



## LA HRTC Steering Committee Meeting October 12th, 2023

[Power Point](#)

[Meeting Recording](#)

**Passcode** yQW&Rar1

[Meeting Summary Notes](#)

[Actionable Items](#)

[Chat Box](#)

[Meeting Transcript](#)

### Meeting Summary:

#### Table Partner Lead Categories, Selection and SOW:

The meeting participants gathered to discuss various topics, including Table Partner Lead Categories, defining the selection process for the TBL, their roles and benchmarks, as well as the scope of work for Affinity Hub Leads. The CERF Team also provided updates on the research, processing mapping and capacity building contracts. The Fiscal agent provided updates and a discussion on fiscal transparency was explored.

The CERF team provided a recommendation based on discussions with the state interagency team on the need to focus on industry-based categories from the Table Partner Leads. A recommended list from the Outreach and Engagement Committee was provided as well as other recommendations made by the Institute of Applied Economics, the CERF SC Chairs, and CERF team. Concerns were raised on pivoting away from categories that focus on disinvested communities to industry based. The Steering Committee requested that the chairs meet with the state to get clarity and a better understanding of how to move forward.

The CERF team opened a discussion to receive feedback from the SC members on what they would like to see be included in the Scope of work and benchmarks for the Table Partner Leads as well as the Affinity Hub Leads. The SC members requested that the CERF team come back with suggestions that they can work through.

#### Fiscal Agent Updates

The Fiscal Agent provides general updates on the status of the research contracts and proposed budget modification. Sharon raised concerns about a lack of transparency regarding the HRTC's proposed budget modifications. She and others were not informed about these changes, which they believe should have been presented to the HRTC for approval before implementation.

Jose, the representative from CCF, clarified that the budget modifications did not alter the initial proposals but were made to redistribute funds to ensure that certain project needs were adequately funded. The intention was to align with the program's goals and address dynamic changes.

Members expressed their dissatisfaction with the lack of prior approval or knowledge of significant budget changes, emphasizing the importance of transparent processes and collaboration and the need for a transparent process and approval by the HRTC before implementing such changes.

The Fiscal Agent and convenor acknowledged the difficulties based on lack of processes and procedures to guide these initiatives; they will work with the Steering Committee members to include these provisions on the bylaws that are being developed.

There's a broader discussion about the importance of a clear process, trust, and effective collaboration in the program. The participants agree that establishing a robust, transparent process for decision-making and communication is crucial to moving forward. The leadership team is tasked with preparing the agenda for HRTC meetings and ensuring that decisions are made collectively.

### General Updates: Process Mapping, Capacity Building Contracts, and Upcoming Meetings

Chioma from the CERF Team provided updates on the process mapping and capacity building. She notes that the first draft of process mapping is complete and will be shared with the group at the next meeting on October 26.

The meeting concludes with a discussion of upcoming meetings, including the next steering committee meeting on October 26, and working sessions related to the steering committee bylaws taking place Oct 13<sup>th</sup>, 27<sup>th</sup> at 10 am.

Overall, the meeting focuses on the need for transparency, a well-defined process, and collaboration in managing budget modifications and program-related decisions, highlighting the challenges and lessons learned in this collaborative endeavor.

### Actionable Items Meeting

- Ensure bylaws reflect transparent provisions for the sharing and approval of fiscal items.
- Set up a meeting between the state and the chairs to discuss Table Partner Lead categories and any proposed changes to the governance structure/program due to the State's rebranding efforts.
- Bring back a draft of SOW for Affinity Hub Leads and Table Partner Leads for the Steering Committee to revise.

### Meeting Chat Box

Bobby Lee Davis (Dylette Family Foundation)

07:46

BL

Good afternoon all!

Alan Cheam

08:00

AC

Good afternoon, all! Please use this link record your attendance: <https://forms.gle/JLCqjay1v99JkhKq9>

Sejal Patel

08:19

SP

Good afternoon team!!

Dr. Narineh Makijan

09:28

DN

Please send the link again for those who just joined.

👍 1

Alan Cheam

09:35

AC

Please use this link record your attendance: <https://forms.gle/JLCqjay1v99JkhKq9>

👍 1

EA JWAC UCR Large

09:44

**E**

Kevin Harbour - BizFed Institute

Blaine Bacher - BizFed Institute

JNajera

10:21

**J**

Jose Najera - CCF - Fiscal Agent

Rudy

10:53

**R**

Rudy, Inclusive Action

Libby Williams, VSEDC

11:22

**LW**

Libby Williams, Vermont Slauson

Jessica Quintana

11:51

**JQ**

Hello all Jessica Quintana, Centro CHA Inc Long Beach

Rudy

12:21

**R**

Its the same responsibility! Celebrating 10 years this year. 😊

Ricardo Mendoza

12:42

**RM**

Hello Everyone,

Ricardo Mendoza, Coalition for Responsible Community Development

Chioma Agbahiwe

13:23

**CA**

'California Jobs First' is the new, re-branded name for CERF as announced today from the State.

👍 1 👍 1

Stella Ursua (She/Her) GRID Alternatives LA

14:56

**SU**

Wow!! Congratulations Alan!!!

♡ 2

Sharon Evans

15:03

**SE**

Congratulations future MBA Cheam



Alan Cheam

16:59

AC

Thank you very much everyone!

Sharon Evans

18:25

SE

Sharon Evans, Business Resource Group

Zahirah Mann

18:36

ZM

Zahirah Mann, SLATE-Z

Rudy

21:20

R

Friends, do we have a running notes document for these meetings?

[1 Reply](#)

Alan Cheam

23:20

AC

Action Item Tracker:

[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1adMxqngNZjvfbuxMwdLfSibZgHW\\_K0Pk6OFsfrKNwzM/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1adMxqngNZjvfbuxMwdLfSibZgHW_K0Pk6OFsfrKNwzM/edit?usp=sharing)

2

Steering Committee Agenda Items Jamboard:

[https://jamboard.google.com/d/1SAGYWNVFqJLwTGvI0XmbE39IRSoSyRcmA\\_vKqD4u19U/edit?usp=sharing](https://jamboard.google.com/d/1SAGYWNVFqJLwTGvI0XmbE39IRSoSyRcmA_vKqD4u19U/edit?usp=sharing)

Arman Koohian

24:39

AK

Table Partner Lead Application/Grading Rubric: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1b4TfGctPr9KqIDGkf-6t7sJ66b-d7m2O2sEI0YTj91s/edit?usp=sharing>

Table Partner Lead Roles, Responsibilities, and Scope of Work:

[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1nd7b8iaHTEqsVwh\\_maqvZahDvEdWK-UoUHduEsLOK8A/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1nd7b8iaHTEqsVwh_maqvZahDvEdWK-UoUHduEsLOK8A/edit?usp=sharing)

Sejal Patel

25:29

SP

Can you go back to the last slide?

1

Thank you!

Alan Cheam

26:52

AC

Good afternoon, all! Please use this link record your attendance: <https://forms.gle/JLCqjay1v99JkhKq9>

Sejal Patel

28:41

**SP**

I would like to consider Biomedical Sciences. Prior to the controversy, MRT had been pushing for this sector for youth of color in particular. The funding and potential here could be large given the industry scale in CA.

Jennifer Zellet

28:54

**JZ**

Not to sideline any productive conversation, but could I see an org chart so I understand how many layers we are talking about and the function of each?

Alan Cheam

29:04

**AC**

Table Partner Lead Application/Grading Rubric: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1b4TfGctPr9KqIDGkf-6t7sJ66b-d7m2O2sEI0YTj91s/edit?usp=sharing>

Table Partner Lead Roles, Responsibilities, and Scope of Work:

[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1nd7b8iaHTEqsVwh\\_maqvZahDvEdWK-UoUHduEsLOK8A/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1nd7b8iaHTEqsVwh_maqvZahDvEdWK-UoUHduEsLOK8A/edit?usp=sharing)

Arman Koohian

30:34

**AK**

Affinity Hub Lead Scope of Work/Performance

Metrics: [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1vjImA\\_mcbnI54x7AS91z73OWrUlitfrobj-gPOWEHpM/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1vjImA_mcbnI54x7AS91z73OWrUlitfrobj-gPOWEHpM/edit?usp=sharing)

Sejal Patel

31:41

**SP**

Do the Table Leads need to be in the larger CERF/CA Jobs group? Or is this application opportunity open to anyone?

 1

Jennifer Zellet

32:18

**JZ**

Tunua is expressing my question as well...how many layers are we after here? I'd rather run lean than have so many layers

 1

Sharon Evans

33:42

**SE**

This shift appears to be a modification of the HRTC's purpose of creating table partners.

Derek Steele

34:26

**DS**

I understand the idea of wanting to “run lean” but I think the intention is to make sure community voice can be added to the conversation by way of the affinity spaces. That's the purpose of the table partners. right?

[1 Reply](#)

moto g power (2021)

36:12

**MG**

Why do we need partner tables if we already have Affinity tables?

!!1

Chioma Agbahiwe

36:21

**CA**

See Governance Structure: <https://lacerf.org/about>

👍1

Linda Kelly, FMWC

36:24

**LK**

yes

Alan Cheam

36:27

**AC**

The Table Partner Leads are 8 undefined entities separate from the Affinity Hub Leads.

Rudy

37:06

**R**

Thanks @Alan Cheam!

Alan Cheam

37:12

**AC**

No problem!

Rudy

37:50

**R**

Makes sense Jennifer!

Derek Steele

38:37

**DS**

Is this suggestive?

moto g power (2021)

38:43

**MG**

There was a purpose of hearing from those voices who are often overlooked in larger conversations. Why not save the money? Multiple Affinity Tables cover many of these issues.

Derek Steele

38:43

**DS**

or is this what we have to do?

Sejal Patel

38:45

**SP**

I understand that Table Leads are specific to the industry sectors and I feel that is necessary and important to have.

Sejal Patel

39:49

**SP**

Yes Jennifer, we need to be clear on what we want.

moto g power (2021)

40:15

**MG**

Yes. I agree with Hector

Derek Steele

42:20

**DS**

What Sharon is saying is making more sense. Where did these additional recommendations come from?

[1 Reply](#)

Derek Steele

43:05

**DS**

Facts Sharon!

Jennifer Zellet

43:19

**JZ**

Also, at 50k per lead, we could be talking about diverting a significant amount of funding

1

Sharon Evans

44:41

**SE**

We have co chairs. Please let them do their job and speak directly with the state

moto g power (2021)

45:12

**MG**

It has been clear from the beginning that the LA model was not like many other regions.

Derek Steele

45:58

**DS**

Yea we not doing that.

That part Tunua!

1

Brady Collins, KIWA (he/him)

47:02

**BC**

Saying we will not get our fair share if additional industries are not at the table is a political statement, but is ahistorical and out of touch with economic realities of communities on the ground.

 1

moto g power (2021)

47:04

**MG**

Perhaps the question is how can we include these industries within our current structure.

[1 Reply](#)

 1

Rudy

48:32

**R**

I support Sharon's suggestion about empowering our Chairs to move forward in a convo with the state

Sharon Evans

49:10

**SE**

Every one of the industries represented is an employer. Employers have tables and seats in our existing structure

Jennifer Zellet

49:25

**JZ**

Hands up in this order Andrea, Zahirah, Stella...they are being very patient

[1 Reply](#)

 1

Bobby Lee Davis (Dylette Family Foundation)

49:47

**BL**

solid message

Benjamin Torres

50:58

**BT**

Thank you

tunua

51:54

**T**

Yes Andrea. That is my understanding.

Derek Steele

51:58

**DS**

Right.

Rudy

52:00

**R**



Co-sign Andrea!

Sharon Evans

52:32

**SE**

Affinity hub leads represent constituents.

Andrea...please read our proposal. You are not correct in terms of the role of Affinity lead

Rudy

55:52

**R**

I have to sign off a bit early today folks. I support where the group is taking this. @kevin and co-chairs, please let us know how we can move on our discussion.

Jennifer Zellet

57:26

**JZ**

Thank you, Kevin. I'll go back to these documents and internalize

Benjamin Torres

57:40

**BT**

agree

moto g power (2021)

57:59

**MG**

At this point in time, everyone's primary activity will be reviewing and commenting on Part 1. We have time to consider these industries when preparing Strategies for Part 2.

Sharon Evans

58:14

**SE**

Can you send that document out to sc members by email

[1 Reply](#)

Benjamin Torres

59:39

**BT**

I think we need to consider extending these meetings in the future there is a lot to do and we need to all have the opportunity to be clear and agree on how we move forward on some of these key issues.

 1  2  1

[2 Replies](#)

Linda Kelly, FMWC

01:00:33

**LK**

yes I agree

tunua

01:01:23

**T**

My question as well, Sharon.

moto g power (2021)

01:02:43

**MG**

Where did the money come from?

Alan Cheam

01:07:05

**AC**

Flagging us at time.

Jennifer Zellet

01:07:27

**JZ**

Sincere apologies. I have a 2:00 appointment and must go. I appreciate this robust discussion

[1 Reply](#)

Derek Steele

01:08:06

**DS**

Do we vote then?

Libby Williams, VSEDC

01:09:03

**LW**

Agree with everything Tunua and Sharon said!

 1

tunua

01:09:31

**T**

The cost of the election is quite telling?

Derek Steele

01:10:01

**DS**

and it jumped to \$5500. thats wild lol  
that \$5K less that even in a budget mod, we dont have

Sharon Evans

01:10:44

**SE**

The hrtc had the right of decision.

Sharon Evans

01:14:52

**SE**

Please send us the chat print out

[1 Reply](#)

 2

moto g power (2021)

01:15:28

**MG**

I need to get to another call. Thank you for this meeting.

Sharon Evans

01:15:42

**SE**

Thank u Alan

 1

moto g power (2021)

01:15:54

**MG**

Yes.

Bobby Lee Davis (Dylette Family Foundation)

01:16:46

**BL**

appreciated conversation but I have a 2:15 so I must log off also

 1

JNajera

01:17:43

**J**

Thank you everyone. I have a 2pm meeting I'm late to, so I have to jump off. Have a great rest of the day everyone.

Stella Ursua (She/Her) GRID Alternatives LA

01:18:35

**SU**

Thank you all for your honesty and your commitment to this effort everyone...late for my next meeting.

Sharon Evans

01:19:03

**SE**

Blessings to all. Have a fruitful day.

Zahirah Mann

01:19:44

**ZM**

Good idea, Benny.

Dr. Narineh Makijan

01:20:25

**DN**

Have a great afternoon!

 1

kevin clark

01:20:39

**KC**

Any updates on labor? Hollywood is on fire with no solution in sight. Just saying !!! \$5 billion lost, and over 200K job are on the line. My constituency is being removed from any recovery.

Zahirah Mann

01:20:44

ZM

Thank you everyone. Enjoy the rest of your day.

♡<sub>1</sub>

Sharon Evans

01:21:37

SE

Please turn the meeting over to the co chairs to run the steering committee meeting

## Meeting Transcript

**06:06**

Hello, Kevin.

**06:07**

Hello, everyone.

**06:11**

Hello. Good afternoon. How's everyone doing?

**06:21**

Good. Hey, Sharon.

**06:23**

Hi there. How are?

**06:25**

Good, good.

**06:26**

Sharon. Looks like me and Sharon are in different environments today.

**06:41**

A lot of things going on today.

**06:43**

Yeah, indeed.

**06:48**

Jennifer, zealot.

**06:52**

Good afternoon, everyone. I hope everybody's well.

**06:55**

Oh, yeah. Almost Friday. Friday Eve. Yep. I get to hang out at my alma mater today. We're over at UCLA.

**07:16**

Right on.

**07:17**

Doing a final site check before the Workforce Development Forum. Got Alan coming. I got Armand. I got you registered today. Chioma got her registered to finally see you guys in person.

**07:35**

Yes, we'll be there. Looking forward to it.

**07:39**

Jennifer, too. We're even going to have a surf.

**07:43**

Yes, yes, there will be a surf table and maybe Armand and Alan, too. So then, yeah, more than just.

**07:53**

Kevin Clark.

**07:56**

Hello, Kevin Harper.

**07:58**

How are you doing, buddy?

**07:59**

Hey, man. Great, brother. Great. Thank you. I hope you're doing well.

**08:04**

Definitely.

**08:10**

So hello, everyone. Charles Johnson here. Sorry I'm not on camera right now. I'm just trying to get this microphone to work through my headphones so I won't get background noise.

**08:24**

That's one demerit. Charles.

**08:37**

Looks like we got about 19 people in the call so far, so we'll just give it a minute. But in the meantime, I did drop the attendance link in the chat, so for those of you who are in here, please feel free to record your attendance using that link.

**08:53**

Hey, Alan. I don't have the capability of doing it here, but I assume that since it's recorded.

**09:05**

I'll go ahead and take note of that, and then I'll go ahead and submit one for you.

**09:10**

Okay, hold on. Blaine is getting it done. Thank you.

**09:15**

Thank you, Blaine.

**09:17**

My pleasure.

**09:21**

All right, well, hopefully my background doesn't bother the background noise isn't too loud. I'm at the economic summit out indian, Wales right now.

**09:32**

My name spelled right. Oh, no.

**09:40**

And yeah, let's go ahead and get started. I'm Charles Johnson. You guys all know me. The program director of what is now California. Somebody helped me out. What is it? California jobs first. California jobs first. That is what Surf is being rebranded as about 2 hours ago. California jobs first. We'll go into that a little bit more later on. So, yes, if you see emails doing California Jobs First, it's going to be surf. So the whole logo, from my understanding, is going to be different, a lot of those things. So be on the lookout for that. Before we get into anything, I want to ask, is there anyone on this steering committee call who did not introduce themselves on the last steering committee call?

**10:46**

Okay, I didn't introduce myself.

**10:53**

Please. Tanea. Yeah, please introduce went through every steering committee member just so they can introduce themselves. I think you had a proxy in the organization, but please introduce yourself.

**11:08**

I don't have much to add then. Good afternoon, friends. Great to see everyone I'm en route to a meeting, so I won't be able to be on camera. But I'm Tanea Thrashintek, president and CEO of the Center Bile Industry, and it's my pleasure to serve on this body and support economic development for our county.

**11:29**

Thank you.

**11:31**

Okay, thank you. I see a hand up. Is it who is that? Yeah. Rudy? Yes, sir, it is Charles.

**11:43**

I did not last I missed the.

**11:44**

Last meeting team, but I was on the first one, but not the last one. My name is Rudy Espinoze. I serve as executive director of Inclusive Action. We're an economic justice organization, a CDFI here in La. Happy to be here. Back to you, Charles. Great to have you. Thank you. Congratulations on the new responsibility. And I'm seeing another hand, and I do not want to mispronounce your name, so can you please help me out there?

**12:10**

Yeah, no problem. Hi, everyone. Assistant vice president and chair of the Los Angeles Regional Consortium, the coordinating body.

**12:18**

For the La 19 community colleges.

**12:20**

Sorry I missed a meeting last couple.

**12:23**

Of weeks ago, but got to be here today. Thanks for the opportunity.

**12:28**

Okay, thank you. Is there anyone else on the call who would like to introduce themselves from the steering committee who is not? Mr. Collins? Yes, hello. Sorry, it's a little bit noisy here. Brady Collins with Kiwa, Korea town immigrant labor affinity hub. Congratulations and thank you for being here.

**13:04**

Entertainment.

**13:08**

Is there anyone else from steering committee who did not introduce themselves? Okay. It's important that everyone on this call know that it just doesn't stop with you guys. We're all going to use each other as a resource. We all have interesting backgrounds that can help surf. That's the reason why we're here. So I would like for Alan Chiam to take 30 seconds, have a minute, introduce yourself, and tell us a little bit about yourself.

**13:42**

Thanks, Charles, and great to see you all steering committee members. So just to give a little bit of background about myself. So I like to give my age because I'm pretty young, but I'm 23 years old. I grew up in La. County pretty much all my life, specifically towards Long Beach. So. More so in the Gateway City, so in Lakewood. That's where I currently live. And I went to Cal State Long Beach for my undergrad in psychology. And I worked at the Americas Job Center of California, based in Santa Fe Springs before this. So in workforce development, in business services, specifically helping businesses out. And here I am on the surf team. And also some exciting news. I have began my master's program in human factor psychology since August. So over the past two months, I've been doing that, adjusting to that program. But it's been a pleasure working with you all, and I look forward to continuing this work.

**14:44**

Thank you, Alan. Oh, Chioma, you are here. Okay. I'm sorry. I should have started with the women, not very chivalrous of me. Chioma, by the way. Please introduce yourself.

**14:57**

Okay. I thought I did this last meeting too, but no, we didn't, so hello. Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Tion, your program manager. That many of you know of me by now. Hope so. I'm born and raised in La. And so I went to school in CSUN a few moons ago, so I lived in the Valley for a while. So I'm familiar with San Fernando Valley as well. But born and raised in La. Specifically South La. Spa six CD nine. Now live in eight. And so glad to be here with Surf. I've been working in the nonprofit space basically my entire life in South La. So very familiar with the nonprofit space and working with the government agencies. And so love Surf because it really encompasses everything with all the counties. We have interactions with all of the service planning areas. So that's what made it very interesting to me.

**16:02**

So glad to work with you all and to continue this work as Charles. Just let us know with the new name, California Jobs First. So I guess I'll be saying California jobs first. Formally surf. So I have to get used to saying that. But glad to have you all on the call. Please let me know if you have any questions relating to outreach, engagement, or anything else. Just send me an email. I think we have Armand is next. I don't think Scarlett's on the call today.

**16:36**

Armand, if you're on the call, please introduce yourself. Tell us a little bit about yourself.

**16:40**

Yes, of course. Hello, everybody.

**16:42**

My name is Armand Cuyan.

**16:43**

I'm the research analyst with the Surf.

**16:47**

Team, and I'm a Los Angeles native.

**16:51**

I was born here, and I've been raised here. I've lived in the Valley my whole life. Also went to community college in Los Angeles before going to university here, doing my degree in economics, and that was just a few years ago, which I've been wanting to get into economic research. So very pleased to be working with all of you and my great team. And, yeah, I'm just very hopeful that we can do a lot of good work to create some good jobs and make La a more competitive city economically and a more equitable city. So, yeah, very pleased to be working with everybody.

**17:26**

Thank you, Armand. Yeah. Unfortunately, Scarlett could not be here today. She has an interesting background as well, and maybe on a future meeting, we can have her introduce herself. So you can understand a little bit about her background myself, Charles. I'm originally from Chicago. I've been out here since the late 90s, early 2000s. My background started out in the film television industry as a writer, wrote for various TV shows, developed a few pilots, transitioned into film distribution to learn the backbone of Hollywood industry. Realized I knew that business very well, but I didn't know business in general. So I went back and got my master's degree at Pepperdine focusing in business and entrepreneurship. Once I graduated, I did business strategy consulting for a little while in different countries, Sweden and Brazil mostly. And I saw an opportunity with the streaming services, with entertainment and applied and received a patent that I built a business around.

**18:36**

So I worked in Silicon Valley for a little while, and while I was doing that, I integrated some training programs to help black and brown students beef up their resumes. So once they graduated, they have something to leverage. That's what drew me to the I'm really big into business. I take it very serious. I was taught by one of the best. He expected the best of me, my economics professor. He was on that plane with President Nixon when he looked down over Pittsburgh and saw that black smoke coming out of those smokestacks and eventually formed the EPA. And he also started Ready Pack, the salad company. The salad and the bag company. So he was very demanding, and I learned a lot from him. I want to take a lot of those principles and apply it here to surf to create jobs for black and brown and other disinvested members of Los Angeles region.

**19:37**

I think we can do it. I hope that we all use one another as a resource. And I like to think that I've been extremely protective of the surf team for any disrespect that has come their way up to this point. And I would do the same for all of you steering committee members. So keep that in mind that the surf team would more than just pencil pushers or taking direction from you. We have a lot to offer, so let's get down to business here. If we can go straight to the next slide, I believe, because I'm sure you guys probably read the agenda already. Alan, were you handling the slide here?

**20:22**

Yeah. So just some general housekeeping. Thank you, Charles. So this is not listed on the slide, but just basic housekeeping. In our meeting, if you're not speaking, if you could please just mute your mic just so we don't have any feedback going on in the background. And we did have a request for an action items tracker, so we did create that. That link is there. And we also have a jamboard where you can submit a request for an agenda item that you'd like to see on the jamboard. I'm sorry, not on the jam board on the next steering committee meeting. So just make sure that you list your name as well, because the limitation with the jamboard, when you do submit some type of text, it doesn't include who wrote it. And sometimes we might need some extra clarification with the chairs to make sure that we can present that at the next meeting as precisely as possible.

**21:25**

And I'll go ahead and pass it to you, Charles, so you can kind of speak on the table partner leads.

**21:31**

Thank you, Alan. This is a very critical, important next piece, next step for you steering committee members. We have to get those table areas identified. Now, I understand that outreach and engagement on the far left, you'll see that their recommended list of areas that those tables should be filled with are based on mostly different areas of people who need assistance. It's important that you all know that the state and just the



program in general, in order for it to move forward, really have those tables focused on industries that can create jobs for those people. So I've talked with the state about this. They've admitted that they probably did not do a good job in their messaging of how those tables should be identified. So with them wanting to focus on industry, which makes sense for it to focus on industries in order to create jobs, on the far right is the recommendations from the surf team from IAE Institute Applied Economics, IADC's Economics Team.

**23:05**

These are the recommended areas that we suggest that those tables focus on. Ultimately, the decision belongs to the steering committee members in conjunction with the HRTC. But we highly suggest that you consider those additional recommendations. Whichever way you go, they need to be identified quickly, because the next step after identifying those table entities is to start getting organizations, businesses, whomever to actually lead those tables. And if we don't get those, then everything is bottleneck. We can't move forward. And again, just for anyone who's kind of new on the call, those tables come with \$50,000 funding, the same as the Affinity Hub leads. We can go to the next slide. So the selection process, I'll leave that to was it Chioma or Alan who is going to discuss this one?

**24:10**

So I believe we want to have our esteemed chairs kind of discuss what went on at our leadership meeting last week in regards to a potential selection suggestion for the table partner lead. So I'm not sure if Kevin.

**24:25**

Oh, Kevin, I'm sorry. I'm so programmed to like the actual chair of the steering Committee. Kevin, could you please talk about this review and selection process for the table?

**24:40**

Yeah. So, first of all, we had a great meeting last week. And when I looked at both the outreach and engagement recommendations and what came back from the state, one thing became clear is that it would probably be wise for us to align the table partners by NAICS codes or vertical market codes. And so when you look at, for example, manufacturing, I think that's a viable code. But having aerospace and automotive is redundant. So those could be collapsed into manufacturing because they're both manufacturers. And then there are others that I think would qualify us as having chosen sustainable industries. And I think that aligns with sustainable careers. So one of the things that was clear to me also is, for example, finance. Everything we're doing is financially based. And I think that having someone head up that Table Partner lead with the right background would help us every step of the way, no matter what decisions we're making, will help us and guide us in making effective decisions, with the end result being a return on investment.

**26:25**

Because we want this to be more than just the next two, three, five years. We want this to be ten or 20 years. The best way to compel and really box in the state and the federal funding is to show a return on investment. So it's interesting, though, that we got the name California Jobs first, because those that know me know that I want to focus on making sure that we have sustainable careers coming out of this. That's the whole purpose of what we're doing. I'm committed to that. The work that we've been doing in my space really aligns with what we're doing, and it's like I can see the goal line. All we got to do is stay true to the mission. So I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

**27:18**

Thank you, Kevin. If I can add to that, for finance, the financial strategy is very important because it's not only just what Kevin said, but all of these various funding sources that we're tapping into. We're going after philanthropic partners, we're going after other grants. We like investors to come in to potentially get equity participation into some of these programs that you guys are eventually going to be identifying. There's going to be, my guess is, like, ways for them to leverage some of the tax credits that are out there, working with other regions who may have the same initiatives as the Los Angeles region, so we can get other grants. To have that expert who knows this kind of at the back of their hand be really important for that. So I hope that you guys really strongly consider having one of those tables be geared towards finance or financial strategy.

**28:15**

If I could lean in also, one thing I left out was that we want to make sure the chair and the vice chair, we've got

great experience, but there are other people on the steering committee that also have great experience. We want it to be an odd number, so there will be no stagnation, and we want to bring a couple more people on board to choose to have a good discussion and choose those table partners. So I just wanted to leave that also on the table. Thank you.

**28:49**

Thank you. You can go to the next slide.

**28:54**

Thank you, Kevin and Charles. I just wanted to note right before we move on that Armand has dropped a link that I will also be bumping back up, which is a live Google doc for the Table Partner lead application and grading rubric. So we'd like to get some of your feedback on what you think that should look like. So please feel free to click on that link and provide some feedback as you like. But with that said, I will move forward to the next slide. And the next slide is actually some more feedback that we'd like to get from you all for the table partner leads in regards to the role and the responsibilities, the scope of works as well as the benchmarks. So that could be reporting, mandates, organizing gatherings, how many gatherings, et cetera. So Armand did drop that link as well. I'll go ahead and bump that back up to the chat so you can feel free to leave your feedback there too.

**29:52**

And it should be there now. And for the affinity. Hub leads. So we do have our Affinity Hub leads already named and seated. So the next step that we need to ensure that we can move forward on are defining the benchmarks and metrics for the Affinity Hub leads as well. So, again, establishing the specific scope of work, performance metrics as well as the specific tasks that they should be identified for them to deliver on. And I see a hand raised by Tanua. Go ahead. Tanua.

**30:31**

Good afternoon. I just want to make sure that I have a sense of where this conversation is going because I feel like I'm missing some elements here. So there's the Hub leads and the table leads and these table leads that you were just describing on the previous set of slides there. Is it the understanding that and I might need to look at our sheet again and see what we've named everything, but is it not the understanding that those Hub and or Affinity leads? I don't know which is which. Now, several of them would have some of these.

**31:21**

To know what I think.

**31:22**

You accidentally sorry, several of them would have these topics underneath their work. So I'm just trying to understand, I don't get there's a whole nother set of organizations that are separate and apart from the community organizations. I'm not catching where you're going with this. The other thing is that these questions that you're asking, establishing the previous slide, where you asked the question here about, even here about the scope and number of meetings and those sorts of things, is the staff not going to provide us with any recommendations first that we can respond to? I'm just trying to get a sense as to how this will work because I feel like we're back at the same place where we've got to then as an entire body, come up with every single strategy and solution and design it and have a chance to respond to it. So those are my two questions that I'm just not sure that I'm catching where we're going on.

**32:36**

What are these new groups? Where do these new resources come from and why aren't they part of our current system and strategy? And second, how are we going to work together and what is the role of the staff going to be in at least providing us with information that we can respond to as a committee.

**32:58**

Alan, can you go back to the slide with the steering committee? I'm sorry? With the tables?

**33:09**

There it is.

**33:11**

So, Tanua, can you give me an example or give us an example of what you were referring to where the disconnect is for you?

**33:19**

As I'm thinking about my role as I think I'm a Hub lead. Right. You clarify for me if I'm saying the wrong word. Underneath that, there certainly could be topics associated with finance or even some industry clusters or even gig workers and self employed. Right. And we could go ahead and focus on identifying who might lead those tables or what entities and individuals would be involved so that we can streamline sort of the system that we have in place now. And there may be others on the line who are managing certain areas or topics, and these topics that are here can fall under their purview.

**34:15**

I'm still not sure I follow. We're dealing with two different lists here. The list on the left was the recommended list from Outreach and Engagement. The list on the right is the new proposed list based on research from IAE, the state, and the I don't know. Tanua, please tell me if this is the same way you're a we have.

**34:46**

Hub leads right now that are on.

**34:48**

The steering committee on this call.

**34:49**

Is that right, Charles?

**34:51**

Yes.

**34:53**

And so I'm confused too.

**34:55**

Are these table partner leads a separate.

**34:58**

Layer of governance that's different than the.

**35:01**

Responsibility that somebody like Tanua has or Brady has or other? Absolutely so, okay. It feels like we have to do a surf one one. The table partner leads are separate entity areas that need to be focused on based on LA's needs. Okay, so the Tanua, you handle one Affinity Hub dealing I'm sorry, I can't think off the top of my head, I know Kevin's dealing with business. There's one dealing with sustainability. We can go down the line of what those twelve affinity Hub leads are. Okay. Now there are eight additional tables where whatever's not essentially that's not focused on in those twelve areas, we can do essentially more breakout rooms to focus on areas that are not mentioned but should be mentioned. So initially, the Outreach and engagement on the far left, those were their recommendations. However, going forward, the recommendations needs to be more focused towards industries, which is why you have those on the far right.

**36:11**

Does that make more?

**36:15**

I'm Tanua expressed my question. I just popped it in the chat. This is Jennifer Zellett. It feels like we're assuming a structure, a need. And we're assuming a structure when there's two Google Sheets that have been popped up where we're going to be determining the Affinity Hub scope of work and performance metrics. If

we haven't even determined the Affinity Hub scope of work, how do we know what we need at the next layer. It's like we're presuming that we need the next layer when we haven't even defined what's happening at that first layer for me. So I'll just tell all of you that this is probably a deficiency in how I think I'm a whole to parts thinker.

**37:05**

So I need to see the whole.

**37:07**

Before I understand how the parts fit together. And so that's the source of my confusion. So I'm just sharing that so that you all understand how I think. If you're a parts to whole thinker this probably makes sense because you're following the parts, but I can't put it into an order yet. And so I struggle with having two sheets side by side where we're trying to determine the scope of work for the affinity leads and the next layer below that. At the same time, I think we need to know one in order to determine the other.

**37:40**

Unless I'm missing something, the scope for the affinity leads. So if you're the affinity lead for business, your scope of work will be defined around business. If you are the affinity lead for sustainability, you will be focusing on sustainability, how to reduce the carbon footprint, creating jobs in that sector. Essentially you're focusing on your core competency. That's it. The tables you have to define what extra, quote unquote pain points there are in Los Angeles. We know there's a water issue. There are jobs to be created in sports. There are jobs to be created infrastructure because there are issues there. Energy is an issue. Let's say you choose eight out of those ten are there who are going to lead those efforts. So the tables are essentially eight additional affinity hub leaders. I don't know if that helps you in your thinking.

**38:52**

I appreciate the explanation and I understand that it kind of defines areas in which we work, but there's still not the tasks or the expectations, right? And when those expectations are delineated, then I think we can understand what's left over for those other groups to pick up. So that's just kind of where I am and I'll stop because I don't want to derail the conversation.

**39:23**

Jennifer, this is an important point because I don't think we're clear on what the conversation is, to be honest with you. What I'm hearing is how do these list of recommended groups and how does this all tie into data and where we're supposed to make the investment and look for the kind of jobs that connect with the communities that are in need. So having a list of water technology, aerospace like all that is fantastic, but how does that fit within the areas that we're supposed to invest in? How is this connected data? I'm a little confused as to what we're trying to do here. To be really honest with everybody.

**40:02**

My hand is up. May I?

**40:05**

Go ahead. Sharon, your hands.

**40:07**

Thank you. So I want to be clear. Prior to our current surf team joining us. We had a very vibrant discussion at both governance and outreach about the possibility of having industry tables as part of our steering committee. I was actually pro that selection and our membership voted that down unanimously. They were like, no, we want 80% community, and we didn't want that. And so I'm a little concerned and confused because if you go back.

**40:47**

Sharon, I think you went on mute.

**40:49**

Structure for the table partners were intended to ensure that the voice of the underrepresented groups that

did not get included based on our affinity hub leads who got left out. Actually, those stakeholders still had tables to bring forth their constituents needs to participate in our future workforce or economic or our ten year economic plan. The outreach committee spent two or 60 days, took two months to go out to the committee and the HRTC for recommendations on what those hubs should be. And we asked them to provide us with information on why they felt that these groups or these constituents were underrepresented and not part of our economic plan. And so what came forward we thought was going to be voted on by the HRTC to move forward.

**42:04**

Prior to.

**42:05**

Us creating the steering committee. But I'm very open. I'm just concerned that this new set of recommendations is now creating we agreed there needed to be an industry cluster table, but it's creating those opportunities for industry based on a formula or a purpose that is directly in contradiction to the purpose as written in the proposal and in the contract of what those table partners are there for. So I'm going to ask that our co chairs have a conversation with the state and LADC to understand why this is, because this is a very drastic change, and I will support whatever the steering committee, of course, wants to do. But this was something brought forth by the HRTC meet members, and I don't think our co chairs have had a chance to dialogue on why the state is seeking this kind of a.

**43:08**

Take. Actually, let me reply to that before I go to you, Tanu. I don't know, Tanu, if you just didn't lower your hand or you have another question, but give me 1 second.

**43:15**

You go ahead and make your statement. I'll go after you're done.

**43:20**

Okay. It's important that you understand and once again, the state has recognized their mistakes in their messaging. So when you say a drastic change from outreach and engagements and la HRTC's recommendations, that was based on old messaging. But regardless, if you're looking forward and trust me, I just came out of I'm here indian Hills and every other region here, all their tables are based on industry. What you risk by leaving it the same is that, oh, okay. So you want to focus on the social justice aspect of trying to create jobs as opposed to trying to create jobs for people who. Have been ostracized, you risk not getting your fair share. So that's why I am asking you to consider the additional recommendations over the original recommendations by on e ultimately, it's, you know, to you know, it makes sense if you want to have some type of meeting with the state to get clarification on it.

**44:36**

Maybe you need to hear it from them, but it's just my recommendation. You risk not getting your fair share if you stick with those. Also, we cannot hold up the process too much because we have to deliver this on time. Los Angeles is severely behind schedule. And if we keep on with meetings and delays, we're not going to get this thing done on time. And that's going to impact the type of funding that we should be getting here. Sanua.

**45:16**

So I think you've heard from just about mean between the colleagues who've spoken, Sharon just spoke, we're all asking the same question, and the lack of clarity that we have does not allow us to really move forward in this conversation. The other thing that I wanted to underscore is that we've always had a space for industry. Sharon just said it. I'm saying it. And that space was in a set of tables that could be set. But to have to put resources behind these industries and having them paid to set up tables was not something that we said that we wanted to do as an entire body and as a community. And it's really important if you're going to go to these meetings, Charles, we've got to get on the same page, and we're going to need your advocacy in those spaces and so that people understand what went through and where we are as a region.

**46:25**

This conversation right here appears to be an undoing of months of work, of activity that I thought were moving forward as opposed to making a change in the middle of our current strategy.

**46:44**

I can't disagree with you on it.

**46:47**

Can I lean in real quick?

**46:49**

Sure, of course.

**46:50**

So, first of all, I think that one of the reasons why this whole why we're here is it actually is. Even though it's economically based, it is a social justice issue. Right. It's a historic institutionalized. You call it racism. Let's call it what it is, all right? And I know it. I'm 66. I've seen it time and time again. And so we have groups, community based organizations and others that have a grasp on the way the community feels and how to identify paths to get the right people in place and look at the people that have been historically singled out and they're listed on the left side. We know who they are right now. I did not talk to the state. Right. And based on what I've heard, maybe we do need to talk to the state, but to Charles' point, we need to keep the train moving.

**48:05**

So while we talk to the state and we're going to bring in two members from the steering committee right to have that conversation. We also need to think about business in terms of once we identify groups of people where no one is left out, where do we find the businesses that are going to hire these people? Because again it goes back to the same to the name, the new name, California Jobs. First for me it's about the people. It's about getting people hired in sustainable careers in sustainable industries that meet all the other criterion. How do we marry that? We all come together to figure out the best path to make that happen. Now I don't have all the answers and I don't have the control over the state but I certainly can, once we get it all laid out, figure out how to marry it and move it forward because I don't want to give them any excuses.

**49:06**

This is going to be done. And none of these folks on the left hand side that have been historically disenfranchised, especially black and brown, Native American and all the other groups here, we're not going to fail at this folks. So let's figure it out. Let's get everybody's conversation recorded. Let's get two people to bring in, let's talk to the state because those of you that know me know that it's got to make sense and we got to get people hired and we can't leave anybody behind and we got to show a return on investment and whatever the best path forward is that I'm for. But I also want to make sure that we as a group that there's no dissension. We got to figure out where the consensus is. Collaborate and execute. I'll leave it there folks.

**50:13**

Thank you Kevin. And just to go in order of the hands Andrea go ahead.

**50:18**

I was hoping and if I'm off track then explain it because I am one of the newer people to the group. How I looked at this is as the Hub leads we are supposed to be organizing and bringing back feedback that is representative of all of these categories that are on the outreach committee side. And so the tabling doesn't necessarily have to be quote unquote, employers. There are a lot of nonprofit associations and groups that have their thumb on the pulse of these industries that can actually apply to be partner leads and a lot of them target like very specific populations, ethnicity, social, economic status and other indicators that we can use to gather the information that we need. Instead of thinking of as an employer we can look at associations and groups that are actually helping set policy and information for these industries. And so every time we're going and we're organizing, my role as the Hub lead fab, it was explained to me was that I'm supposed to be gathering the information and sharing the information in mind that these groups are.

**51:35**

Part of the conversation. Not that they need to be like each separate bucket, but that this is like a holistic thing where we're looking at the whole picture and making sure that we're bringing all of these voices to the table as part of our organizing. It's not an either or. It's that our role as the hub lead is that we are supposed to be gathering this information and feedback. And then by putting these partner leads in place, we're then extending our outreach to bring in the associations that actually know what's going on in these areas and where they're falling short so we're not having to put out a whole bunch of time and energy on getting additional research done. And then we're also able to help these organizations thrive and that we're able to create pipelines. That's how I saw it. And if I'm off base, let me know.

**52:31**

But that's how I saw the two working together.

**52:35**

These are all discussions that the steering committee you guys who are elected steering committee members should be working out. Absolutely. Zahira, I see that your hand's been up for a while.

**52:46**

Thank you. And thank you. I appreciate this conversation. My comment's just about process and I think we're getting there with respect to who needs to go back and have conversations with the state. But I'm always curious in terms of recommendations, like how we get to those recommendations, why we're making them, and why we're unpacking something that's been packed to reconsider it. And so that conversation and follow up with the state I think will be really helpful. But I also think it's really helpful to think about that as we move forward and how recommendations come to this body and knowing where do they come from, especially if it's a change from what's been discussed over the course of I do. I think lots of people have shared, Andrea, very much shared and others about this focus on community and community focus and community need, and the fact that we are very much looking at disinvested communities, which is the purpose of surf, and so very much ensuring that we're getting back to that purpose.

**53:52**

It's all over the materials in terms of the bylaws and other pieces. But how do we actually live it out? And we know that La is going to be different just as all the other regions are going to be different. And the conversation with the state is more of a right sizing in sharing again with Sacramento, what La actually looks like as an organism and as a county, and how to be responsive to what our needs are so that they can get what they want to get done too, which is to see economic growth in California. So I appreciate the co chairs and others being able to have those conversations with the state so that we can find out why we're getting certain recommendations, if these are indeed their recommendations. But how do we actually achieve the goals that we have as a community and move forward in a way that is really conducive to the collaboration that's already been discussed and formed.

**54:43**

So thank you.

**54:46**

We're going to have to move forward. But Stella I see your hands.

**54:49**

Yeah, just real quick, Charles, I really appreciate this conversation because I'm thinking, like, as a table, as a Affinity Hub lead, I'm going to go to those folks that are thinking sustainability, energy, et cetera.

**55:06**

Right.

**55:06**

I want to make sure that I'm getting all this feedback from them. But I'm also looking at the list that we originally recommended from the On E team. There's about nine different groups there. I want to make sure that those folks are at the table. And now I'm looking at the additional recommendations, and I'm thinking,

okay, how do I engage folks from technology and infrastructure, energy, et cetera? Because those are all connected to sustainability in my mind.

**55:33**

Right.

**55:34**

This is like a full time job for Affinity Hub leads. Right. We're going to spend a lot of time doing the outreach and engagement. So I definitely think this is a very important conversation to have with the state, so I agree with a lot of folks that have already made that recommendation. Thank you.

**55:56**

Thank you. All right.

**56:00**

And just to summarize the last couple of slides, I know a couple alan.

**56:05**

Real quick, there's one other thing that Tanua mentioned. As it pertains one of the last discussions that we had. Chioma about a month ago, I submitted some information that addresses everything that Tanua and Jennifer Zalette are concerned about. Right. You remember roles, responsibilities, processes, reporting, deliverables, project management, timelines before the election. So I think if we can get that back, it will give people a comfort level on not only organizational structure, but how we're going about delivering our value as it pertains to these roles. And I think you probably have enough, at least what we've talked about, to be able to get that back to the group. And I think that would help add clarity and also provide a platform so that when the chair, vice chairs, two additional people, try to figure out how to collapse what the outreach and engagement recommendations were, what the state came back with, and then we get our game plan together, and then we meet with the state.

**57:28**

Just one meeting. I think we can clear this up without too much delay. Those are my thoughts.

**57:38**

Thank you for that, Kevin. And I think maybe I can post, like, part of what you sent us and share that in one of these documents Alan has created to share to give everyone an example or, like, a template so we can see which we already have. So I'll paste it in there.

**57:59**

Thank you, Chioma. Thank you so much, Kevin, for that reminder. So now I want to pass it on to our partner over at CCF to provide some fiscal agent updates. Jose, if you're there, you can go ahead.

**58:14**

Yes. Hi, everybody. I have a couple of updates to give. The first one is the Affinity Hub and Table lead agreements update, as I hear. I know that there's a lot of work still being done in regards to kind of identifying just the work that's going to be performed in order to be able to incorporate that into the agreements. Currently, we have an actual template for the agreements that has boiler template language in regards to just overall responsibilities and not getting into the weeds as to specific line items and deliverables. So I'll continue to work with not only Charles and team, but I know you guys, and identifying so that we can make sure that it gets incorporated in the agreements so we can start finalizing them, putting them in your hands so you guys can start reviewing. The next item that I have is the budget modification update.

**59:09**

I'm happy to report that we did get back from the state the budget modification. It looks like they've approved the proposed changes that we have made. So we're currently reviewing internally in order to ensure that all the changes and everything is correct so that we can sign, send it back, and then the process will be they'll sign it and then we get the fully executed version of it. So I'm very happy to report because it did take about eight weeks to get this done, but I'm happy to know to report that we got it back and we'll be working on getting it



finalized. Last but not least, regarding the research RFP status, I just want to let you guys know that next week we'll be doing a kickoff meeting with the two identified vendors for the work in order to continue to process their agreement and get them executed as well.

**01:00:03**

The only one, I believe it was research number two, that wasn't procured. Nobody really applied and we're putting it we did offer it to the individuals that got awarded and the organization. So they're going to be looking at it. We're waiting for the proposals. They both indicated interest, so we're waiting for the proposals. And then at that point, we'll score them, look at it, and then contract with whoever we identified. So we're on track with that. If there's any questions, please let me know, but those are my updates.

**01:00:39**

Sharon, I see your hand is up.

**01:00:40**

Yes, thank you so much. I do have a question, and this was one we asked on a couple of meetings ago, so thank you. We are not aware or we're not made aware, neither the HRTC nor the steering committee was made aware of what proposed budget modifications were being submitted on behalf of the La Surf HRTC. When we asked for it, we thought there was going to be an update last week and then we got feedback saying, no, we would not receive any update or transparency until after that had been approved, can you please provide us the nature of what is it that you went in and changed in our overall budget? Because I would have assumed that type of a change in structure would have come before the HRTC or for approval or consideration.

**01:01:29**

Jose, I'll answer this. Sharon, everyone on this call, it's important that you understand that the budget modification did not change anything that was initially proposed. Only thing the budget modification did was take redirect some of the monies where there wasn't enough monies in one bucket, let's say, for like process mapping, there wasn't enough money in that bucket. And to make sure that it was money in that bucket, the only reason the modification has been done, everything that you guys propose, literally nothing has changed.

**01:02:05**

But that is a change. And so I'm saying this is a process conversation. LAEDC doesn't have the ability to make decisions to alter the budget. CCF doesn't have that authority without the HRTC's consent. And so I understand we didn't have money for certain things. I think from a process standpoint, that should have come back to the committee of the HRTC for approval because the ultimate deciding bodies was the HRTC, and now it is again the steering committee. So, yes, if money came out of some bucket, it came out of one, and we have no clue. So I think there is a need for transparency, and it's transparency before the change is made, not after.

**01:02:48**

Well, once again, it's up to the fiscal agent how they want to share that information with you guys.

**01:02:56**

No, it's so and I can jump in. Charles. So, Sharon, I appreciate your comments. I don't disagree. What I do want to remind everybody is, again, as fiscal agents, we do have a fiduciary duty. There is a timing issue that I need to make sure that everybody's aware. As you guys know, even by today's meeting, things are very fluid with this program. And I can't emphasize that enough things change and have been changing. So what was proposed and the structure of the nature of the contracts that were originally contracted to do, the nature of that agreement and the structure of this program continues to change. It's very fluid. So we're going with the flow and we're trying to do the best to keep up. From my understanding, again, we needed to move in order to make sure and with the work with LAEDC, in order to identify the work that needs to be done to be able to do that.

**01:03:56**

We don't mind sharing things with you. I'm glad that there is a committee established now. So again, anything that needs to change, there is, from what I see, a little bit more structure, a lot more structure in regards to being able to come in and if there's anything that is proposed or needs to be done, again, everybody will be

able to see it beforehand. So they can be discussed. So again, we're not proposing that we're moving by ourselves or doing any changes on our own. Everything is with the program in mind. And again, I just want to continue to echo the fact that it has been difficult to keep up with the programmatic changes. But again, the partnership we've had so far with Laudc has been a very collaborative and positive one where we're continued to try to solve problems and find solutions to the problems.

**01:04:48**

So again, now that there is this committee, I'm very happy to be able to report things up front. I'm also speaking on behalf of Maria, who's my colleague, and unfortunately she's not in today, so we'll be able to have these discussions. And I think that and forgive me because I'm not very good with the names, but I believe the individual that spoke earlier about processes and being able to identify how we're going to go about communicating items to you guys, I think it's very important to have and I agree with that assessment because it'll help our work too. We don't want to make it seem like we're not transparent, it's anything, but we want to make sure that you guys understand that as fiscal agents, we're just trying to help the program as best we can. So I hope that resolves and I hope that helps a little bit.

**01:05:39**

Thank you, Charles.

**01:05:41**

Thank you, Jose. TenUA.

**01:05:44**

I just have to underscore I was like, I don't understand why in the world there would be any change to the budget without this body having access to that. Agree. It just it was not acceptable. We specifically stated that one of the purviews of the short list of purviews of this particular body was review and oversight of the budget. So to dismiss us today and say it is just up to the fiscal agent cannot be an acceptable way that we proceed. And the immediate opportunity that I was anticipating by hearing this is that this new budget needs to be emailed to all of us right away. Like, we need to see it. Right. It is, it is not just the purview know, and CCF was part of those conversations when we said what the role of the steering committee and the HRTC would be regarding the budget.

**01:06:46**

Absolutely. I just make that work.

**01:06:50**

Let me add some context for you guys. So the budget modification, the budget for the elections was initially \$500. It went to \$1,500, then it went to \$4,500, then it went to about \$5,500. And all that came because in the heat of moments, a lot of changes were made on the fly. So going back to the HRTC to approve taking monies from the research that was already earmarked to go somewhere else to go for the elections, were talking about holding up probably another probably month or so. At the end of the day, everything that you guys agreed upon, you're still getting it's just from a fiscal standpoint, it's put in different buckets.

**01:07:53**

But Charles, the issue is you don't have the authority to do that. And it's not malfeasance, but it is absolutely a violation of the process. And so it's a simple thing. We have the following six expenses that need to be adjusted funding and we need additional funding allocation for that. If you had the HRTC and that item on your agenda, you would have gotten a vote on that. If you had brought it to the steering committee the moment it was sitting, you would have gotten a vote on that. I'm just saying, from a process perspective, this is manipulation and I want to be very forthright. This is one of the reasons there is fear and distrust amongst community. We have to be fully engaged with one another. We have to have our cards on the table and we have to know and have trust that everything is going along with the understood process.

**01:08:53**

Voting on these things.

**01:08:56**

I'm sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt. Go ahead.

**01:08:59**

That's I shared, again in terms of process and how important it is. And I really appreciate what you shared, Jose, and I think that's exactly right. Like having a process that makes sense. I'm hearing something else that I'm a little bit concerned about and I just want to make sure that I'm hearing it correctly. So it sounds like the price that you just gave the example for Charles in terms of the elections was originally \$500. And I don't know if that was for setting up the system and it increased. And what I recall is that, again, I'm just stating this because I want to make sure I'm getting it right, is that I'm going to turn my video on for this. Is that what I recall is that there was someone that you had a relationship with who you brought in, who was going to do a sample of this for the election, to do a model for it, and that this person had a product, they were going to build it out for us.

**01:10:00**

And that was a product that you were sharing. I asked a question in terms of RFPs and how were sharing, how were identifying how much were going to spend. And I was told it was going to be a nominal amount of money. So to move from five hundred dollars to five thousand five hundred dollars with \$5,000 added, that's taken away from some other piece, that is no longer a nominal expense. And we never went through a process of even selecting the vendor. And again, from what I recall, this is why I'm kind of really stating everything. Again, this was a relationship that you had in terms of someone who brought in. I think that is accurate. We really need to make sure that the process is absolutely solid and that we don't have issues where there's concerns about how money is going out, where it's going, and who is getting various vendor or other contracts.

**01:11:00**

And so as we move forward, I appreciate all of the concerns, and I do believe that you want to do the best for all of us and the best for this process. And processes require process. We still need a process to make sure that all of this moves smoothly and that we really have an understanding. Because changing and shifting to the order of thousands of dollars from, for example, evaluation to a voting system that we reluctantly went on with because were told over and over again, like, this person is providing pro bono services. We need to make sure we move forward with them. This is what we have right now. We should be going that way. We can't then say now, well, this was like spur of the moment, things were happening on the fly, and that's why this money was overspent. So, again, all I can say is process.

**01:11:54**

We just need process.

**01:11:55**

Okay? If we're talking about process, important that you understand that there was no process in place for you guys even choosing your steering committee. And that's where the issue came in. And at the last minute, over and over again, four additional times, it put us in this position. We should look at this in a different perspective, that we had someone in place in order to make those changes on the fly. Otherwise we will be severely even worse behind.

**01:12:22**

And Charles, I just want to just also make one more statement, just because you're in the role of facilitator here, and I know we've all been, all of us, all of our organizations, we all facilitate conversations, we facilitate meetings. And one of the dangers of facilitation is arguing with the discussion, right? And that is just a key part that breaks down facilitation. It breaks down collaboration. What I hear right now is an argument about really what is a statement related to process. Again, I understand your reasonings. I understand where you believe were, what we're all saying, and I've heard it not just from me, but from other people as we move forward is how can we have a process moving forward that helps to ensure that we don't have these issues come up. Again, clearly, this has been upsetting for a number of the members of this steering committee.

**01:13:15**

And so it's a matter of just like how we do in the future. But I know that as we kind of all make our statements and as we all kind of fulfill our roles, just understanding that's how meetings gather most effectively is for us to just all have a really good sense of what our role is in the meeting and it helps it move forward more productively. But process, and it sounds like we're going to get there. So I look forward to that.

**01:13:43**

I agree with you. And my apologies if you feel this is argumentative, but it's important that you guys know the background, the history of why decisions were made, and to let you know, more importantly, that nothing was done illegally. Nothing was done to keep you guys in the dark. It was literally to give the HRTC what they wanted in that moment. And the fact that none of the initiatives that you initially proposed have been impacted by this. That's why we went ahead and made the changes, so we can keep everything on track and give you what you want. So I'll look at that for right now, but it's important that we move forward. We'll start putting processes in place. Thank goodness we have a steering committee. We have great chairs here in place, and one of the discussions we'll be talking about is bylaws to make sure that we don't run into these issues anymore.

**01:14:42**

Charles so just hearing the passion and the concerns, many of which I agree that we need to do in order to have inclusion and transparency, why don't we integrate as part of the process, make sure that at least the chair and the vice chairs and maybe an HRTC member or two are part of the discussion. Even with the state, we can't go back and unravel what's already been done, but we can certainly put things in place in the future so that we remain strong as a group and we continue to move forward. Is that fair and reasonable?

**01:15:26**

If you're asking me, you're the chair. So I should leave it for you guys in the steering?

**01:15:32**

If I've heard everybody, then yeah, absolutely. And I think hopefully I've captured the concerns of what have been expressed here and how we're going to move forward. I wasn't involved in the discussion with the state on the additional recommendations. I'm just trying to figure out how to move forward so that we can get this thing done. And that's what I want to do. I appreciate everyone's voice, everyone's concerned, and as we move forward, if we're going to be effective and be that group, we got to resolve these issues in the way that we do business and have meetings, and I think it's going to be okay. So what you just said, we move forward.

**01:16:21**

Yeah.

**01:16:21**

And if I may, I totally, 100% agree, embrace, welcome. The sooner we can get a process in place, the sooner we can start adhering to it. So please know that you have our full commitment to that. So thank you for saying that.

**01:16:38**

Okay. I'm not sure if you didn't if you just haven't lowered your hand, if you had an additional comment or question.

**01:16:45**

I'll lower my hand.

**01:16:47**

Okay. Chioma, if you don't mind giving the update on the process mapping and capacity building.

**01:16:54**

Yes, and I'll make it quick because I see we are ten minutes over the process mapping. The first draft is complete. The Mark would have liked to share some of that first draft information. Today, but they're at the same conference Charles is attending right now. So at the October 26 meeting they will come on and explain or answer any questions with their first draft and hopefully we'll be able to mail it out to you, email it out to

you before that meeting. We're looking forward to doing that when they come back. And Monday or Tuesday. And then also capacity building vendor search. We're currently meeting with those who have expressed their interest in being a vendor for the capacity building funding that is available. And so we're in the process of having those meetings and that's the only update I have for today.

**01:17:55**

Thank you.

**01:17:56**

Chioma. And I know everyone's trying to leave soon, but just to give an update on the upcoming meetings and a reminder, so we do have our next steering committee meeting two weeks from today, on Thursday, October 26, from one. To 02:00 P.m. And we have our partners meeting tomorrow from 09:00 A.m to 10:00 A.m. And tomorrow is also the first steering committee bylaws working meeting following right after the partners meeting at 10:00 A.m.. The second session for the steering committee bylaws would be on the 27th, which I believe is two weeks from tomorrow. So just some notable dates there and I think we're good to wrap up. Charles, if you have any last comments we can go ahead and wrap up.

**01:18:41**

No, I don't have any additional comments. Again, here at the Ending Wells Economic Summit and tomorrow I'll try to present as much as I possibly can to update you guys on what I've experienced here that could help the so can I jump in?

**01:19:05**

Because I'm hands up and I know you want to wrap up, so that would be really helpful. In the future, the steering committee should prepare for the HRTC meetings. In other words, we should put together the agenda for the steering committee so that we're all on the same messaging, we're on the same game plan, so that everybody hears a very clear message. So just for the future, it'd be great if the leadership team committee are able to work in preparation towards those HRTC meetings. I know the second thing is more of a recommendation in terms of the affinity hubs or hub leads. Are there going to be a convening with those that are going to be affinity hub folks soon?

**01:19:51**

I think that's a great question, Benny, because I think that's one of some decisions that the steering committee is going to have to make. Are there going to be different meetings for the affinity hubs with HRTC members or affinity hub leaders only table leads with HRTC members? Table leads only affinity and table with know affinity tables. With the steering committee, there's a lot of know decisions that need to be made, but for effectiveness. But also you want to make sure that you don't want to burn yourselves out. So all of those decisions will have to be made.

**01:20:36**

And let me say this, Benny, we did meet last week, the chair and vice chair. It's our first meeting, so we're getting our arms around this to, you know, we'll be meeting every day. What we're trying to do is be as effective as possible, respect our jobs and the time that we need to dedicate in that without losing momentum. But your point is well taken. I'm in agreement. And I think that some of the statements I made earlier and everyone else made earlier, we will hopefully alleviate any concern around setting the agenda and making sure that anything on that agenda, we've been involved in the decision making process. We understand it. And the things that you are bubbling up to us, we're representing in that meeting.

**01:21:35**

Okay. There's not any other comments over. We can adjourn this meeting and tomorrow at 09:00 a.m.

**01:21:49**

It.

**01:21:50**

Thank you, everyone. See you all tomorrow, 09:00 A.m..