CERF L.A. HRTC

Governance Subcommittee Meeting

Summary Notes and Transcription

November 16th, 2022

Meeting Video

Passcode: wSVzR0g$

Meeting Summary Notes

The CERF Governance Committee meeting is led by Tunua Thrash and co-chaired by Kelly LoBianco and Maria Salinas. They discussed the governance structure of the High Road Transition Collaborative (HRTC) and brainstormed who should be at various tables to ensure inclusivity, consensus building, and community-based leadership. The Hub Leads will work across affinity topics, language, region, and conduct outreach strategies that cover underserved populations. The Steering Committee will have major voting decisions with an emphasis on having a supermajority of seats go to community-based leaders from government, labor, business, industry, education sectors along with residents or grassroots partners. The Stewardship Committee would select members for both committees based on set criteria that prioritize disadvantaged communities and consensus-building principles. Discussion points include term length limits for steering committee members as well as whether they should select new members once established.

During a presentation, the selection principles of a table were discussed, and concerns were raised about whether the community should be providing input first or if content experts should bring ideas to the community. It was decided that there will be a data team to collect information which will then be shared with the community for feedback. There was also discussion on ensuring that sustainability and environmentalism are prioritized in the work being done. The idea of term limits for committee members was brought up, but it was suggested to focus more on term lengths instead. Communication and transparency within the steering committee is important, as well as having clear expectations for all members involved. A Stewardship Committee led by the convener and fiscal agent has been recommended with leads for training/capacity building support, outreach, data management, and governance management proposed.

The HRTC is discussing the implementation of their program, which includes filling positions and dissolving certain committees. They are awaiting contracts and staff to move forward with their plans. There is discussion about setting term limits for those on the steering committee, but some members believe continuity is important for institutional knowledge. The timeline for implementation and grant deadlines is in flux due to lack of guidance from the state. Attendance at meetings has dropped, but it's believed that once real work begins, numbers will increase again.

The committee will report on Friday and provide updates on the 45-day partnership engagement. The subcommittees unanimously voted to restart the clock and partners who did not sign during the proposal phase will have an opportunity to onboard. Jermaine's office will schedule remaining meetings for governance. The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, November 30th at 4 PM after Thanksgiving. Participants are encouraged to share any additional feedback with co-chairs or reach out to Jermaine directly.

Meeting Transcription:

00:01
Speaker 1
Thank you. All right. Good afternoon, and welcome to the Surf Governance Committee meeting. I'm tenUA Thrash

intuk and I Am Joined By the two Co chairs, including Kelly LoBianco, general Manager of The Department Of Economic Opportunity.

00:23
Speaker 2
Its director. The city goes by general Manager okay.

00:29
Speaker 1
Director. Maria Salinas, president and CEO of the La Chamber of Commerce. So many of you. I'm looking around, maybe there's I don't know if anybody's new, but if you are, welcome to the Governance Committee. We've spent the bulk of our time looking at the governance structure and helping to shape what the actual HRTC, the High Road Transition Collaborative, will look like. Those elements were placed in the application itself, so you'll have a chance to look at the various table of tables that this committee has recommended for today's meeting. We determined, based on our last meeting, that we would, as co chairs, get together and do some brainstorming and focus on identifying who should be at the various tables. Go into detail about that, and then go into detail about how those tables get set for today's conversation. We want you to know that it is a recommendation.

01:37
Speaker 1
It's really a presentation, and we want to use the conversation to get your feedback to be able to come to some consensus on those two important topics. Once we're able to do that, then the convener can go ahead and proceed with implementing those efforts of the consensus of the Governance Committee. We will also have an opportunity to share out on Friday at the full HRTC conversation. There may be an opportunity for some brief feedback there. We really want to use the committee meetings as a chance to get all feedback and have discussion. Are there any questions, comments, or if my fellow co chairs would like to add anything regarding today's agenda.

02:28
Speaker 3
I think you covered it. Thank you for that.

02:31
Speaker 1
Tanoa okay, great. I'm going to share my screen here and pull up a presentation that those of you who've been involved with this work for some time are aware of. This particular set of slides. Oh, I guess this is the first one. We won't go through the whole thing. This information is also available, at least in previous iterations, on the LAEDC website under the Surf Program. What we'll just remind you of is that we really were focused on identifying the kind of collaborative governance structure we would create. Our hope was to create something that had a series of values that this committee lifted up as part of the process. So you'll see them there. These are the decision points that the committee said that the governance structure should be prepared to opine on. We then took in a lot of feedback and discussion. From there, which is where we'll start to really move into the meat of the conversation, we looked to create what we called a shared power set of tables where each of those dots represents some constituency within La County.

04:01
Speaker 1
There were for the purposes of those who haven't been with us, four major tables that were set in place. One of

those tables is called the Community based Business Sector industry cluster table. Really, this is not one table, but a series of tables and really is made up of any individual, any group organization within the county that is interested in getting connected with the surf program. You'll see that we had identified and shared previously already with this committee what the responsibilities are and what would happen at that level in terms of that table. Oh goodness, sorry guys. Then there's table B. Table B is considered the steering committee. The steering committee is the committee where we would anticipate. The major thing is there is that major voting decisions would occur there. Table A incorporates both the community as well as and you'll hear more about it what we call the table leads or Hub leads who will help lead and provide support information and strategy of doing the outreach and making sure that information flows both ways.

05:31
Speaker 1
We also have a stewardship committee and the stewardship committee is really the convener along with the fiscal agent, community resident leads and potentially a couple of other leads determined that will be determined by the right now be determined by the convener. We'll come back to that later in the presentation. What we'll do is you'll see the items that are in red. The items in red are the new elements of the conversation that have not been presented previously. We talked about table A which is really any individual so who can go to those tables? Any individual small business, community, business or industry groups with an interest in engaging in the serve process. Any entity that wants to get engaged, maybe there's a table that's already set preexisting, maybe there are collaboratives that already exist and or maybe they're just individuals who are interested in getting connected.

06:40
Speaker 1
The concept here is that anyone can join a conversation and hopefully contribute to helping us get to our goal which is creating a plan for guiding additional resources around HRTC. In this sense there isn't a need to focus on how the table will be set that really will be vetted via the outreach process and making sure that we're conducting all the outreach necessary. This is just a reminder that table B is the Hub leads and those Hub leads will work across affinity topic, they will work across language, across region, throughout the county. There will be an emphasis in making sure that regions are covered, language is covered, modality and how people get connected to the A tables, all of that. The twelve anchor Hub organizations will be responsible for making sure that happens and they could be setting upwards of 50 plus tables across the county.

08:02
Speaker 1
Again, soliciting feedback as well as sharing data and information that comes out of the data analysis work. The items that are in red are really for this group here to have a conversation about. We looked at some values that we thought were important when it comes to the Hub groups and the work they were doing. We wanted them to really be groups that focused on inclusivity, that there would be no voting at the Hub table A, table B levels, no exclusionary practices, really open to new members and voices. Hub leads should be selected to ensure that there's all different kinds of folks who can participate and they should have a strategy around that. They should commit to consensus building so that we can gain a coherent sense of information that's coming out of the various conversations. We'd love for these Hub leads who are looking to be Hub leads to have some convening experience.

09:11
Speaker 1
When they do get ready to apply, were saying that they should be in a position to talk about their outreach strategy and how they're going to reach various underserved populations. The recommendation is that the Stewardship committee will select the Hub leads. The Stewardship Committee would design an application and set forth a timeline, outline the key characteristics of what Hub leads should have and then outline all of the requirements that

the Hub leads should follow. Maybe they have to host the minimum number of meetings they must attend, steering committee meetings, what kind of note taking they should have, summary of activities, reports, evaluations all of that should be itemized out as much as possible so that the Hub leads are aware of what's expected. We also recommended that the Stewardship committee look at other processes within the county for inspiration, such as the Care First community initiative and the selection process.

10:15
Speaker 1
There. I'll stop there. We have two more tables to go over, but these are the first two.

10:28
Speaker 2
Yeah. Thank you. Tanua. The only thing I would add here is obviously the Hub leads have an important role within the governance structure in making sure that the previous tables that we talked about, the industry cluster sector, business, community tables get set. Our Outreach committee is going to be making sure people know about it. The Hub is going to make sure that the conversations, that the meetings are happening, the conversations are happening and that information really gets to the broader HRTC so we can make decisions with it. I would love for folks beyond talking, we want folks feedback generally around selection principles and some of what we proposed here and where you have expertise around an application or other processes that we could use for selection of Hub leads. It'd be great to crowdsource here as.

11:26
Speaker 1
Well because my screen is up. If you do want to talk, feel free to raise your hand or chime in. I think we're small enough that we can just chime in. Okay, so thank you for that, Kelly. We'll move on to Table C. Table C is the steering committee and it's at this table level where you get the major voting decisions. Again, the areas that are in red still need to be, I just realized, updated. The whole point is to have a discussion here. This was presented to the governance committee previously before the application went in. It was determined that it was a level of detail that we wanted to spend some more time really sitting with and deciding if this is the right set of voices and numbers that we wanted to see on the steering committee. It was so detailed that we determined that we would hold off given we only had so many pages that we could present in the application.

12:51
Speaker 1
We're looking at anywhere from 24 plus seats of critical voices from government, labor, business, industry and community. Since this serves as the primary decision making body where votes will actually be taken, there was an emphasis on having a supermajority of the seats go to community based leaders. You'll see that were looking to aim for 70% to 80% of the seats on this particular committee, going to those who are from community based organizations and or leaders. There was also consensus around having seats that are reserved for residents, workers or very grassroots community partners who may not be associated with larger organizations, but just everyday folks who want to contribute to the conversation. Keeping in line with the Surf application and RFP, we did look to create additional space for other partners to be at the steering committee level. You'll see business and industry, labor, municipal partners, and another document that we had, we also added education.

14:14
Speaker 1
We added a seat there and then removed the additional member with no vote. That way we still are looking to try and figure out how we get to an odd number, but in order to try and make it as manageable a number as possible, we

would like to present today that number five would be an education member looking at K through twelve and then post secondary education. I'll stop there because this one has a lot of information on it.

14:55
Speaker 4
That's education with the vote or still no?

14:58
Speaker 1
Yes, that would be education with the vote. Let me see if I can.

15:07
Speaker 5
One.

15:08
Speaker 2
Of the things were talking about among the co chairs was that it was very clear in our conversations prior to submission that this 80% community leaders was solid within the structure of our steering committee. As we are identifying, we're all community members in some ways. The way we've defined community based leaders, where we additional voting seats, there's some math equations that we have to do and it increases the size of the steering committee body to keep it at 80% community Base Leader so I just want to throw that out there because I think it is important for discussion. We can determine ultimately what this steering committee looks like, but maintaining that percentage level or around there is going to be important because that's what the broader group committed to.

16:11
Speaker 1
You see this again, unless there's any other feedback today, we'll go ahead and increase the number of seats here so that we can get closer to the 80% and those increase in seats will go then to the community based leaders side of the table so that we can get to closer to 80%. Well, then we'll move on to how this group gets seated. We just started looking at what would be required so these representatives would commit to attending the steering committee meetings, reviewing materials, actively attending the table convenings. We'd love for these to be representatives who are going out into the community and engaging in those conversations so that they can hear firsthand commit to surf principles to prioritize disadvantaged communities and commit to consensus building. Our recommendation is that the stewardship committee would select the steering committee to start. They design an application, set out a timeline, outline the characteristics and other requirements of steering committee members in order to the stewardship committee might want to increase transparency.

17:48
Speaker 1
We would suggest that once they've outlined the selection process that they maybe bring it back to this committee for feedback. Once they've identified the selection criteria, including the application, the questions and the timeline, they bring that back to this committee for feedback. Potentially inviting non hub leads and non steering committee applicants to participate in the selection process to help with determining who would be on this first round of steering committee members. Of course, all of this is up for discussion. We also had a number of other questions that we wanted to make sure we spent some more time thinking about and would be happy to get as. I love how you said that, kelly, some crowdsourced thoughts. Should there be term length term limits? If so, how long should term

be? If there are term limits, should we have staggered terms? Once the steering committee is set, should the steering committee select new members?

19:05
Speaker 1
So we'll start we'll pause here.

19:14
Speaker 6
Hi, Tanua. This is Enrique with climate resolve. Thank you for this presentation. It's very illuminating, lots of information to take in and I'm particularly interested in learning more about the selection principles on this table. Specifically the bullet point that says actively attends table convenience to hear firsthand from the community. It seems to me like we are the content experts that should be bringing ideas to the community first and then have the community be the context experts as to where this makes more sense in their community. This the process that you have in mind or is there an alternative process?

20:03
Speaker 1
I think that you've described it well we do think that it'll go both ways. There will be a data team and or consultant put in place to collect data and information that then would be shared with the community, and the community then can provide context and respond to that. Even in that direction of flow of information, we'd also love for the community to say, here are the kinds of things that are important for us to know or to study or to make sure we think about as we are even deciding what direction we go with data collection. We're anticipating it's going both ways, but there will absolutely be a set of information that the community can respond to.

21:01
Speaker 6
That's great to hear. Tanua I guess my second point is more of a concern in that we work in the climate change arena and we work with both traditional environmentalism, which has to do with air, soil and water, but we're also pushing the envelope with innovative ideas that are looking to do a variety of solutions across the board. Some of the information that has been presented in prior tables doesn't seem to have environmentalist or a sustainable lens to them. They seem to be more traditional areas like engaging youth employment, so forth and so on. I just want to make sure that we are sticking to the original intent of Surf, which was to sustainably and equitably build back the economy that COVID really disrupted. I want to make sure that we always have an emphasis on how we can make all of these ideas sustainable so that we're not just reproducing some of the types of jobs that we had prior to COVID which were a bit problematic, but that are looking to the future to also address the broader issue of climate change.

22:31
Speaker 2
Thank you. Enrique, can we go back one slide to Nua? Because I want to .1 thing out. Too because I think that's a great point, Enrique, and I think it's something that we need to be really cognizant about when we're thinking about quality jobs and equity and also sustainability and climate resiliency as part of this broader effort. We do want to make sure that's a priority throughout the governance structure and with the HRTC generally. I'm glad you centered it when you're looking at the steering committee, we did prioritize organizations committed to environmental justice within the community based Leaders team, and we certainly want the broader tables to be representative of maybe your traditional environmental groups, but also those like yours that are pushing the envelope. I think that we also need to bring that up within our outreach and engagement committees. Too we want to make sure that we're getting information about Surf to those parties that should be joining.

23:37
Speaker 2
Enrique, hopefully you can help us with that.

23:39
Speaker 3
Too yeah, and I would just add is that something you're not seeing? Like if you look at this slide, I'd be curious to see what your thoughts are on that since it's called out in there.

23:59
Speaker 6
Yeah, so environmental justice has some historical underpinnings with regards to ensuring that communities aren't overly burdened with pollution sources. And that's great. We believe 100% in that we have an active community engagement and outreach division at Climate Resolve that does just that. There are other strands to sustainability and environmentalism like climate resilience, which doesn't necessarily address what environmental justice advocates typically go after. To use environmental justice as a catch all, I don't know that necessarily works here because they have some very particular issues that not all climate activists are involved with.

24:58
Speaker 2
Would you say environmental justice and climate resiliency, how can we better represent that?

25:11
Speaker 6
Yeah, that's a good question. There is environmental justice, which like I said, typically involves protecting people from some of the solutions that climate change activists are putting forward. There is some tension there sometimes there are some dilemmas as well. There's climate justice, which looks more towards the broader issue of adapting our communities to some of the climate impacts that climate change is really gearing up. There's just plain old environmentalism which is protesting and that kind of advocacy. Yeah, maybe climate resilience could be another catch all term that we can incorporate here. Environmental justice and climate resilience.

26:09
Speaker 1
Okay, take that feedback. The other area that I was going to just remind us of is that you're going to have Enrique great opportunity to lift up these concepts so that they can get into the regional priorities. These concepts are going to be very important for that. As we shape the regional priorities out of this process, I'm very hopeful that we'll see more of what you're describing in that document. That brings us then we just went over that slide. We went over this slide. Any thoughts about the other questions or how this particular body gets set? Any feedback or thoughts here's?

27:49
Speaker 2
There anything we should be considering as the stewardship committee designs this application? We want to make sure your thoughts are reflected as we move into those operationalizing stages of this.

28:12

Speaker 6
I hate to do so much talking here, but I did want to raise another point, but I'm going to step back to see if anyone else wants to say something first as I've already spoken.

28:27
Speaker 1
Thank you for giving them the invitation.

28:31
Speaker 4
Let me respond to Noah to your question. These are great questions. I think a lot of us have been a part of this type of process where it's kind of trying to push something by committee. I think the challenge here is we don't know what we're getting into and it's hard to put guardrails on something that we don't know, we don't have enough information about. I almost wonder, do we set reset or exit points for the stewardship committee to reconsider some of these on like on a regular basis, like, is this steering committee doing a sufficient job and responsibility? Do they need to then make changes? Because term length and term limits are great to diversify and kind of rotate people in at the same time. It's also good if you have really good people that keep the locomotive moving. You want to try to keep them as long as possible.

29:41
Speaker 4
It's such a hard decision to make up front before kind of any of the real work happens.

29:52
Speaker 6
I don't know.

29:58
Speaker 2
Okay, yeah, I do hear what you're saying, Billy, though. Maybe there is something around, especially in the first year where we're new that like at the year point or something, the stewardship committee is maybe bringing back the selection and like expectations of the steering committee to a vote or something like that. I don't know.

30:32
Speaker 4
Yeah, I don't know. Do you want to put that responsibility on the stewardship committee? I don't know if they'd also want to be in that position either.

30:46
Speaker 1
I think that we want them to focus on the work as much as possible and not so much on the governance of it.

30:58
Speaker 2
If we could.

31:01
Speaker 1
To your point, we don't have to have term limits, but we could still have term length. People could say, well, I'm willing to do a year or two years or whatever those terms are. If somebody wants to stay on and can depending on if the steering committee is selecting itself, if you are an active member of the body and people think you can still contribute, you'll get selected again. But if not.

31:44
Speaker 2
Do you think like term lengths there's some just based on past committees. It's like a good moment for folks to evaluate their own commitments and experience on the committee too, and opt out.

32:00
Speaker 1
In a gracious way.

32:02
Speaker 2
Gracious way?

32:04
Speaker 3
It's just part of the process. That it's just part of the process. I think that's a good way to define it so that it's just part of normal process and you don't feel like you're moving somebody out either way.

32:27
Speaker 1
So then, yeah, it's all right. So we're still thinking about it. What do you all think about this idea? Does the stewardship committee, if there are term limits or even people just decide, hey, I've done my time, I'm going to step away and we have to replace people? Does the stewardship committee still continue to select or does the steering committee select or how does that work? Any feedback on that.

33:06
Speaker 6
In past committees? Folks who served on steering committees always had an alternate as someone who could fill in. Maybe something like that could help here. I'm also thinking maybe this is something that we could table and go on a test run with a committee and then evaluate whether we need to address term length and term limits and stuff like that. I don't know. What I do know is that I've served on very large committees in the past that involved La County. I want to give a parable, if you will, a parable as to what we learn from such a structure is that typically what happened was two factions formed. On the one hand, you had factions. This was a committee that was looking to address water quality and water quantity issues in La County. We had one faction who was the fix it first, rather folks who wanted to fix existing infrastructure.

34:18
Speaker 6

We had another faction that was the innovative ideas that the state had not invested in faction. What ended up happening was that the ideas that got funding were the ones that had precedent and that were the most popular, which were the fix it first faction. I want to make sure that this committee takes that into account so that we don't have all of these representatives from nonprofit groups and so forth give their time and energy, only to find out that their ideas are not as popular as some of those others that the majority of the group of these committees may be more familiar with.

35:18
 Speaker 7
 I just wanted to add, I think, to Erica's point. I think part of this, right, is because I lead a steering committee, right. In our collaborative, I think communication is going to be key, like how do we communicate, how decisions are being made and full transparency, right. The good and the bad right. Really focusing on data driven kind of conversations, right? Like, here's what we heard from you. It really is the role of those facilitators that are going to take that.

35:48
 Speaker 1
 Lead.

35:51
 Speaker 7
 I think, around the steering committee and having potential second delegates, right. The only thing that I would highlight, I think sometimes that works. I think we do also have to outline for whoever ends up being a steering committee member, right, if we go down that path, also being very clear on what's expected because I've had that right where we have multiple delegates and sometimes the communication isn't kind of being shared back and forth. You almost feel like you're having to brief everyone again before we can move forward. I think we saw this early on with Surf, right, where different folks would join from different organizations, but they had not been part of the conversation. So it's almost like, how do we.

36:40
 Speaker 1
 Bring you up to speed while still.

36:42
 Speaker 7
 Trying to move the conversation and the work?

36:50
 Speaker 2
 I think that's a great point, Dr. Frank.

36:54
 Speaker 1
 Sorry.

36:55
Speaker 2
I had that experience in some of the collaboratives too, where one of the things that we even instituted was like, you have your primary and a secondary participant and one of the commitments was if you're going to send in an alternate at any point, you need to.

37:12
Speaker 1
Make sure they're briefed.

37:13
Speaker 2
I think because you do lose a lot of steam and then that hurts the broader collaborative.

37:21
Speaker 1
I was going to say the same thing. That's a very good point. Well, let's go ahead because we are running close to the end of time and we can probably come back, make sure we at least touch on the Stewardship Committee. The Stewardship Committee, the recommendation is that it's led by the convener and the fiscal agent and that these members will then determine who the other members of the steering of the Stewardship Committee, who those will be. The recommendation previously by the Governance Committee is that there is some because this is the implementation, not the decision making arm is that there be a lead who can help implement training and capacity building support at the table. A level at the steering committee level for any smaller community. Very grassroots organizations, individuals or workers who might be on the steering committee and need additional capacity building and support.

38:30
Speaker 1
We also recommended an outreach lead to help organize all the hubs, a data lead to help organize the data part of the work. What will we study, how will that be studied and how is that information distributed? A Governance Committee lead to help manage the governance structure, including setting the logistics, setting up the agendas, taking the minutes, ensuring all of the members of the Steering Committee are aware, and that the rest of the governance structure is working well. LAEDC, I know that they're seeing this as well. This is the recommendation. It also appears that LAEDC is looking to fill some of those positions with the staff that they're going to be bringing on. The program director, the program manager, the admins accordingly. They may be filling part of these leads that we have listed here. We also were recommending that the current committee structure, outreach data and governance would dissolve so that we don't have a shadow governance structure outside of the HRTC.

39:53
Speaker 1
We'd move to collapsing the work and the activities under the HRTC governance structure that we're setting up here. That was several concepts. So I'll stop there's.

40:21
Speaker 8
So what would be the timing? I apologize everybody, to joining late, had another meeting before hi. What would be

the timing that these new ones would take over and the other ones would dissolve? The ones that we have been using leading up to the planning.

40:37
 Speaker 1
 One is the recommendation and the timeline is very much in flux because we don't have the contract right, we don't have the staff. This is a very good question that we can pose to the convener in LAEDC. It's really there are things that we could do, including if LAEDC wanted to start the application, maybe not put it out, but just start drafting it. We have to get a sense of how far they're willing and able to go without a contract.

41:18
 Speaker 8
 With regards to setting up the Stewardship Committee, with regards.

41:22
 Speaker 1
 To setting up all of the.

41:24
 Speaker 8
 Tables, all the tables.

41:30
 Speaker 2
 Because that timeline, like to newest head is in flux. I think we're going to book these governance committee meetings out through the end of the year just as placeholders. We'll adjust as we make that transition.

41:45
 Speaker 8
 That makes sense. We know we're getting to the holiday season now, so we know things are going to slow down regardless of what they say.

41:57
 Speaker 5
 Quick question for next week. Would you like to move forward with next week's meeting as well? Or is that one going to we.

42:07
 Speaker 1
 Were having every other week meeting.

42:08
 Speaker 5
 Okay.

42:09
Speaker 1
Not every week.

42:14
Speaker 7
Thanksgiving.

42:18
Speaker 5
I got to ask.

42:20
Speaker 8
Yeah, you won't see us here next Wednesday.

42:23
Speaker 5
I'll be right on here by myself.

42:31
Speaker 1
Has there been any indication from the state in terms of timing on the contracts as well as the request for an extension on that next stage and report that is due?

42:44
Speaker 5
I guess I can chime in here. The answer is no, unfortunately. We're still waiting for additional guidelines. We're still waiting for the contracts as well. We hope we may get some information. There's some listening sessions that are forthcoming. Suli maybe can drop those listening sessions in the chat. I don't know that any intel is going to be provided in those conversations, but we're hopeful that something happens. We get some type of notification prior to Christmas because the reality is we've taken all of the characteristics and skill sets that the HRT has wanted to see in the convener roles. We are in the second stages of those interviews. We'll be finalizing selections over the next two weeks. We're queued up and ready to move forward, to be quite honest. Obviously we're doing all of this work in kind right now. We need to be able to get our staff together and we need folks that are committed 40 hours plus a week to this effort.

43:50
Speaker 5
That's kind of where we are right now, unfortunately.

43:52
Speaker 2
Andrea, thank you. Jermaine, thanks for the context.

43:56
Speaker 5
No problem.

44:00
Speaker 1
Very good question.

44:04
Speaker 3
We're wondering ourselves.

44:11
Speaker 1
All right, let's see. That takes us through all of the recommendations that we had that were in red. It seems that the area where we still have some discussion is if there should be a length of term for those who are on the steering committee and once it's set, how it continues to get populated.

44:47
Speaker 8
Has anyone been against term limits or should I say not so much against have they been in favor of us having term limits or has anyone spoken up in any of the groups and conversations we've had?

45:01
Speaker 1
This is the first time that I think we've gotten this level of detail out, so I don't think it's been presented anywhere else for any feedback.

45:15
Speaker 2
Sorry, go ahead.

45:16
Speaker 8
Let me what's the time frame that our expectations are once we go through the whole planning process and we do get our award of however many hundreds of millions of dollars. What's that time frame that we have to actually implement a program that we have designed? Is it a five year, ten year? Just trying to get a context for how long this length of term would be that we're talking about to begin with?

45:40
Speaker 2
Don't know. Jermaine, do we have any sense of what the implementation that second round of grant timelines might look like?

45:50
Speaker 5
 Once again, it's kind of hard to say without that additional guidance. I think some of the conversation in those listening sessions may be able to point to some of that later this month. As soon as we find out some affirmative answers, we'll certainly share that. What I don't want to do is just put out information as kind of hearsay and then be wrong, and then we have to circle back. We will make sure to get that information as quickly as possible.

46:18
Speaker 2
 Okay.

46:20
Speaker 8
 If it's a short matter of time. I'm one who's actually in support of not having term limits because something as in depth and involved as Surf is with all the different moving parts. It takes a while for someone to get up to speed and completely get their arms around all of it and understanding what their role is and being able to intelligently articulate their suggestions or ideas or opinions. To have continual turnover, I think, would just slow us down from being able to truly implement the programs. If it's like, five years, if that's what we're looking at in terms of implementation, I'm okay with not having a term limit and having someone serve that entire time. However, there might need to be a mechanism to remove somebody who is no longer active or coming or we haven't seen them. You missed three meetings or however many we choose, and we need to move on to somebody else because we need the bodies there.

47:17
Speaker 8
 Term limits, I'm okay with this not having my opinion.

47:24
Speaker 1
 See, Libby, you and me serve a long time on some things, but you.

47:30
Speaker 8
 Know, with that wisdom that you get, so you bring it back. Somebody has an idea and you're like, what? That's a great idea. Let me share with you what we've tried that before in the past and what happened. Not to say we can't do it again, but let's just give you some background in history. Who is that at the last full meeting, Carrie Doy, who brought up the fact, like, I've been here before. We did this in the 80s. Let me tell you, I appreciate that. I don't want to have to repeat going through those pitfalls they went through. I appreciate having Carrie remind us so that we can avoid them to begin with. There's something to be said with that's. My thing about Congress, how people always say that California needs to have term limits on our congressional members. Well, if we do that we will have no positions of leadership because no other state does.

48:15
Speaker 8
 You don't want to hamper us and you want to have that institutional knowledge here. I'm looking at this as institutional knowledge even over the short time span of time that you'll build up by participating in surf.

48:29
Speaker 5
One thing I can share, which is in the SFP, but like I said, I rather share affirmative kind of deadlines. If you look on page 18, there is some timeline and some pieces on there that really talk about the regional strategy. One timeline or implementation that is noted is funds must be encumbered by October of 2026. Like I said, who knows if that's going to change because by now were supposed to already be contracted. The state is actually three months behind already. So these deadlines or timelines can change. I'm giving you that as some guidance. There's other grants, obviously, that are supposed to supplement and or leverage that go along with this surf program. One of those like K through 16 collaborative. That kind of matches up in terms of timeline as well. There's some other ones out there also. Just to kind of give you some context, but we'll get some affirmative dates and we'll report back.

49:33
Speaker 1
I'm also thinking that it's going to go in phases, so the items that are listed here as decision points for the HRTC will be done, but there'll still be maybe a need for a group that convenes and looks at how the projects are doing. Like what happens with this structure I think will change as the phases change.

50:01
Speaker 2
Yeah, I definitely think that the expectation setting for those that are on the steering committee is important for folks, for individuals in the group to evaluate whether or not the individual or the organization that's sitting on that very important seat is meeting our expectations so that we can actually deliver the work that we need to do and giving folks an opportunity to go in or out. My thought is also that when someone chooses to leave for whatever reason from their seat, that we have an application process that we outreach and engagement committee pushes out widely so that there is information to the broader county on how they might participate as opposed to someone, like selecting someone to backfill their seat. My thought on term limits is like, I totally hear you all on what we're looking at is not too long of a time when it comes to the HRTC.

51:05
Speaker 2
And so that continuity is probably important. My only thought, and maybe this is just for future times to put in the back of our heads, is like, what happens if this steering committee exists outside of these particular grant dollars in the future? Right? I think the idea is that we start to leverage this kind of governance structure to help decision making and leverage future dollars and all that stuff. If it does go on in perpetuity, that might change the conversation around term limits.

51:43
Speaker 8
That's a good point. To see it live on as a regional collaborative beyond just the initial funding source.

51:52
Speaker 3
For something like that, then I think that those decision points would be very important. And even the selection criteria.

52:01

Speaker 2
Right.

52:08
 Speaker 1
 I'm thinking about three year terms and two year terms and having both, did we hit the time? We're just about there and really looking at this being from 23 to 27. At that time, you could potentially have full turnover, but you may not. Some people can sign up for I don't know how we divide it up, but there's some that could be three year terms, some that could be two year terms. That way we have people have a chance to enter an exit. And in 2027, it's revisited by some. It's written down somewhere that it gets revisited, and we determine whether this continues on in some larger or longer scale. At that time, should there be term limits or different length of terms? I hear you, Libby, and I think some people may sign up to do all four years, but not everybody is able or willing to do that.

53:35
 Speaker 8
 That's true.

53:39
 Speaker 1
 I feel like we have four years. We're talking about four years here.

53:42
 Speaker 8
 Yeah. I'm a flexible person.

53:47
 Speaker 1
 Yeah.

53:54
 Speaker 8
 What I'm finding amazing, though, right now is how much the attendance has dropped prepatously at these meetings, even yesterday's meeting and today, it was when we first started this, it was like 100 people on each call. I don't know if I should be concerned about that or are they.

54:12
 Speaker 1
 All did you start charging them to come into this?

54:20
 Speaker 5
 I think what will happen is once we get some confirmations about some contracts and some real work that is going to begin, you'll start to see those numbers creep back up again, especially once we do that email blast to all the partners. To be continued.

54:41
 Speaker 1
 To your point, Libby, I was like, texting some people, like, where are you at? Because when this report gets made on Friday right.

54:57
 Speaker 7
 Recover post GeoTV work.

55:03
 Speaker 1
 It's been a busy season.

55:05
 Speaker 7
 Been real.

55:06
 Speaker 1
 It's been a busy season for some. You right. All right, well, we are at time and a little past. Thank you all. I found this to be a very pleasant and useful conversation. I want to thank you all for your input. We will continue to mole on some pleasant.

55:23
 Speaker 8
 I just say how you said pleasant. I like how you said pleasant. I like that. Not contentious in argument. I like that. That's good.

55:32
 Speaker 1
 But these are big concepts.

55:33
 Speaker 8
 This is.

55:36
 Speaker 1
 The committee will report out on Friday and share the results from this call. We'll meet in a couple of weeks. If anything comes up in between that you want to make sure that we consider as co chairs, because we'll go back and look at this feedback and consider what was said here. Feel free to share that with us. If you need to, just reach out to Jermaine. He'll get it to us.

56:03
 Speaker 5
 One thing I'll kind of add, we'll give some light updates as much as we can on Friday. We'll obviously give the governance committee chairs a chance to speak as much as they need to. The only other piece is all the subcommittees did vote unanimously to extend that 45 day or actually restart the clock on that 45 day partnership engagement, given where we are contractually, and then the adjustments that have been made to that new onboarding form. The fact that a lot of the partners that did not sign on to the initial HRTC during the proposal phase, they'll need an opportunity to obviously go and do that onboarding form and provide their information as well. We'll give those updates on Friday to the whole HRTC.

56:56
 Speaker 3
 Jermaine, will you schedule the remaining of the meetings or your office for governance?

57:03
 Speaker 5
 Yes, we can do that. Both the co chair meetings and the subcommittees or just the subcommittees?

57:13
 Speaker 1
 Yeah.

57:14
 Speaker 5
 Okay. Yeah, actually, not me. Susie will take care of it. Yes, we can take care of that. No problem. It looks like the next one will be obviously on it'll be on.

57:27
 Speaker 8
 A Wednesday right after Thanksgiving for the 30th.

57:31
 Speaker 1
 After. Thanks.

57:31
 Speaker 5
 The 30th, is that right? At 04:00. Okay, I got it.

57:38
 Speaker 8
 Thanks, guys.

57:39
 Speaker 2
 All right, sleep on then. Have a great holiday.

57:42
 Speaker 1
 If we don't see you Friday. Okay? Yeah.

57:46
 Speaker 6
 Thank you, everybody.

57:48
 Speaker 5