some of the regional challenges as a result of some of the fires that have transpired in the region, and then just kind of looking at future aid and recovery and prevention as well. And then obviously, if we're going to do any additional work outside of the scope that we already have in place for cadison implementation. What does that look like? And then how can we support and make sure that the convener and the fiscal agent have the money in place to do so? So these are things that we discussed.

**10:24**

Speaker 3

We did not come up with a finite number. My best suggestion, given how much some of



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

these things are going to cost, is to really come in high and then see what they come back with. So, you know, in the neighborhood, maybe we asked for half a million dollars to support advancing these efforts. I'm not really sure we wanted to bring it to the steering committee's attention and really just come to a consensus. Hey, is this something we want to take on? Does it make sense? And should we ask the state for funding to do so, since the opportunity is there? And then once they come back to us with what the denomination may be, we can basically develop a subcommittee to land on the different activities and initiatives that we want to kind of finalize and roll with.

**11:08**

Speaker 3

So I'll put a pin in it there to kind of open up for questions. I know that there was a couple of folks that actually reached out in advance of this and actually stated some solutions. I think Tony was one of those folks. But want to just leave it open for discussion. Tony, I see your hand is up.

**11:25**

Speaker 7

Yeah, I didn't know the best way. I mean, this is a very long conversation, but I think a couple pieces. I think a half a million is probably too low because we want to be also be able to have sub grants. I think we should consider some different approaches to outreach that supplement kind of our approach for the overall regional plan. The American Indian Chamber very much feels like we need to really look at trusted messenger organizations that have already demonstrated experience in certain areas. So geography is important, but you may need to identify trusted messengers that might be across different areas and recognize that the extreme impacts people are really going to need people they trust. The other thing was to suggest that this collaborative actually be like a center component for the state's resources that are coming in.

**12:28**

Speaker 7

And so a lot of the recovery efforts are very government focused. But there's already



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

500 organizations that know about this structure. So having a single place where we can be community members can be sure that there isn't. This is where we're going to learn about things. This is where we're going to understand how to do input and that there isn't some other conversation that, you know, that happens and we missed it. So it's not saying you shouldn't have other conversations, but knowing. Knowing that it's particularly here. Wanted to bring up the issue that you're going to have a lot of in home businesses that are going to be impacted. And so looking at both, which we don't normally look at for a while, but physical locations for small businesses to get started, as well as people that could be remote.

**13:22**

Speaker 7

So I guess the real question at the end of this, if you can tell us how we might submit maybe some written ideas. We have some. I haven't gone through them all, but those. Those are just a few of the highlights.

**13:33**

Speaker 3

Yeah, I would say, yes, team, that might actually be a really good idea, just to have a general survey to take on ideas of what this could look like. And then that way I can start. We can uplift these ideas to go biz so that we can land on what this number or funding allocation may be. And that's part of it, Tony, because I know you mentioned businesses. That's part of what that impact analysis would look at. You know, what is the impact of what the. Of the fires. You know, we know that is billions of dollars, but how many small businesses. What are the small businesses like? This is what that impact analysis could potentially uncover to help guide us in terms of what recovery looks like. Sharon, I think was. Or I can't. I don't know who was next.

**14:18**

Speaker 3

I think it might have been Sharon.



**14:20**

Speaker 8

I think Andrea had her hand up, and I. Andrea.

**14:23**

Speaker 3

Sorry.

**14:27**

Speaker 1

Oh, I. Well, Tony actually brought up some of the points. One, yeah, I would definitely go for way more than 500 to get to the 500. We have a. A much smaller impactful contract that is over four. So I would. I would definitely increase the asking amount. And then Tony brought up about, like, being a resource and being able to look at the organizations who actually have the relationships. So that was. That was why I lowered my hand. But, yeah, Tony.

**15:05**

Speaker 3

Sharon.

**15:06**

Speaker 8

Yeah, couple things. I mean, I'm looking at the proposed initiatives, and I'm a little concerned that they're very analytical. We know that SBA is funding 22 small business assistance Centers to address recovery. We also know that we have the county's Office of Planning with an entire wildlife plan and sustainability piece. And I don't know if Kelly's on the call, but that's already ongoing. The chair of the City of Los Angeles Small Business Commission as well as the County Small Business Commission are all over this stuff, and they're mobilizing as well. And so I'm kind of figuring on. I Mean, we have an infrastructure here at California Jobs first we had something that Armin effectively



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

read and Jermaine, your input is always so very valuable. We have a strategy development subcommittee that worked to develop strategies for Regional Plan Part two.

**16:15**

Speaker 8

And I think that might be an idea of using, just mobilizing that, calling a meeting of that Strategy development committee and getting folks to throw in the ideas and then of course, for that, because I'm concerned that we're, I don't want us to divert our attention away from the disinvested communities we're focused on, but that we could possibly do some work around having each of our seven primary sectors, high growth sectors, along with our small business sector, have some input together in some session with our Strategic Strategy Development Committee to flesh out additional strategies. Right. And before we go spend a whole bunch of money on research and, and, you know, funding sector investments Coordinator, we kind of already have, we've done this before. We've had three wild, major wildfires. We have the data from Woodsley.

**17:14**

Speaker 8

I mean, yes, there's going to be a need for impact and I think that's going to be significant philanthropic dollars that are going to come to the table. But right now the county, the city and SBA is mobilizing to, you know, and they're throwing money at it. I'm just waiting to find out or if, you know, whether in the next seven days the president is going to release part of the emergency EDA funds. Because those are the emergency disaster dollars. Right. And so I kind of think we need to come up with, you know, it would be great for if we just do what we did, get the strategies down on paper. It wasn't that complex.

**17:52**

Speaker 8

Take the best information that we already know from the past three wildfires that we've had as well as Covid, and then coordinate with county and city and then see what we



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

can come up with. I just don't want to see this gobble up a whole lot of money on a bunch of more studies if we don't leverage what we just did.

**18:11**

Speaker 3

Got it. Yeah. Totally agree. These are only suggestions. I will share that he wants, the state wants something back from us by the end of the week. So that being said, this is obviously a quick turnaround. Obviously, we got a lot of folks in need. So that being said, you know, we can get a survey going just to get preliminary ideas and then we can utilize those preliminary ideas to say, hey, go biz, what's the max that we can do based upon these preliminary ideas? And then to your point, Sharon, I think we just come back to the table and then we work through what the activities will actually be. I don't think there's an issue with that.

**18:48**

Speaker 8

What's hilarious is that when we started, if those are on the front end, when we started Surf not California jobs first. Right. One of the four priority areas, and I know Scarlett remembered Jim, and doing this in a whole fact sheet visual, one of the focuses was resiliency. And then it shifted to California jobs. Right. And so, you know, I'm one encouraging us, but I know that we just don't have, you know, I think there's a lot to be done and we don't need to, you know, step on everybody. But who turns away money if it can give us closer. Because I get, you know, we got a lot of unemployed folks that are going to, that have no place to live, but they also lost their businesses. And I think the SBA Assistance center is 22, is a lot for our region.

**19:34**

Speaker 3

Yeah, absolutely. Luis?

**19:39**

Speaker 2



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Yeah. Can I recommend that? You know, I think I want to echo what Sharon said. I'm concerned that it's a little bit too research heavy. I think if we can make the focus solely primarily on helping some of those businesses that have been really destroyed, especially those smaller ones. I think, you know, Altadena had a lot of small businesses, a lot of independent workers, people who were, you know, worked in the entertainment industry, were cameramen who had, you know, people who do design work, who had equipment at home that they used for that work. And all of a sudden that's all gone because they weren't able to take it with them. I know of one individual who was a landscaper, and he lost his truck, lost all his equipment. His wife is a housekeeper.

**20:16**

Speaker 2

Now they're kind of worried like, hey, they're not going to get anything and they're not, you know, they don't have papers. And so they're worried that if they're even going to qualify for any of those programs. And so I think to the extent that we can kind of really try to focus on those smaller businesses and how do we kind of help them not just recover, but remain here? Because I think the biggest challenge we're going to face is not necessarily getting the funds to help people, but getting it to them in a timely manner. If you're not going to get your house rebuilt for another two, three years, you're going to leave. If you're not going to get, you know, your business opened up again, it's not going to open up there anymore.

**20:50**

Speaker 2

So I think the more things we can do quicker and get folks, you know, resources right away, I think that would be one of the more effective things that we can do.

**20:58**

Speaker 3

Got it. Makes sense. So in the, what we can do is in the survey link to collect ideas, just put those ideas in there, we'll synthesize all the information and we'll send it directly to the state and say, hey, this is what the steering committee and the collaborative is



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

thinking of. This is the number that we think is, you know, makes sense for these different types of activities in totality. And then obviously, you know, depending on what's available, we'll then have to come back to the table with the steering committee and basically develop a subcommittee that can work on the actual activities before we finalize any type of contracts or anything like that. Kevin and then Ricardo thank you, Jermaine.

**21:44**

Speaker 1

I just want to make people aware.

**21:47**

Speaker 3

I have a lot of friends and.

**21:48**

Speaker 1

Frat brothers have lost their homes. Terrible thing. And there's predatory behavior going on right now. There are people that are going in.

**21:58**

Speaker 2

For a money grab to try to.

**21:59**

Speaker 1

Offer people money to take their homes. As some of you know, may not.

**22:05**





Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 2

Know, Altadena was one of those red line cities, about 60, 70% African American.

**22:11**

Speaker 1

And it just would be a tragedy for people to come in and.

**22:17**

Speaker 2

You know, decide to sell their property.

**22:20**

Speaker 1

Because they're in a tough situation.

**22:21**

Speaker 2

Governor Newsom put something out that he's conferring with one of the governors of the governor of Hawaii because the same activity was going on in Hawaii after that fire. So I think an outreach and engagement.

**22:37**

Speaker 1

Campaign and offering resources along those lines would be a good idea.

**22:46**

Speaker 3

Absolutely. Thank you, sir. Ricardo, I'll just echo, I think what.



**22:52**

Speaker 1

Everyone has already said, but I'll add to that there should be added kind of worker focused. Luis mentioned some of the landscapers and gardeners and others that had routes that encompassed Altadena and some of these communities altogether, and they're without where do they turn to? Now? The other thing that I would add, Jermaine and I think they the survey is a great idea, but just given the sense of urgency, maybe a 24 hour turnaround membership and just kind of ensuring that we move this along and to everyone's point, the asks should be substantially higher.

**23:28**

Speaker 3

Makes sense. Well, I know we're running low on time here and I want to make sure we get to the other agendas items. Luis, you had something real quick.

**23:35**

Speaker 2

Yeah, sorry, last thing, real quick. I know racial equity has been a Big thing for this group we want to get, you know, addressed. Homeownership is one of those areas where it was, you see it drawn out more than anything. African American homeownership stands at 35% in California. In the city of Altadena, it was 81%. So if we don't have the folks to rebuild these homes and rebuild them quickly, that's going to drop down significantly because we're going to move out of those areas and we're going to be the same things other. So I think the construction side needs to be part of our strategic plan that really needs to be bumped up to. This is an industry. We need support because we need to rebuild a lot and we need to rebuild a lot fast. Thank you.

**24:16**

Speaker 3

Okay, sounds good. I'm on board. Makes total sense. Everything that everyone has said. Team, I think, Juan, if you can get that survey rolling and then to Ricardo's point, yes, I



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

think a 24 hour turnaround will be the cap on that. That way we can get this information synthesized and I'm just going to literally just send everything to the state and then if you guys can also just drop in that survey, you know, the amount of money that we should ask for because I've heard a couple different numbers thrown out there. I don't think that there's a ton of money available just kind of putting that out there. But you know, we'll go high and then whatever they come back with, you know, we're more than happy to receive that so that we can help our residents here that are going through some challenges.

**25:01**

Speaker 3

Thanks again. I'll pass it back to.

**25:04**

Speaker 2

This is Robert again. I think it's important if there's somebody on LADC staff that could go back and look at the recent bills that president has signed for funding and see how we can link or at least guide state folks on how we move those monies into our community. There's going to be a kind of.

**25:25**

Speaker 3

A two prong approach. Got it. Thank you, sir. Will do. All right, team, I'll pass it back to.

**25:36**

Speaker 5

Go ahead and. Yeah, I'll go ahead and take over. Juan, if you can put up the slide just really quickly. I'll go ahead and share it in the chat shortly, but and I'll share it through email as well. LEDC did put out an email to all of our California Jobs first partners. We are just requesting our partners to please, if you have the opportunity and time to just fill out the survey. We're trying to extract data in terms of Mutual aid and what services are being provided by what organizations within each fall. So I'll drop that in the chat as



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

well. So if you do have a moment, we would love an opportunity to understand the services that you are providing on the ground. And then if we can get that, the presentation back up.

**26:21**

Speaker 5

The last item on that slide, I believe was a 30 day extension. The state did go ahead and give us the green light in terms of a 30 day extension for our activation work plan. It originally was due on January 31. Seeing that what we are experiencing is impacting us at every level within internal capacity as well as our steering committee and stakeholders, they did grant us that 30 day extension. So we will be meeting internally with HRNA to re strategize our game plan for the activation work plan and we will be rescheduling the working meeting that were supposed to have last week with the steering committee on the activation plan. That information is going to be forthcoming and we will keep you all updated. And if I can ask for the presentation to please be put up. I don't think I see.

**27:15**

Speaker 1

Scarlett. The presentation is up now. At least I see it.

**27:19**

Speaker 5

Oh, I don't see it. So apologies, I guess the next slide, whoever has that, let's see.

**27:29**

Speaker 1

You see that now, Scarlett.

**27:34**

Speaker 5



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Yeah, so we'll go ahead and just. This is actually my slide as well. It's just streamlining steering committee request. I am sensitive to the time we have, so I'll just run through this very quickly. Internally, we are doing our best to ensure that we are being kept accountable to the different requests that we are receiving from the steering committee, including proposals, agenda items and motions. And so we currently are developing a more streamlined process to ensure two things. One is providing the steering committee members a more structured process for submitting agenda items, motions and proposals. And then also one, creating an internal review system that keeps us accountable to your request.

**28:17**

Speaker 5

So at the next meeting and forthcoming this week, we should be sharing, we are creating a checklist and basically this is a standardized checklist that will guide the submission of these types of actionable items. And the checklist will also have references to our bylaws. So it'll be one document that basically just informs the steering committee on how to go about submitting these types of actionable items to include in our meetings. And then we're also just developing an internal review process to ensure that every item we receive is compliant and really ready for consideration at our meetings and giving us the enough and appropriate time to be able to review and process these items.

**28:59**

Speaker 5

So we'll go ahead and distribute the checklist that we are currently creating and we will be updating our agenda form to ensure that it provides more opportunities for us to be able to just get more information, include the checklist items as well. And overall, this is just an opportunity for us to be able to just have a smoother transition when it comes to being able to be accountable to just the bearing requests that we receive from the steering committee and just having a more efficient process during our meetings. So that does conclude this specific slide. We can go ahead and move on to the next, which is timeline review. And I believe our co chair, Stella, will be reviewing this with the support of ccf.



**29:43**

Speaker 1

Yeah, thank you, Scarlett. Appreciate it. And let me just say real quick, I really appreciate everyone still, you know, making an effort to join this call today. We know what's going on out there. We know that all of our organizations are just overwhelmed with trying to help out, trying to figure out what our next moves are for our organization. So thank you, thank you. Just real quick. This will take like 30 seconds. So we just wanted to just quickly review the timeline for Catalyst RFP development and the activation plan. And so you see the activities listed on the left side column there, you've got the deadline, the dates for those particular activities, and then it's just kind of fleshed out for the weeks of January and then moving forward. So we've got the. I'm not going to read through all of this.

**30:36**

Speaker 1

Catalysts, rfp, the working group interest form, deadline, you know, all the way down to, you know, activation plans and application and questions. So there's a timeline there's deadlines for all of us to try and meet again. We know this is. It's really tough right now just to even keep focus. So we wanted to make sure to share this. If there are any questions, please, by all means, contact us. Contact CCF and, you know, hopefully we'll be able to meet these deadlines moving forward. Good deal. Thank you. Not sure who takes the next slide.

**31:20**

Speaker 5

Yeah, so the next slide we have our chair, Andrea, that will just walk us through past motions and some of the action items we've implemented. For one and two and then three, we have Armand.

**31:32**

Speaker 1



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Okay, since our last meeting, and I'm going to do this quickly before anybody starts barking. We had spoken of expanding the Catalyst RFP Development Subcommittee. We put it out to vote. It was agreed to expand it. The seats have been filled and so we now will be moving forward with the workie meetings. The activation Plan and work plan voted on that for the transportation and logistics. So we did come out of that with a 64% vote. And we are going to be working and doing some more outreach on increasing our voting participation as we move forward. That's something that we have spoken of. And then the working group meeting has been rescheduled. And as mentioned earlier, we have the extension. So we have a little bit more time to work on these things. And then. Oh, the steering committee goals in the RFP process.

**32:34**

Speaker 1

I will pass that over.

**32:37**

Speaker 3

Thank you.

**32:38**

Speaker 4

Yeah, yeah, thank you, Andrea. And I'll just be giving an update. So Chioma, our senior program manager of outreach and engagement, has been leading this charge to contact other regions and reach out to them to learn of best processes, to see how they're handling their RFP process. So far, I've received word from Chioma that we've reached out to five of the 12 other regions. From these five, it seems like we're going to have a conversation with Valley Vision, representing Greater Sacramento in the coming days. Apart from that, we have also had some conversation with Orange county and the Bay Area. Orange county are a little bit in a different place than us right now. They are barely releasing their notice of funding opportunity for the rfp. And they're one.

**33:25**



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 4

One thing that we learned from them is that they are making an effort to include their regional plan part two strategies in their scoring rubric, and we'll keep in touch with them as they continue forward. I think I'll actually speak mostly on the conversation we had with Bay Area. So we spoke with the representative from their regional convener at all home. And from this conversation, we learned a few things. One thing that we learned was that they have three sort of separate subcommittees as they're going through this catalyst process. They have one subcommittee for procurement design, one for scoring, and then one for voting. Another thing that we learned from the Bay Area is on the question of geographic equity.

**34:05**

Speaker 4

They don't have specifically a clause that says certain regions must receive a certain amount of funding, but their funding awards are different depending on the number of counties that they're included in the application. So, of course, they're made up of six counties that are in the Bay Area collaborative. And so if they. If the applicant is servicing two plus counties, they can receive up to 1.5 million. And if they're servicing one county, they can receive up to 1 million. They actually have announced their funding reward. And I'll put that in the chat in one moment after I finish speaking, so you can see an idea of what those 10 projects were. Some of them did receive the full 1.5 and some of them received, I think the smallest award was about 370,000. But yeah, you can check it out. It's very interesting.

**34:50**

Speaker 4

You know, as we approach our. Our process of submitting projects, I think it's a good thing to keep in mind for examples for projects. One other very interesting thing that I think will lead into the next conversation that we had with Bay Area was who was in these subcommittees. And the Bay Area mentioned that they had a very strict conflict of interest statement that they developed in tandem with their fiscal agent, which is the City of San Francisco. So they had this very strict conflict of interest because they spoke with the state and said to us that the state would not approve of individuals that are





Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

applying for funding to then, you know, influence the RFP development. And so that actually led us to reach out to the state and that. That was one of the big, I think, takeaways from that conversation.

**35:37**

Speaker 4

And I think that leads into the next slide. So I'll pass it on. There's no questions here. And thank you, everybody. Stay safe.

**35:44**

Speaker 8

Amen. You said there were five. Did you include Inland Empire?

**35:50**

Speaker 4

Yeah, yeah. So we have reached out to Inland Empire. We have not received any response yet, but we will follow up.

**35:57**

Speaker 1

Okay.

**35:57**

Speaker 8

Because they presented with a really, very robust PowerPoint on their process at our partner meeting. And it did create quite a bit of excitement by our committee members that were on that call and Chris was actually consulting with them on their equity subcommittee. So we should be able, you should be able to pretty easily access their presentation because they presented it to our hrtc. So I thought you might have it in house.



**36:31**

Speaker 4

Oh, no, yeah, definitely. We've reached out to them. Still waiting a follow up. Like I said, we have a conversation with Valley Vision, representing Greater Sacramento coming up soon. And so, you know, as we learn more, we'll share it with the steering committee.

**36:43**

Speaker 8

Thank you.

**36:44**

Speaker 1

Thank you.

**36:46**

Speaker 2

What were the five again?

**36:48**

Speaker 4

So the five that I at least have, you know, I have the receipts for that we've reached out to is Inland Empire, Orange County, Bear Area, the Capital Region, and Valley Vision.

**37:02**

Speaker 5

Okay.

**37:03**



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 8  
Yeah.

**37:03**

Speaker 5

And Armand, just to add, just to end with this slide is what we will do is once we have most of the responses, we will go ahead and just make a matrix of each region, the different responses that we've received in terms of how they've been working with the steering committee and incorporating feedback, and we will go ahead and send that out to the steering committee as well.

**37:24**

Speaker 4

Yeah. Thank you, everyone.

**37:33**

Speaker 5

Okay, that takes us next to just the current state response that we've received based on some proposals. And I believe a team member from CCF will be going ahead and taking this slide on.

**37:47**

Speaker 9

I'll be taking it on. Thank you, Scarlett. Hi, everyone. So we did receive a thoughtful proposal to establish a four tiered funding system for Catalyst grants ranging from 80,000 to 400,000. We recognize the intent behind this approach, which namely is to support smaller organizations and encourage a greater number of funded projects. However, after consulting with our state funder, were informed that members who will be applying for this funding cannot vote on the tiers as it would result in a conflict of interest and delay the region's ability to award projects. Therefore, unfortunately, we are unable to move forward with the formal vote on this matter at this time. Having said that, instead of an actual formal vote, what we're proposing is to include flexible tiered



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

language in the RFP itself stating that tiered funding system may be considered for awards.

**38:46**

Speaker 9

We don't need to detail every aspect right now. Rather, this language will provide flexibility to implement a tiered approach later if it proves beneficial and feasible once we see the applications and the requested amounts. So again, for me, in essence, we're still addressing the core request for a tiered approach, just reframing it, how it's going to be adopted to ensure we remain compliant and flexible, and then just some rationale. Next steps that we have is again maintaining that flexibility. Our existing RFP language, as you know, states that applicants can request up to 400,000, which allows organizations to propose the amount they truly need. Including this optional tiered language now will give us another tool to ensure smaller organizations can successfully compete. Number two is during the application review, technical assistance laid by HRNA will guide applicants in refining their budgets.

**39:43**

Speaker 9

If a tiered structure emerges naturally, we can apply it without locking ourselves into a preset number of grants per tier. And then last is just avoiding that conflict of interest by avoiding a formal vote where potential applicants having voting power, we will be able to remain in compliance with our funder's guidance and prevent any conflict. Conflict of interest. So thank you for understanding as we strive to ensure an equitable, transparent and compliant process. If you have any questions, please let me know.

**40:20**

Speaker 8

I have a question. The first item, I will be amending the motion in today's meeting. The language that's on the screen, it does not exactly reflect the mess the language the state provided. And so I've amended my motion based upon the language the state provided. So thank you, Jorge, but you will see an amended motion coming into the chat



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

momentarily. The second item on number three, we cleared the equity criteria conversation earlier on, and so I'm going to defer that one over. That's an issue of a group of our CBOs and I think there was dialogue with the state prior previously on this issue that we could establish equity criteria. In fact, our bylaws state that we would define equity as long as it exceeded the state's requirement. I'm going to defer that one over to our equity tin.

**41:18**

Speaker 8

But again, there is a motion to amend the bylaws. That is an entire different process and that is following the bylaws documents. I do want to just stay true to the number one motion because thank you guys at ccf, for sharing what the state's response was and I'm happy to put that in the chat. And it's a little bit different than the language there and I think we can still get steering committee vote on that. On the number one item, as you know, I have rejected the amendment that was proposed to just leave a generic and leave it up to HRNA advisors as whether or not what if those levels exist and what those should be. So I did reject that offer and I would like to keep my motion intact, but I will be amending that motion.

**42:09**

Speaker 9

Thank you, Sherrod. So again, based on what? So it looks like you're rejecting the recommendation for us to put that language in RFP and that's going to give us that flexibility to be able to not lock ourselves in. And I just want to make it very clear that again, if we decide and we move forward and we put tiered language individually, we're locking ourselves. And if we don't get that, those type of applications that fall on those tiers, we won't be able to contract out because that's not what we put in the rfp.

**42:38**

Speaker 1

Number one.



**42:39**

Speaker 8

I'm sorry, I'm sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt. I apologize.

**42:43**

Speaker 9

So. So that's number one. And then number two, again, you know, we're trying to find a compromise where we don't lock ourselves in the state. And I think I did get to see your amended language. Just bottom line, we could take it back to the state, but it looks like they've already ruled that we can't vote on it. And so I'm trying, and ccf, we're trying to work around so that we can take your input and your suggestion into consideration and put it into the RFP and abide by it, because I think that obviously we feel that there's value there. We don't disagree with it, but we're just trying to frame it in a way where we can pass it without being able to vote because we've been told we can't vote on it.

**43:26**

Speaker 9

So I hope that gives a little bit more clarity on it.

**43:29**

Speaker 8

If we're ready, we can open up. I'll put the motion in, and then we can open dialogue if there's a second on the motion. But again, first, I want to put the language from the state email directly into the chat so that we are clear on what the state has said. Said at least then I feel really more comfortable that, you know, I understand there's a counter proposal, but I just think this is critically important for our members. And again, I don't. Again, we'll open it up for. You'll open up for discussion. I'm not sharing the meeting, so I'm trying to be a little bit more respectful than just kind of countering out. But the language that was on the screen and the language that the email from the state have, they have a little bit different, and I think it's a significant difference.



**44:17**

Speaker 1

I just want to mention. Sorry, Andrea. Same thing that you were saying. Yeah. And we'd like to hear from as many partners as. As possible during the discussion period around any motions that are made forward, just so that we get a good perspective of what the consensus is of the group. Tony, I think Luis was first, I believe. Oh, okay.

**44:44**

Speaker 2

Yeah. So apologies. Was. So was there a formal response by the state, and was that shared out? Maybe I missed it.

**44:50**

Speaker 8

I'm gonna put that into the chat right now.

**44:52**

Speaker 9

Yes, it was Luis who came.

**44:53**

Speaker 2

Who from the state responded?

**44:55**

Speaker 9

Karen.

**44:57**



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 2

Karen. Is any information. What department, what position?

**45:00**

Speaker 9

Karen Sevis. I. I could look up her title.

**45:04**

Speaker 2

Okay, so what was.

**45:06**

Speaker 5

Karen Calderon? She's a special initiative support group manager from edd.

**45:12**

Speaker 1

Okay.

**45:13**

Speaker 2

I'm kind of under. I'm kind of wanting to understand what the. They said. They flagged the proposal to establish A4 funding tier levels. Why was that flagged?

**45:24**

Speaker 9

It wasn't flagged. It was communicated. We reached out as.

**45:28**





Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 2  
By the state.

**45:29**

Speaker 9  
Say it again.

**45:30**

Speaker 2  
It says flagged by the state on the screen.

**45:32**

Speaker 9  
Yeah, well, again, flagged by the state in the sense that we reached out to get information and get clarification if it was possible to be able to do this. They indicated. We presented Sharon's proposal and they responded and they indicated with that exact language that There was a conflict of interest. Folks that were going to be voting, I mean, folks that were going to be applying cannot be able to vote on this tiered approach.

**45:59**

Speaker 2  
But so, okay, so let's walk back through. So, so, but why was that an issue of itself? So the underlying proposal is not problematic.

**46:12**

Speaker 9  
The, the actual proposal to do tiers? I don't think that's an actual issue. And that's why I did the workaround that we're building is. And the further, how should I say, recommendation that they made was to put in this tiered funding language.



**46:30**

Speaker 2

Yeah, no, I understand that part. So here's my concern or here's what I'm trying to get around and it's kind of frustrating because we're trying to see if the steering committee should ultimately have the authority on this. Now if they're saying because so many members of the steering committee are planning to apply that creates a conflict, fair enough. If the steering committee were to approve that proposal and send it out to the entire membership, which is 800 plus organizations, and ask those who are planning to attend to apply to abstain and that gets voted, would that address those conflict concerns?

**47:04**

Speaker 9

Again, I would have to take it back to the state. There is an aspect also, Luis, that I want to bring up. There's an aspect of the time, right. And the administrative burden that we have to do to the proposed reaching out, doing a survey. And then how do we truthfully screen out the folks that are going to be conflicted out? Do we just, do we just trust everybody, that everybody is being truthful and honest? Do we really vet it? Do we wait for the applications? And for me, part of the concern that I think we can all agree on is some of these things. That's why we're trying to find the yes.

**47:42**

Speaker 9

And I think that part of our proposal is getting us to get to yes and trying to avoid this administrative and timeline because then it starts affecting our RFP timelines, which this affect the actual time that the folks are going to be, you know, the folks that are going to be doing the work, should I say the performance review or performance timeline. So there's a lot of little aspects. So I just want to make sure that we're trying to address it. I think getting to yes, and we're still going to be able to adhere to these tier levels and implement it, but we're not boxing ourselves into it by writing it in the RFP where later on if we don't get the application.



**48:25**

Speaker 2

Okay, but here's. Here's my point. Here's what I'm trying to get at, which is this kind of feeling that the authority of the steering committee keeps taking away one of the motions. I submitted my motion, one of the requests was that somebody from CCF or whoever is a authority, decision making authority can be here to answer questions. And when you're saying, hey, would that address those concerns? I don't know. Then who does know? And it's frustrating because what we asked for, whether that's somebody from, you know, ccf, from edd, whoever it would be here to answer our questions so that we could find a way around it. We can find a way to ensure that the steering committee maintains that. Because what you're kind of saying is that, no, there's. We don't have time to do all that stuff.

**49:03**

Speaker 2

We're just going to do it our way. And it's.

**49:05**

Speaker 9

No, I'm sorry, that's not what I'm saying. I just want to clarify that. That's not what I'm saying. I'm just bringing up an aspect of the work that needs to be done if we decide to do this route. But I can offer.

**49:16**

Speaker 2

Could be addressed.

**49:16**

Speaker 9

Yeah, Louise, what I can offer is I could bring the state and have a state rep, whether it's Karen or Adriana or somebody that can. Can help address this. I think that again, to



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

share what you're talking about, Luis, part of us is we do answer the questions as to what can we done can be done or not done. But then you guys challenge it. So then it's. Then we go back to. Well, let's go back to the state and see what the recommendation.

**49:39**

Speaker 2

So I guess. Why wasn't that person here today?

**49:41**

Speaker 9

I'm sorry?

**49:42**

Speaker 2

Why wasn't that person here today?

**49:44**

Speaker 1

Well, one, because this proposal came in over the weekend and were trying to. We've been trying to facilitate this request because it went out to the entire steering committee. But I mean, really, because it didn't go through the appropriate process for us to be able to review it in a timely manner in order to get.

**50:05**

Speaker 2

Because the equity criteria was approved months ago.

**50:07**

Speaker 9

No, well, let's. I'm sorry, let's just. Let's just deal with number one first.



**50:12**

Speaker 1

We're referring to the.

**50:13**

Speaker 2

But it's. But it seems like the two flagged issues stem from the same issue, which is the conflict that exists for the steering committee members. And that's the one I'm trying to figure out. What the workaround is for that if there is one. And so the conflict exists with the equity criteria, one's going to be the same reasoning. So when we asked, hey, what can be done? Why isn't that we don't have somebody who can hear speak to that. Now we're kind of being told again, we need to get this moving, we need to get this going.

**50:41**

Speaker 9

No. So again we did reach out to answer your direct question. The reason they're not in the room is because we had already gotten the answer from them when we presented it. So for me there's no reason for them to be in the room. Were communicating what they already indicated, which is again, there is a conflict of interest. So we can't put this to a vote.

**51:00**

Speaker 8

Jorge, I challenged that statement at 2:18. I put into the chat the exact language that came from edd and I do based on I am presenting a revised motion. I do want to respect the state's positioning, but this where the benefit is when we are given information back we are actually capable, competent and willing to make adaptive decisions in order to maintain our authority to make decisions. And based on the state's response, members that will be applying for funding cannot vote on the tiers as it would be a conflict of interest and delay the funding. That does not mean we cannot take up the matter. And



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

so I take a little bit offense. Again, this is where our ability to come up with solutions and guide this is being taken from us.

**52:02**

Speaker 8

And we have members of our stewardship committee who are not supposed to have a vote telling making these decisions for us. And I think that's where the push and pull is. And I would simply want to be able to respect what the state is saying. I'm willing to honor that. And my proposed revision, revised motion is to create is for the steering committee to create defined tiered funding levels for the Catalyst Grant while retaining the 400,000 that we already approved and Sharon, may I finish my motion please?

**52:37**

Speaker 1

Tony's hand was actually has been up.

**52:40**

Speaker 8

Are you asking me to stop mid sentence?

**52:43**

Speaker 1

Well, yeah, if or wait to be.

**52:45**

Speaker 8

Recognized, I will then I will do that.

**52:48**



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 1

Thank you, Tony.

**52:52**

Speaker 7

Thank you. I understand that we're in kind of a difficult position here and I can see that the fiscal agent is trying to come up with solutions that accommodate a variety of things. But what I do need to say is that for the American Indian Chamber we do not want to have multiple tiers. So I think we need to be careful about essentially a backdoor regulation that in the sense that you're saying, well, we'll accommodate it anyway. That may not be the majority of the people that are here, I don't know. But that's what I came to the meeting ready to vote. And that's what. We just need to be careful that in being flexible, we aren't actually implementing a policy that may or may not be agreeable for everyone.

**53:43**

Speaker 1

Thank you for that, Tony. Appreciate that.

**53:50**

Speaker 2

So how do we stop this issue of when we have proposals that it says we'll take it back to the state. State said no. And then that kind of leaves us in an awkward position because no one can speak to the note. And as to why, if I, if.

**54:01**

Speaker 1

I can make it, if I can actually, that we did actually discuss this as the, as part of the leadership committee. And I mean, being completely transparent, there was not a lot of support for it. The reason it's being brought forward is because it was sent out to the entire steering committee. We already established a \$400,000 total limit. And it's. This is me, Andrea, as just a member of the steering committee, I would rather see proposals



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

evaluated based on their merit rather than their budget. And so I think that we're going to get better projects if we evaluate the projects based on the type of the project and what it aims to accomplish, as opposed to where it falls in a tier.

**54:43**

Speaker 2

But you're one member, and that was my feedback, not the deciding factor. And I think that's where the steering committee.

**54:50**

Speaker 1

But that's a motion for discussion. And so, and, and the way it's being presented is as if this is something the steering committee is bringing forward as a whole and the state is holding us back from this. And that's actually not an accurate portrayal.

**55:05**

Speaker 2

Well, no, what the steering committee has approved is equity criteria, which requires a small nonprofit to be part of the leading proposal projects. And my sense seems to be that is not part of what's being incorporated into the rfp.

**55:19**

Speaker 1

We don't know what's being incorporated because it hasn't even been presented yet. They haven't even started meeting yet. And it does. It requires. It requires that at least 50% of the funding go to a CBO. There's no scope of work. There's no determination as far as what the CBO is bringing to the table. I personally think that's problematic and is going to create problems down the road.

**55:44**





Speaker 2

Fair enough, but it was approved by the committee.

**55:46**

Speaker 1

Yeah, but then we're also learning. But there are ordinances and other things that are written up that can be approved by a committee, but once it goes through the complaint clients, it doesn't always end up seeing the light of day.

**56:00**

Speaker 2

And all I'm asking is for someone.

**56:02**

Speaker 1

Who already there are issues and problems. I mean, just to say, oh, the committee approved it even though that there may be problems and the state. And we're already seeing that CCF is saying that there was a conflict, we're already seeing other problems. And so we're just revisiting the same thing over and over again.

**56:20**

Speaker 2

Why wasn't it raised when we discussed it?

**56:24**

Speaker 1

I think it was raised. We had a big, long conversation about it at the last meeting, not when.

**56:30**



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 2

It was approved back in September.

**56:33**

Speaker 1

Remember, the committee approved it, the steering.

**56:36**

Speaker 2

Committee approved the equity.

**56:37**

Speaker 1

The steering committee approved to go with the plan of the equity criteria. And we've already revisited over and over again and we. And which is what's led to CCF being purchased present at the subcommittee meetings to make sure that there is proper guidance moving forward.

**56:55**

Speaker 2

Well, they've been present at all the meetings, but again. So I think it just reiterates this point. This is my last comments. But again, we need to stop this idea of if someone's going to be. If the committee is giving direction and somebody's saying no. We need whoever is saying no to be here to explain why and to be able to work with us to see if there's a workaround that we can achieve the goal that we're seeking to do while maintaining that we're complying with all laws. That's it. So I just don't want somebody else to say, hey, I took it, they said no because I don't know if the person who presented it, fought for it like they should have been on behalf of the committee and said, hey, here are some workarounds. Here's what we could have done.

**57:31**



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 2

Here's what the underlying thing of what they're trying to achieve is. And I think, I suspect there probably could have been some kind of workaround, said, hey, if you do this could work. You could achieve the same desire to do it. And that's where our frustration is. That was just kind of being taken away from us, despite our continual desire to be in those discussions and not being included.

**57:50**

Speaker 9

Thank you and thank you, Luis, for the feedback. What I would say is that's exactly what we're doing today. The state came back with, no, you can't vote, but you can put language, do it this just the way that I presented it. That's exactly what happened. So thank you for that because that's exactly what we're trying to do. And I started with we're trying to get to yes and get to a compromise where we're essentially doing the tiered and adhering to what you guys want. Whether again, now, Tony andrea, not everybody necessarily wants it, but we're trying to find workaround. And that's exactly what the state provided and that's exactly what we're communicating today, that there is a quote unquote workaround and a way to get this done.

**58:31**

Speaker 9

It's not the way that you guys presented it initially, but we're still trying to get to yes. So I just wanted to again reiterate that we are trying to be as flexible as the state will allow us to be.

**58:47**

Speaker 8

My hand is still raised. My hand is still raised. May I be recognized, please?

**59:02**

Speaker 1

Okay. Sharon.



**59:03**

Speaker 2

Sorry.

**59:06**

Speaker 8

Thank. Did you call for me? Okay, so I want to stick with one item at a time. I know. Thank you for the conversation. But what I was bringing to the table and the two points that I wanted to make were simple. And thank you, Andrea. And thank you, Tony. You have stated your position on motion item number one. The state's position is not that we could not adopt or implement a tiered funding level. That was not the state's response. The state's response very clearly is that members that will be applying for this funding cannot vote on the tiers as it would result in a conflict of interest. I will respect that. This is why bringing that back to the committee is keeping with what Luis is saying.

**01:00:00**

Speaker 8

Bring us what has been said and allow us the to assume our role of structuring a response. So with that, in honoring that, I am putting forth a revised motion proposal to create defined tiered levels for the Catalyst program while retaining our \$400,000 cap that we approved. That wasn't a conflict of interest. The steering committee, the steering committee elected RFP Development Committee would establish funding levels and the eligibility criteria. Any funds not awarded at any single tier would be allocated to other applicants based upon a formula determined by the RFP Sub Development Committee. The state has said that we don't get to vote on the tiers. So I am still. I believe the tiers are critically important to our community and our lower or size organizations.

**01:01:05**

Speaker 8



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

And therefore, I would like us as a committee to consider establish these to create defined tiers and defer that duty to our subcommittee who does not have a conflict of interest and is independent. It is not done by ccf. CCF is a member of It. It is not done by laddc. They are a member of it. That subcommittee represents us all and is their scope of duty as Scarlett has pulled up. So that is my motion number one, as amended. All I can do is the amount of those tiers and the specificity would have to come out of the subcommittee based on the state's response. And so that's the motion I'm putting forth. If there is a second on that motion, we go into discussion. That's the normal protocol, and then it is considered for vote.

**01:02:00**

Speaker 8

But I do not want to discount what the state has said. I want to respect everybody has the right to approve and not approve of it. I do know that we have over 11 steering committee members that have said, absolutely, I'm behind this. So. But they may decide to vote differently based on discussion. So I've said we've had three seconds. Motion has been moved and seconded. Madam Chair, back to you.

**01:02:29**

Speaker 1

Thank you. So basically the motion has been amended. We as. As the discussion entailed that this is not something that has been decided on. And so the votes will be put out later. Any questions that folks have, we would definitely respectfully request that you submit them so that we can get them answered so that everyone is clear on what they're actually voting for. Anything else? Would you like to go on? Armand Robert Scott. Sorry. Dr. Robert Saucedo has his hand up. Oh, I'm sorry.

**01:03:08**

Speaker 2

Yeah. I just want to be clear about, as discussed with the state, if that. That that discussion could be memorialized in writing from the state and shared with the group.



**01:03:19**

Speaker 3

But it sounds like there's discussion, but. And I could be wrong, but no.

**01:03:24**

Speaker 2

No paper trail to it.

**01:03:26**

Speaker 3

So that could mean an employee of.

**01:03:28**

Speaker 2

The state made a decision, but it may not be correct, et cetera.

**01:03:32**

Speaker 3

But I think we need to see.

**01:03:33**

Speaker 2

That in writing as well.

**01:03:37**

Speaker 8

Stefania was kind enough to send that to me, and that's what I copied into the chat.



**01:03:43**

Speaker 1

So the plan is, with the motions, when it goes out for the vote, that we include the information that is available to us and the discussion points so that the members have the information when they're making their decision. So thank you, Dr. Estefania.

**01:04:03**

Speaker 5

Oh, yeah. So just a little bit of context. I shared that information with Sharon because she's the one that presented the motion. So to Luis's comment about why this wasn't shared with the rest of the steering committee, it was shared with the person that proposed the motion in the first place. The other thing is that we did not receive the amended proposal. It was sent to everybody else besides us. So that we do ask if there are amendments to motions that we be included in it so that we can have sufficient time to respond. Unfortunately, we did not. So that's. That was. That's something that we do ask moving forward. And I also do want to add that we did have a conversation with the state this morning about just the general. Just steering committee members voting on general tiers.

**01:04:51**

Speaker 5

And that again was also flagged as a concern for a conflict of interest. So wanted to flag that as well.

**01:05:04**

Speaker 2

Chair. Madam Chair, can I speak?

**01:05:09**

Speaker 1

Louise, is that you or Robert? Oh, okay.



**01:05:13**

Speaker 2

So quick question. So how have the communications with the statement verbally or in writing?

**01:05:19**

Speaker 9

Both.

**01:05:21**

Speaker 2

Can I recommend that from now on anything when we're asking for clarification, those always be submitted in writing so that we can get a written response. Now my concern is whenever there's something verbal, then it leaves itself open to misinterpretation or from someone in the state saying, no, that's not what I said. So any communications that have been existing in response to this, can you please share that with the steering committee, both the initial request and the response. So if it's just an email, feel free to just turn it into a PDF and send that off to the group.

**01:05:51**

Speaker 5

Luis, we can take that into consideration. Again, I just wanted to confirm that we made a request in writing to the state based on Sharon's original proposal. We did not receive the amended proposal. So we could not submit a written request to the state about her amended proposal because again were not included in that email notification. So moving forward I think on both sides.

**01:06:15**

Speaker 2

Well, but I think the issue that was that would the state responded to is something that is affects the equity criteria, which is. Which was approved by the steering committee





Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

back in September. So it's not a new question. It's not something we had the criteria and someone along the lines talked to the state said this is a problem. And so that's where I'd like to see those communications if they're available that.

**01:06:37**

Speaker 5

We're still waiting a response from the state about item three, but I was discussing item one.

**01:06:42**

Speaker 2

So. Yeah. But any communications that exist, if you can, please send it. That way it allows us to see what was the question that was presented or information that was shared with the state and what was the response back?

**01:06:53**

Speaker 5

Yeah. If I may just to again I think provide just clear context moving forward, we're very happy to provide just written responses that we do receive, but also keeping in consideration that we receive amended proposals a few hours before the meetings and at this specific day, moment in time, the best option that we had to be able to get a response as quickly as possible was to call the state EDD directly through a brief 10 minute phone call to discuss the amended proposal that we had that the convener had received. CCF was not included in the email. So this is.

**01:07:31**

Speaker 5

We're doing our best to really be as responsive as possible when it comes to receiving last minute information and trying to get a response from the state to be sure that we're prepared and ready to bring forward proposals that are actionable to the steering committee and that you all make informed decisions that ultimately do not jeopardize the process that we're going through. We're all doing our best and moving forward we



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

will set that structure in place. But please keep in mind that these very last minute amendments proposals that we do receive ultimately make it very difficult for us to also have everything in time for the meeting that we then.

**01:08:06**

Speaker 3

Scarlett, hold on real quick. Louise. Scarlett, while you're on that note, can you just reconfirm because we have folks on here that may not be privy to the exact process for submitting things and so just in general, can you just go over that process? That way we can probably avoid some of these challenges if we just all stick to the formal process.

**01:08:26**

Speaker 5

Yeah, we're actually doing a whole internal review now. We're going to be announcing it at the next steering committee meeting. But ultimately we do identify issues with the process. What we do ask is currently as it stands we are going to be enhancing this to provide just a better structure is that there is a formal form that we are using a Google form that captures everyone's different items that they're wanting to propose. We are requesting this to be completed in advance of the meetings us to then be able to have these proposals and motions be processed internally to then be able to agendize formally and present at steering committee meetings. We did receive a lot of the most of these proposals I would say over a weekend after we had already developed the agenda.

**01:09:17**

Speaker 5

So now we're doing our best internally to try to bring these forward. Moving forward next meeting we are going to be presenting a more cleared screen structure with specific just action items checklists for you all to really try to stick to. For us to also be able to internally process this. So there are formal forms, right? We have a form that we use for everyone to submit their agenda item internally. We have to process that and then also agendize it with advance notice. So we're working on advancing this. Oh, go.



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Oh, sorry, someone. Oh, yeah. So at the next meeting we will be having more time to just discuss this and provide our updates in terms of the changes that we're making to make sure that we don't go through these types of issues anymore.

**01:10:08**

Speaker 2

Thank you, Scarlett. And real quick, on, just on that I mentioned, I, I don't know if I, who I responded to as part of the CJF team, but our form, when we're submitting agenda items request, there's only options to submit enter text and so to the extent you're allowed to add either a PDF or a Word document, I know I'm used to, I prefer kind of doing a proposal in a Word document that way kind of, it's a little cleaner, but so if that could be updated, that would be perfect.

**01:10:31**

Speaker 5

Yeah, it's been updated based on your request that you sent in for us. And we will be actually making more enhancements to that form to capture just other gaps that we've seen. So this will all be ready. We're working on it this week, so it should be ready before the next meeting to again, just create more structure in the ways that we're being accountable to your guys. Request.

**01:11:03**

Speaker 4

Just wanted to flag that we have 18 minutes left and our sector investment coordinator, HRNA Advisors also have some slides that they want to get to.

**01:11:13**

Speaker 1

Thank you. Is there a way for folk to bring up any discussion points that they may have before this goes out to the vote since we've exceeded our time? Do you mean on agenda? On item number one on the motions, as amended, period. This was supposed to take us 30 minutes and I do have another meeting.



**01:11:46**

Speaker 8

I think Robert Chant is up.

**01:11:50**

Speaker 1

Oh, okay. Robert.

**01:11:53**

Speaker 2

Yeah, I, I, Is there someone I.

**01:11:54**

Speaker 3

Can give my proxy to, either Libby or someone else?

**01:11:57**

Speaker 2

I've got to go.

**01:11:58**

Speaker 1

Yeah, we're not, we're gonna, the vote is actually going out online. Oh, perfect.

**01:12:06**

Speaker 2

So we can respond to that online.



**01:12:07**

Speaker 1

Yes. And it will be submitted with the materials. And that's why I was calling for a way for folk if they have ideas or points that they. Is there a way for folk to be able to see what their feedback is so that we can get a better idea of what the consensus is and what some of the concerns folks may have or ideas that they may have?

**01:12:26**

Speaker 3

Excellent. Well, thank everybody for their time and effort.

**01:12:29**

Speaker 2

I gotta go.

**01:12:29**

Speaker 9

Thank you.

**01:12:30**

Speaker 1

Thank you for your attendance.

**01:12:34**

Speaker 8

Madam Chair. Motion number two is now in the chat.

**01:12:41**

Speaker 1



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Yeah. How do we want to move forward because we do have a stop at three, and we do have a lot of other points that we need to get to.

**01:12:54**

Speaker 3

Maybe these can be sent out. The only thing I would say about item two, Sharon, just to kind of, after reading it over, and I think you may understand, but I don't know if everybody understands, part of the scope of work that the sector investment coordinators already have is to do regional investment or attract regional investment. That's part of the reason why of the activation plans. And so the activation plans really highlight that roadmap and strategic planning process based on the sectors that we're focusing on. And then organically, they're just going to be attracting investment to the region in general. The challenge that comes with this item number two is just the timeline.

**01:13:32**

Speaker 3

It's going to be very hard for them to pivot, get a new contract, and then to be able to raise, you know, \$5 million supplemental fund for Catalyst that aligns with the timeline. So there's going to be, definitely be a challenge there. So I'm just flagging that if you all want to move forward with the motion and vote on it, entirely up to you. But I would flag that. There's going to be a timeline issue there and it's going to basically run into additional challenges because the big picture here is we want California Jobs first to continue over this 10 year period and to also make sure that we're implementing our regional plan. And so if their attention is drawn from that to raise Catalyst funding, which is not really the big overall picture, then that could be problematic.

**01:14:16**

Speaker 2

So just flagging it, actually, it's in.

**01:14:19**



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Speaker 8

Their, it's already in their scope of work. I think we may have been.

**01:14:23**

Speaker 3

Yes, fundraising in general is in there, and that's the reason for the activation plans. But it is not specific to whether it's Catalyst implementation, et cetera. It's just overall, they need to attract regional investment.

**01:14:35**

Speaker 8

Gotcha. So I don't know if there's a second, but that's why I put it on there.

**01:14:46**

Speaker 1

Okay. Tony's asking a clear statement about whether voting on each motion would invalidate the organization's ability to apply for funds.

**01:14:55**

Speaker 5

We can include that as part of the materials that go out with these items.

**01:15:02**

Speaker 8

And on item number two, the state did not flag anything, so it stands as a motion.

**01:15:15**

Speaker 1

Oh, and Connie has added that for those who can't see the chat, the Sector Investment



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Coordinated work plan is linked in today's agenda for your reference. Okay, how do we want to move forward because we obviously did not stick with the structure discussion.

**01:15:34**

Speaker 5

Yeah, I think what we're. What we're waiting on is it seems that item two seems to be a motion that requires a second. So we can move forward with that. But ultimately, I think with all items what we will do is that through our email communications we'll be sure to specifically have a clear statement of what each action item could mean for the program and ultimately put this forward to the steering committee. We have a second for item two and in terms of item three, I'm not sure if we fully discuss this in terms of moving in terms of just the issues we have. The state currently has the equity criteria. They are reviewing it. They did perceive this as a potential conflict of the steering committee specifically amending the voting to amend the bylaws to include this. We are currently awaiting their response.

**01:16:39**

Speaker 5

So we don't have a response yet, but they are reviewing the equity criteria. And I do see Tony's hand up.

**01:16:46**

Speaker 1

Thank you, Tony.

**01:16:51**

Speaker 7

Yeah, we would like to. American Indian Chamber would like to amend the motion that the supplemental funding would be available more broadly where were concerned that if an organization already received a certain grant. That's great. The language in that grant application explained how they use that money and that there may be other worthy projects out there. So we think the idea of a supplemental catalyst grant fund is





Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

fabulous. But we would like to amend the motion that the use of those funds would not be limited to those awardees that. That already received funding.

**01:17:32**

Speaker 8

Hang on, let me reread the revise to secured funding to establishment with a target amount of smaller board eas. I think I can accept that amendment because subject to a supplemental grant, committee will determine. We'll make a determination on that later on. And as long as we're not conflicted out, it's a reasonable request. Thank you. I'll accept. Thank you.

**01:17:56**

Speaker 5

Yeah, what I could just please request whether it's now through the chat or by email, hopefully by 3:30 as we're wanting to get everything out. If Tony, you can please provide the specific amendment as written to us. That would be very helpful for us to then include in the email that will be going out. And I believe Estef has her.

**01:18:22**

Speaker 1

Esther is. Is Estefania's hand. Is your hand up?

**01:18:26**

Speaker 5

Oh, yeah. Yes.

**01:18:27**

Speaker 1

Okay, I'm sorry. Go ahead.



**01:18:29**

Speaker 5

Really quickly for item two, what we had discussed internally is that the current scope of work adequately reflects the intent of the RFP in supporting organizations for identifying external sources of funding. Nowhere in the RFP does it say that sics need to fundraise much less \$5 million. So just wanted to raise that point. And then on item three, I did want to raise, and we did discuss this with Sharon, that the equity criteria, whether it's put in the bylaws or not, as the fiscal agent we have to adhere to the rules and regulation of the funding source. So whatever the funding source states that's going to supersede the anything that's in the equity criteria. So just wanted to flag that as well.

**01:19:18**

Speaker 8

I'm going to challenge that issue and I'm helping to send it out to public council. We addressed this issue previously as a steering committee and were under our prior chair and were clearly led to believe from that we have to meet their minimum criteria, but we could establish criteria in excess, which is why the equity criteria participation level is higher than the state's 40%. So I'm going to, if you went in, seen that out for legal review, but I did. We got that previously feedback from the state. We don't have to comply word for word. And when we put our bylaws in and they reviewed our bylaws, it is, it defines that we would establish that criteria and they knew it could be larger. And that's, I believe, what the criteria is.

**01:20:08**

Speaker 5

I think what would best for item three is seeing that the state currently is reviewing the document as a whole, if we can just allow them hopefully by tomorrow to give us a response. But I think this would be just the best form of action in terms of seeing what the state is saying and what their stance is specifically with item number three. They currently have a document, they are reviewing it and so I think giving them that opportunity would be the best put forward for us.



**01:20:45**

Speaker 1

Is it okay for HRNA to just jump in with a couple of additional thoughts? Okay, thank you. I'll ask Jane to step in a moment. In our original proposal, we had allocated a total sort of number of hours per month for technical assistance both to support organizations seeking grant funding as well as technical assistance overall for industry sectors. So the proposal number two. I'm sorry, I'm speaking to item number two that would direct us as part of our contract with the LA Regional Collaborative, would be to identify and secure, I think it was, \$5 million for additional funding. We would just really need to make sure how that is, I guess delineated in the contract. Our contract right now is to provide a specific amount of support.

**01:21:54**

Speaker 1

Already some of that we anticipate is for the funding applications but we had not actually anticipated being directly applicants for grants ourselves. Considering that we're a consulting firm that provides specific services. We are often not the best applicant for many of the grants that we believe proponents would be seeking. So I think we just want to make sure that we're helping organizations put their best foot forward, that we're doing research and analysis that supports that, providing technical assistance that is helpful, but also, you know, supporting the grant applications, but not, we had not anticipated as part of our work plan being applicants and raising that amount of funds. I'll also note that we can, you know, sort of share the total amount and Jane can speak to that in a second of hours that we had anticipated per month. Thank you.

**01:23:05**

Speaker 5

And we'll include that in the information that we'll send out to email by email as well to make sure that folks have this information when it comes to specifically item two. Connie, was that what you were speaking to?



**01:23:19**

Speaker 1

Yes, thank you.

**01:23:22**

Speaker 5

Yes, Madam Chair, I'll go ahead and.

**01:23:26**

Speaker 1

Yes, go ahead.

**01:23:28**

Speaker 5

Oh, okay, let's see. So I just responding or just highlighting in the, in. Oh, I missed it. I'm sorry. In the chat, Catherine, I put, she put. My understanding is that this is about what we will put out in the RFP criteria, not our bylaws. And the issue is not with the content per se, but that anyone who votes on it or has anything to do with the requirements in the RFP could not then apply for those funds without a conflict of interest. And just acknowledging that is correct. The core issue just comes with the fact that there are conflicted members that are voting on items that influence the rfp. We will go ahead and just make detail of all this in the email as we kind of move forward with these items.

**01:24:17**

Speaker 5

But Madam Chair, if you want to go ahead and close us out and we can proceed to the next items on the agenda.

**01:24:25**

Speaker 1



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

Yes, absolutely. Let's go to the next slide where these will be motions. We'll be sending out a packet. The vote will be open and available for the 72 hours as usual. And we definitely encourage strong participation. If there are any questions, please feel free to email us.

**01:24:42**

Speaker 7

I did put the modified language in the chat so that everybody can see that before we go. So that if they're not, if their understanding isn't the same. I did just put it in the chat.

**01:24:53**

Speaker 1

Can I just speak to the slides? Just, you know, 30 seconds on the three for us because it will set some context for the follow up communication. It's back. Absolutely, go ahead. Jane. I'm sorry, Go ahead. Sure. On the work plan. So our work plan was attached to the agenda. I very much encourage you all to take a look at that. I think it will help explain kind of how we are approaching the various fundraising. But in general, there are five work streams within the work plan. Here are some details about what each of those mean across both item or work stream number three and number four, there are technical assistance hours allocated. It is 36 hours in total per month over a 12 month period.

**01:25:45**

Speaker 1

And we are very much willing to have a conversation around the technical assistance approach and how we can put aside some of those hours for specifically for fundraising or helping the Catalyst projects or the projects outside of the Catalyst funding as well actually apply and succeed in acquiring additional funding. So I think that's important to just point out. We can go to the next slide. There are various moments for steering committee input throughout our scope of work. They are all detailed here. The next moment you'll be hearing from us is about the Outreach plan, which I will get to in a moment. But then again, speaking to the activation plan, the funding recommendations,



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

approval, additional ecosystem outreach, you are all part of industry ecosystems throughout the region. And we are very much planning to build a real community of practice.

**01:26:48**

Speaker 1

All detailed in the work plan, the remaining activation plans, and then a technical assistance approach which is not included in our work plan, but if passed by a motion to, you know, ask that we bring forward a technical assistance approach for steering committee review, we would certainly be willing to add that next slide is just on outreach. We did not have time today to discuss these items. We are going to send them out in a survey. We would love your feedback and input on how we can best approach outreach both in this kind of pre and during RFP phase and then afterwards to continue to support projects again, both Catalyst projects and other projects outside of that funding stream. And that's it from us. Thank you. Okay.

**01:27:50**

Speaker 5

All right, I'll go ahead and close out the meeting. Just a reminder that we do have a partners meeting this Friday at 9am and that we currently this week we'll be also holding three meetings with the RFP Catalyst Subcommittee. The steering committee next meeting will be January 23rd from 1pm to 2:30. And we will go ahead and work on the agenda towards that. And just as a reminder, please check your emails. We are doing our best to just communicate a lot of these matters that we need direction to ensure that we also don't jeopardize the release of the Catalyst RSP, which currently is set to be released on the 27th so we have less than two weeks to get this done. Just want to thank everyone for your time and your participation.

**01:28:40**

Speaker 3

Real quick one quick announcement. Thanks all again we'll get that survey out so that we can get feedback on what we will send to the state and then the only other piece just



Los Angeles High Road Transition Collaborative

want to congratulate there is a transition at laedc your very own Scarlett Peralta. She has moved into the CJF director position and been promoted into that position and then Shioma Abahawe has been promoted to senior program manager. We are actively doing interviews to backfill Scarlett's position in Charles Johnson has actually moved into a different role with LADC so just wanted to make sure everyone was aware of the change in structure at ladc.

**01:29:24**

Speaker 2

Thanks.

**01:29:30**

Speaker 5

Thank you everyone. Congratulations with everyone. Thank you very much. I will go ahead and communicate directly by email so please stay tuned. Have a great rest of your day.

**01:29:42**

Speaker 1

Thank you.