CERF

L.A. HRTC

CERF LA HRTC Governance Committee
Summary Notes and Transcript
July 6th, 2023

[Meeting Presentation](#)
[Meeting Recording](#)
Passcode: Xb!.7iz%

Meeting Summary Notes

The Government Meeting commenced with a discussion regarding the approaching August 1 deadline for essential deliverables mandated by the state. The primary focus of the meeting was to choose a steering committee, and two options were presented: a voting process and a hybrid selection process. The specifics of both processes, including timelines and eligibility criteria, were explained and included in the presentation.

The meeting proceeded to review the Hybrid Selection Process, which involved appointing Subject Matter Leads (SMLs) to assist in the selection process but without being eligible for membership on the Steering Committee. The SMLs would be selected either by the convener or through a voting process conducted by the HRTC. Subsequently, the SMLs would convene within their respective subgroups to select entities and stakeholders to be included in the steering committee.

The second option under consideration was the Voting/Election process, where interested candidates vying for seats on the steering committee would be elected through a virtual voting process. Each partner would receive one vote, and candidates from different categories would be chosen. The number of votes allotted to each person would depend on the available seats in that category.

Discussions were held regarding whether candidates could run in multiple categories and how self-nomination would work. A suggestion was made to restrict entities and stakeholders from running for a subgroup different from their initially chosen one, as indicated in the onboarding form for the program. These details would need to be finalized before being submitted to the

engineers for ballot layout. Another suggestion proposed leaving the decision to the HRTC members based on candidate statements and qualifications. The need for a sample ballot and clarification on eligibility categories was also raised.

There were discussions about the candidate questionnaire, with a focus on ensuring alignment with representation goals. The participants expressed a desire for active participation from steering committee members and consideration of individual capacity.

During the discussions, some participants expressed frustration with the timeline of the hybrid model selection, while others highlighted the openness and inclusivity of the voting process. Recommendations were put forward to outline the selection process, guarantee seats for labor representatives, and emphasize flexibility in adjusting decisions as necessary.

A poll was conducted to seek a consensus on the committee's preferred selection process, considering that the HRTC had only three weeks left to implement the process and meet the mandated deadline, which included establishing the Governance Structure and seating the Steering Committee. The survey question asked, "Which method to seat the Steering Committee are you in favor of?" The results were as follows:

- Voting process – 73.33% (22)

- Hybrid selection process – 26.67% (8)

A majority consensus was reached to proceed with the voting process method, and it was recommended to the HRTC as the next course of action.

<mark>Outline:</mark>

Chapter 1: Introduction and Agenda Overview
   1. Timestamp: 06:29
   2. Content: The participants discuss the agenda for the meeting a

Chapter 2: State Mandated Deliverables and Deadlines

   3. Timestamp: 07:51
   4. Content: The participants discuss the deliverables and deadlines required by the state.

Chapter 3: Recap of Feedback on Selection Process
   5. Timestamp: 13:04

6. Content: The participants review the feedback received from previous meetings regarding the selection process for the Steering Committee.

Chapter 4: Seating of the Steering Committee Selection Options
7. Timestamp: 14:11
8. Content: The participants discuss two approaches for seating the Steering Committee and the corresponding timelines.

Chapter 5: Timeline for Voting Process
9. Timestamp: 17:41
10. Content: The participants go over the timeline for the voting process, including uploading candidate statements, formatting the election ballot, and finalizing the deliverable for submission to the state.

Chapter 6: Subject Matter Expert Lead Application and Selection
11. Timestamp: 23:49
12. Content: The participants discuss the hybrid selection process for opening the subject matter expert lead application, selecting the subject matter leads, and then selecting the Steering Committee members and alternates.

Chapter 7: General Discussion and Final Remarks
13. Timestamp: 25:02
14. Content: The participants engage in a general discussion and share final remarks before the meeting concludes.

Chapter 8: Conclusion and Meeting End
15. Timestamp: 1:12:52
16. Content: The meeting comes to a close as scheduled.

Transcript:

00:51
 Speaker 1
 All right, we're going to start admitting hi. Good afternoon, everyone. Hope everyone had a great July 4. So we're just going to allow people to kind of come into the meeting for a bit and we'll get started shortly. Like, our governance co chairs are here, but Kelly and Tamil, we're just going to give a minute. There's a lot of people joining the meeting right now.

03:04
 Speaker 2
 No problem.

03:05
Speaker 1
Absolutely awesome. All right. I don't see anyone joining currently, so governance co chairs. And Charles, if you'd like to kick it off, feel free to go ahead. Unless you'd like to give another minute. It's up to you.

04:22
Speaker 3
At least five after. We're five after.

06:29
Speaker 1
Okay.

06:35
Speaker 3
All right, charles, did you want to start or would you like us to start?

06:40
Speaker 1
Oh, no, I don't want to. Hijack, you guys'meeting. By all means, go for it.

06:46
Speaker 3
Well, good afternoon, everyone. Thank you for joining us today for the governance committee meeting. Tanua Thrash, Intuk for those of you I haven't had a chance to meet, I'm one of the co chairs, and I'm joined by and I'll give Kelly an opportunity to say hello, as well as the co chair. Hi, everyone.

07:04
Speaker 2
Kelly LoBianco, director of the La County Department of Economic Opportunity and Governance co chair with tenUA. So glad to be here with you all today.

07:13
Speaker 3
All right, so we want to also start out by thanking our partners at LAEDC and the staff for working with us to put forth today's agenda and meeting. We've got quite a bit to get through, but we're excited to be able to share with you today some options around how we move towards our

August 1 deadline. So with that, let's walk through the agenda. So welcome to all of you on the call. Of course, any and everyone who has participated in the HRTC can be a member of the governance committee. So this conversation is specifically about governance. Today we will talk about the state mandated deliverables and deadlines. We have achieved much more than we realize, which will be great to share. We'll want to do a recap on some of the feedback that we've received from you all regarding the selection process, and then we will talk about some seating of the steering committee selection options.

08:14
Speaker 3
We'll have two options that we'll present to the group today. We'll then use hopefully the bulk of the time to walk through some of the pros and cons of those particular options. And our goal here is to really be able to provide a consensus readout as the last thing that we do for today, and that is really to move us in the direction of what kind of process we will utilize in order to seat our steering committee. So that'll be sort of our big North Star for today. Kelly, did you want to add anything to that?

08:52
Speaker 2
I think you captured it well, but yeah, I just want to echo my thanks to the LEVC team and all of you who joined us today. And hopefully we have a productive conversation. So thank you. Excellent.

09:04
Speaker 3
So then that moves us to the first item, and I believe, oh, before we go, let's make sure that the agenda is good. So, Luis, I see you have a question, and it probably could be about the agenda, or can I just ask.

09:19
Speaker 4
A question on process? At the last HRTC meeting, the group decided to set a deadline to have the structure for the Steering Committee finalized by the 14th. Does this confirm with that time frame?

09:35
Speaker 3
So when we go over the timelines, you'll be able to see what the timelines are for each of the processes. I don't think that either process necessarily gets us to the 14th, but what it does do is get us to the August 1 deadline.

09:55
Speaker 2
Yeah, I think July 14 was the previous due date, and now we have the extension. So I think we're going to try.

10:00
Speaker 3
To use that to extra time yeah.

10:03
Speaker 2
To have the most productive process.

10:07
Speaker 3
But hopefully, Luis, as we walk through the options, you'll be able to see and we can again, we'll go over the pros and cons. Time might be an issue for you, and certainly we want to hear about that. So now we'll just go to our next item on the agenda, which is our deliverables. What have we achieved so far and what are we looking to achieve? Scarlett, I'll have you go over that on behalf of the team.

10:39
Speaker 5
Yes. Hi, everyone. So we would really like to emphasize that our next deliverable will be August 1, 2023. That is a very hard stop deadline for the upcoming deliverables that I will be discussing. And just to give you a little bit of context, the Surf Interagency State team has already granted us two extensions to fulfill the following deliverables. And it's really important that this August 1 deadline is met, or else we could be potentially jeopardizing program funding due to non compliance. And so our governance and outreach and engagement coachers have worked tirelessly throughout the past, I believe, over a year now, to get us where we're at. And a lot of this work really entailed the governance structure, which is the Surf La HRTC's governance model that really encompasses all the tables, the hubs and committees that will be involved in the program. This is something that we have overviewed multiple times throughout this past year and is in its completed form.

11:51
Speaker 5
We have introduced it to the HRTC as a whole in multiple meetings, but it will be again presented at the next July 14 meeting. Then we also have our Steering Committee, which includes the proposed structure, which is the suggested allocation of 33 seats that the

Governance Committee has worked on throughout the past year in reaching this structure, has been worked through and has been recommended in its completed form. Now, what we are missing, which is one of the biggest parts of our deliverable for the August 1 deadline is the entities that will be assigned to the seats of the Steering Committee. It's going to be very essential for us to proceed with selecting a seating process that will allow us to implement and have finalized by August 1. So what this means is that this process will have to be delivered within the next three weeks for us to have the entities, the names of organizations or stakeholders that will be seated within the actual Steering Committee structure.

12:57
Speaker 5
And if we can go to the next slide, and I believe I will pass this on to our co chair.

13:04
Speaker 3
All right, so just as a reminder, this is some of the feedback that we had gotten in a previous meeting regarding what should we make sure we take into account as we work on putting together some options for a selection process for the Steering Committee. This is not exhaustive, but just a number of sort of themes that we picked up on. So I'll leave them here for a second. A lot of them relate to transparency, making sure that there is equity, that there is a process that's based on qualifications, avoiding unconscious bias, and the election process may be divisive. So it's really important that we want to maintain a sense of unity. I like that one, appreciate that one being there. All right, so those are some of the things that we have heard from you all. So now let's move into the meat of the meeting where we'll talk about the two approaches that have been formulated.

14:11
Speaker 3
We heard from the overall HRTC that there was interest in seeing what ways we could seat and what timelines could be used to get that done. So we'll walk through two ways of seating and timelines accordingly. So we'll start with the voting process and I'll turn it back over to Scarlett.

14:33
Speaker 5
Yes. So the voting process will until an election. And so who will be allowed to vote? It's really important that our partners understand that all partners that have executed a partnership agreement letter will be allowed to vote. Everyone will receive one vote to ensure that it's an inclusive process and also who will be a candidate in the election process. And the same concept will be applied to that of a selection process if that's the route that the HRTC decides to go through. But again, all fully onboarded partners who have actually executed a partnership agreement letter will be allowed to be a candidate in this election process for the Steering

Committee. And I think it's also important to emphasize that members may serve on the Steering Committee and also apply for a grant opportunity in the Outreach hub structure of the HRTC program. If we can go ahead and go to the next slide, please.

15:37
 Speaker 5
 And so what will this process entail? Interested candidates will be able to submit a self nomination application. They will answer specific questions about their qualifications and area of representation within the Steering Committee. We do have an election vendor who will be ready to upload all this information into a splash web page that will display all candidates and their submitted information based on the different Steering Committee groups that they are applying to. So this information will be viewable to all our partners to ensure that they can read behind every candidate's intention and qualifications for the different Steering Committee groups that they would be applying to during the election process. All registered voters, which will be the primary point of contact of each stakeholder organization, will receive a unique token via email and this token will allow them to provide will allow them to vote safely within our process and this will also ensure that there is no double voting.

16:44
 Speaker 5
 Once all ballots are casted, the token will automatically close and once the voting window closes, the voting results can be presented to the HRTC. If I can go to the next process. We do have a mockup of candidate self nomination application, but we will be asking our HRTC partners to please take a look at it and provide us any feedback in regards to any questions that they think is appropriate that should be asked. We were intentional in ensuring that questions that were asked really pertain to the qualifications and intentions behind candidates applying, as well as ensuring that they're appropriate information in regards to the types of groups that represent, is also a question to ensure that we have equity in the folks that are running within the different groups of the Steering Committee. If we can go to question. Thank you. The next slide. So this is the voting process timeline.

17:44
 Speaker 5
 We would like to introduce the process if chosen at the next HRTC meeting. Between now and then we would work on working with the vendor to set up the splash page with all the information and nomination applications that will be needed for members to fill out. July 17 through the 20th, we will have the self nomination application open for candidates to begin applying. The deadline will be July 20. On July 21, the engineer will work on uploading all the content, all the candidate statements, formatting the election ballot, a digital election ballot for the surf team to review and finalize. We will then have the voting process begin on July 24 at 09:00 A.m. And close the voting window on July 27 at 05:00 p.m.. On July 28, the Steering

Committee results will be presented to the HRTC meeting and then July 28 and July 31, which is a Monday.

18:54
 Speaker 5
 Our team will compile the data and finalize the deliverable that then needs to be submitted to the State by August 1, which I believe is a Tuesday, and that entails the voting process. And I will go ahead and pass it to our coachers to introduce the hybrid selection process.

19:14
 Speaker 3
 Thank you, Scarlett. So the second option that we are presenting today is what's called the hybrid selection process. Through this process, we will have a two step and simultaneous set of activities happening, meaning those who are considered to be what we call subject matter leads. So of the six areas that we have to seat on the Steering Committee, there are specific expertise experiences that those individuals and organizations we hope that they'll have. So for each of those six areas, we would look to select two to five subject matter leads that are not seeking direct membership on the Steering Committee themselves. So all fully onboarded partners who have an executed Surf collective partnership agreement letter would be eligible to serve as subject matter leads. This is also to help with some of the consistency of people who've been involved with the activity so far, understand what we're trying to achieve.

20:18
 Speaker 3
 The subject matter leads can either be selected by LAEDC as our convener via an application that they would complete or by vote of the fully onboarded partners, similar to the vote that was just described. This gives us an opportunity for those seats, for example, that are focused on residents and those with lived experiences. We would look to identify organizations that have direct service and leadership investment programs. In those, community members would be encouraged to participate as subject matter leads to help identify the individuals who would sit in those seats. Similarly, again, as we have educational partners, labor partners, business partners, we would look for subject matter leads in those areas who are very familiar with the leaders in their communities and understand how to get a cross section of perspectives and leaders in those areas who could serve on the Steering Committee. Again, subject matter leads themselves would not be eligible, them or their organizations to serve on the Steering Committee.

21:29
 Speaker 3
 There would be six caucuses of the subject matter leads. This is based on the categories that we have for the Steering Committee. And again, no member organization of the subject matter lead can be selected for the Steering Committee. So when it comes to once the subject matter leads

are selected, those caucuses are formed. Again, anywhere from two to five individuals, five really being connected to the areas that have the largest number of seats, which is community focused. Having those folks there all fully on boarded partners and any interested parties in La county could be eligible to apply for membership on the Steering Committee. It's quite possible that there are groups organizations who haven't necessarily been involved in the process so far who still might be good Steering Committee members. And we want to give the Selection Committee the opportunity caucus to be able to identify any gaps in some of any outreach or focus that we've had so far.

22:45
 Speaker 3
 The subject matter leads will caucus within their respective subject areas select representatives and one alternative for each seat. This is to ensure that we have enough individuals who are saying yes, even though they're applying directly to the program. So for example, a labor subject matter lead and caucus will select the labor representative and alternate. The hope is that the subject matter leads will caucus as an entire body so that they could come together and review the overall background experience, look at equity attributes, the capacity to serve, and assess the consensus building capacity of the entire selected body. So there is a moment in the timeline where the entire caucus group comes together, all six, and the overall presentation is made in terms of what the seating of the steering committee would look like, taking into account all of those areas. Next slide. So in order to get there, we would begin opening the subject matter expert lead application as quickly as tomorrow.

23:59
 Speaker 3
 That would be open again to all fully onboarded members of the HRTC to serve in that role. The subject matter leads will be selected by July 14 simultaneously. At the same time, those who are interested in serving on the steering committee would also be applying for the steering committee. So that's happening at the same time. They would be selected by July 19. The goal on July 26 is to have the subject matter leads select the steering committee members and alternates. There would be a July 27 all subject matter leads meeting to go over the entire delegation. And then by July 28, the next HRTC meeting, the Steering committee would be presented as seated. So those are the two concepts. What we'll do now is open it up for discussion. We can open it up for general discussion maybe to begin with. And then we've also laid out a couple of jam boards that will help us get some pros and cons and perspectives on each of the scenarios.

25:16
 Speaker 3
 I see a hand up already, so I'll call on Luis.

25:22

Speaker 4
Who selects the subject matter leads? Saw they apply, but it identified who selects them.

25:28
 Speaker 3
 So in the document here it notes that they're either selected by the convener or they're selected by the entire onboarded body of the HRTC.

25:42
 Speaker 4
 But when does that occur though? Like what's the process for that?

25:46
 Speaker 3
 So that occurs on, I believe it's July 14. We can see the date. So if it's la e DC as the convener then they would review the applications accordingly. And in some cases, I don't know that we'll get twelve applications for two seats, but it's possible. Otherwise we would potentially utilize the voting process where each of the subject matter leads that look to apply, we could vote on them by July 14.

26:27
 Speaker 4
 I'll just final words I would chime in. I would prefer the voting one as opposed to subject matter leads. I think that provides a more kind of democratic process that I think more people would feel comfortable with. The one part I'm not sure on the voting one that wasn't specified is do you get like one vote per category or how does all the positions?

26:50
 Speaker 3
 Yeah, that's a good question. I don't know if the team has thought through that before. Most every category there's at least two seats. So how many votes does each member get for those areas?

27:10
 Speaker 1
 If you're looking at voting, the voting process, if you guys like, I can show you a demo of the of what's been built so far. It's about 98% and only say 98 because he doesn't have all the information. As if it's going to be voted on, how the 33 seats are going to be broken down. Give me 1 second here. Okay. Give me 1 second. Someone has to stop sharing their screen. You have sharing permission by now, Charles. Okay, thank you. Second. Sorry about that. Little cat in the

corner there is my daughter putting something on my computer. Can you guys see the screen? A little demo? Yes. Okay, perfect. Thank you. So the voting option could look something like this, where there's a countdown of how long the voting will actually take place. On the home page will be some information talking about the actual voting with the steering committee in this case.

28:36
Speaker 1
And here, if we click on let's just say this is voting 20 seats for the CBOs here. It will show us exactly how many votes we have, how many votes we actually have left before we need to choose. So if there are 40 candidates there, we need to choose 20. It'll essentially count down. So let's say we choose this woman here and you notice that it went from green to red. We choose this lady here, green, red tells you exactly how many votes you have left over. Let's say you made a mistake. Even that's not who I really wanted. Should be able to click on it. It goes right off, go back. This is actually who I wanted. You go back and after you choose your make your three selections, you submit and as you can see here, that section is closed off. So the next section, let's say, is for resident workers.

29:52
Speaker 1
And you get in this five selections and you just go through the exact same process. Choose your top few. Once you're done, you close out. Just a quick note also that it's the well, it's been set to go for. You can choose the language that works best for you and move forward. But once everything is done, again, an email is going to be sent out to each of the voters and that'll be essentially your unique ID. It can't be forwarded to someone else. Once you vote, it's closed out. Once the election results are completely done, it'll be calculated and ready to be delivered right away. And again, as Scarlett mentioned, for anyone who wants to run the submission process is submitting the information to us to LADC will put that information onto a spreadsheet and make sure that we give it to the engineers so they can upload into the system.

31:23
Speaker 1
The pros to this is that everyone gets a vote, and everyone meaning the individual stakeholders or the organization. So if it's an organization, obviously it's one individual who's representing the organization. I'm seeing two hands. Kelly.

31:44
Speaker 3
Kelly, sorry.

31:47
Speaker 2

Just to make sure I'm clear. So if you're a signed on member to the HRTC, you get one token, one ability to vote against the full seats. How many votes do you get as a single person going in? Do you get to vote for how does that process? How many votes do you actually get? Do you get to vote for 33 people?

32:16
 Speaker 1
 Okay, I understand your question. So if there are 33 seats, you get to vote. There are 33 seats. Let's say there's 100 people running, so you're choosing 33 of those hundred seats. That's essentially it. Once you choose your 33, you're closed out yourself as an individual or your organization, you're closed out. That's it. I hope that answers your question.

32:51
 Speaker 5
 Yeah, if I can elaborate. Each subgroup will be its own ballot, basically, and so you will be allowed to vote within each subgroup or each ballot with a total number of 33 elected seats. So every subgroup will be within its own ballot. Even though there might be for example, in the subgroup of 20, there might be 100 candidates running. You will only be able to select 20 among the 100. That's one ballot. Then you move on to the next, which is residents, workers, and those are only five options that you can choose depending on how many run. If 30 run, the system will only allow you to choose five. So you will have a total of 33 basically elected seats that you will be able to vote in.

33:45
 Speaker 1
 That's correct. So to put it in perspective, this may be blocking, this may be 20 seats. You're voting on 20 seats for the CBOs. There may be 50 people running, but there's only 20 seats that you have to vote on. Once you close that out, there may be five seats here for resident workers. So if there are 15 people running, you're choosing five out of that. Two for business and industry, two for labor, two for municipal partners, two for education, so forth, and so on. So it depends on how many. It doesn't matter how many people are running. You're only choosing the amount. That is, the maximum amount. Regardless, it ends up to being 33 candidates that you're choosing. You.

34:40
 Speaker 3
 Know, Louise.

34:43
 Speaker 4
 Is a candidate allowed to run into multiple categories? So you said there's six categories that

people are going to be able to vote between. Can someone appear in more than one category, or did they have to pick, this is the one I'm running within?

35:01
Speaker 1
I hope that question isn't for me.

35:03
Speaker 3
It should be.

35:05
Speaker 5
I believe that's HRTC.

35:08
Speaker 1
I believe that's a detail that we haven't really came to consensus on, so it could be a point of discussion. There are a few issues that need to be ironed out, and that's one of them, Luis. The other is, are we voting that way of 20 seats for CBOs, five seats for resident workers? We know that labor is lobbying for not so much additional seats, but more than the two seats that's dedicated for them. So all of that needs to be worked out. Is it going to be voting by spa? I mean, those are issues that all need to be worked out in order for us to before we submit to the engineer so he'll know exactly how to lay out the ballot for you guys.

35:54
Speaker 3
I'm not sure where that comes from even mentioning voting by spa right now, but part of what needs to be worked out there is trying to figure understanding what are the options with voting, given that everyone can self nominate. I think what we're saying with self nomination is that you could self nominate for any category, and it'll be up to the body, if we vote, to determine whether that self nomination was a strong one in whatever category that person chose.

36:38
Speaker 4
Okay, a couple of other questions. What if I nominate myself into a category? I guess, which one? How do I know what I'm classified as? Like, could I say I'm a community based organization, therefore I'm nominating myself as a community based organization candidate. Even though somebody may say no, you're not a community based organization, you're a business organization. Therefore you should be under this as people self nominate. How do they

know whether the areas in which they nominate themselves for are eligible for those? I wouldn't want somebody to get rejected from one category, not be able to nominate themselves into another one.

37:15
 Speaker 3
 So right now, self nomination under the voting, from what I can see, you are self determining where you would go, and you wouldn't probably necessarily be rejected because we don't have any mechanism. We haven't talked about rejecting anyone from a voting category. If we did, the subject matter lead again, you could absolutely apply to any category you want, and the subject matter leads would really look at the validity of your application and your experience in the particular area that you say you have the experience in under voting, we'll decide as a group whether that person has that experience. Unless the LADC EDC team has thought otherwise, there appears not to be a way to disqualify anyone. Everyone who self nominates can self nominate for any category.

38:15
 Speaker 4
 But I think the intention was that certain ones, certain seats are carved out for a specific type of person or specific type of organization. So someone can't just say, hey, I'm a labor. I'm running under labor, even though I don't have no labor.

38:28
 Speaker 3
 But if we vote, then that would be up to the body. The way it's been presented today, the body would determine whether there's validity in that person saying, I'm a member of the labor community.

38:46
 Speaker 5
 If that's an option, I think there's two ways of going about it. One, we do have entities and individuals that are signed on as official members do self, or they choose their own entity within the form that they submitted in their partnership letter. So it could be tied to the form that was submitted initially when they became a member of the HRTC. Or it could be left up to basically the HRTC members to make that decision once they read the candidate statements, read the backgrounds and qualifications, and then decide, hey, this person does fall within this subgroup and therefore they will get my vote. So I think there's those two options that can be played with and discussed if a voting mechanism is to be chosen.

39:35
 Speaker 4

Can I recommend before the next meeting, sorry, my last thing, can we get a sample ballot? You can do like don't have to put an actual people put candidate one, candidate two, because it should be prep by now. Here's what it's going to look like. And do a walk through of like, here's what you're going to get. Here's how you vote for here's just a sample, because while this is helpful, it isn't quite give it. The second thing I'd recommend if we could also get is, again, have everybody who was fully on boarded, just tell them here's what categories you are eligible to run for based on the information you have provided. So if somebody disagrees, they can say no. I think I should also be under.

40:11
Speaker 1
This to you, Luis. I think what everyone's trying to tell you and this is it, with the exception of an image or video, there won't be anything here because you guys voted to not have any images or videos. So this will just be a placeholder generic nothing. It just could be a black box. But down here is where you're going to make your play. So if you've already signed up to the HRTC saying that, hey, the constituents that I serve is youth down here will be your campaign, so to speak. It will be your 250 words, whatever we agree upon saying that I serve youth, I'd be great for this steering committee because of XYZ. Blah, blah, blah, blah, it's your job to convince the HRTC body to vote for you. So if you're not good for if you already told everyone that you serve youth, it probably would not be smart for you to campaign under labor.

41:09
Speaker 1
So I think that's what everyone is trying to say is that this is a campaign where you are convincing people of your worth of being on that steering committee.

41:20
Speaker 4
Can we update the left hand side.

41:21
Speaker 1
With the correct categories then?

41:25
Speaker 5
Yes, but I would like you have.

41:26
Speaker 1

To vote on it first because again, you have to keep in mind all of this work that you're seeing has been done for free. This has not been. Approved. It has not been paid for. This is really someone, a company who would like to have the business, but is under the assumption that if you guys vote against it, they're going to lose, that they won't get the business. So I can't in good faith ask him to do anything more than what he's already done.

41:57
Speaker 3
So we want to give other people luis, you have been wonderfully active, and we're counting on your voice in this process. But there are a couple of other hands, so feel free to leave yours up if you have more you want to share. But I want to give Sharon and Kelly a chance to also join the conversation.

42:19
Speaker 2
Sharon, go ahead.

42:20
Speaker 6
Thank you. Okay, so I want to just cover two points. One, this conversation, we did have a dialogue, and thank you for referring to it.

42:31
Speaker 2
Charles.

42:32
Speaker 6
At the HRTC level, where there was a vote, decided that we would create whichever method a candidate questionnaire that would not contain any variance. There was a majority vote poll taken, documented vote on what that would look like. And so I assume, charles, is that what you put into the chat as a sample of what that would look like, that questionnaire?

42:56
Speaker 1
Oh, I haven't put anything in the chat.

42:57
Speaker 5
I'm sorry.

42:58
Speaker 6
I thought I saw something.

42:59
Speaker 2
Was it you, Scarlett?

43:01
Speaker 6
Yes. So I think that's where our feedback is. We've already agreed the entire HRCC. We will have a questionnaire for any candidate and what that will contain. And so I think that feedback is important and can get to what category are you in, what experience have you had? We can drill down and what those questions look like to really get an understanding, no different than we would if were attempting to elect neighborhood council members or representatives of unions or our local politicians. What have they done for their communities in the categories and why? So I think that's important. The other thing that I wanted to just get conscious of is there did surface I heard Tuna say you didn't know where the idea around spas came from that came out of the written document.

43:45
Speaker 3
Not quite.

43:48
Speaker 6
It was a meaning spa based conversation that there was some discussion around ensuring that we had some spa equity that came out of that surfaced out of governance. And I think that's the one that got caught up in the spam and.

44:02
Speaker 3
You guys didn't get I think I.

44:06
Speaker 6
Just lost both the one held by region engagement and the one handed by governance.

44:17

Speaker 2
Sharon, you glitched for just a second.

44:19
Speaker 6
Are we losing me again? Do you want sharon, I apologize.

44:24
Speaker 2
Maybe go off camera for a second and just say that last bit again. I don't know if other folks I just okay.

44:31
Speaker 3
Is that better? Yeah, that's better at all? Yeah, it's better.

44:36
Speaker 2
Sharon, go ahead.

44:37
Speaker 6
So there were two jam boards conducted, one in our outreach engagement meeting over the last two weeks where there was feedback given from the members on the Limited and then in the last jam board at Governance, there was same feedback brought forth. So it's resurfaced a couple of times. I've seen three different points of information. So it's just not new. It's just how do we haven't had a chance to dialogue about it.

45:06
Speaker 3
Yeah, it's more nuanced than that. The way you described it is not quite what I was trying to convey, but we will continue on. Kelly, I know you had your hand up and Zahira, thank you.

45:22
Speaker 2
Yeah, I think the one thing I wanted to sort of lift up maybe for conversation of the group or consideration is there is this conversation around sort of like, how do you assure that the folks that are nominated or self nominating. Align with the representation that the HRTC wants on the steering committee, whether it's a labor representative or education or community member? And so I do think that is something that the hybrid model considers. So I think that was in the chat

too, and I just wanted to lift that up. That process doesn't quite exist in the voting model yet, but maybe could be adjusted to accommodate that. The other thing just for consideration of the group too is organization or individual. Right. So I don't know how deeply this has been talked about, but the steering committee membership is types, but also includes folks like residents and workers and individual leaders.

46:29
Speaker 2
And so I think that is a little bit of an open question around self nominations or how we're vetting that piece when everyone has signed on as a partner, likely as part of an organization to the HRTC, as opposed to as like sort of an individual.

46:52
Speaker 3
Thank you for that, Zahira. Thank you.

46:59
Speaker 7
Yes, my question is.

47:04
Speaker 3
I just want.

47:05
Speaker 7
To back up and understand some of this for some of the positions that based on this process would be seated. So if we're talking about not the steering committee but some of these other roles, those are funded positions, is that right?

47:20
Speaker 3
Yes.

47:21
Speaker 7
Okay, so this kind of relates to something that Charles has been mentioning in terms of this selection process and working with a private company to create it. And this is a very in the weeds question and I'm sorry for that.

47:39
Speaker 3
But in terms of this funding, does.

47:43
Speaker 7
It allow for sole source contracting or does it have to be a process where multiple entities are provided the opportunity for the funding, which sounds like it will be as part of the selection process where funding is going out. But for some of these other pieces, does it have to be multiple organizations or can it be a sole source funding where the state money is transferring, if that's what the intention is, to use state money for it?

48:18
Speaker 1
I'm sorry, I'm a little lost in your question. Are you referring to the voting mechanism or being used as for Affinity Hubs and Tables, or just the voting mechanism in general?

48:32
Speaker 7
No, I understand. Like the affinity, hubs and tables. And it sounds like we would be looking at some sort of process where it's multiple entities that are being looked at to then be reviewed and placed into those tables when there's funding being exchanged. My question is like in the Weeds question, that may relate to some other pieces down in the future, but does the funding allow for one organization or one entity to be identified as being the entity that receives funding? That's coming up in one instance in terms of the use of the funding, but it could also influence some other pieces down the road in the future. For example, say that one of the entities who is seated to receive funding, who becomes like a Hub, Leab or something else, and they can no longer do it, then can the HRTC just designate another entity that does it?

49:25
Speaker 7
Or do we have to open up a new process? This kind of piqued my interest, like thought process when you were talking about the selection process, because it sounds like there's a specific company that you've been working with, and that if we go with the voting process, then it's likely to be that specific company who's chosen. And so it's not an open process, it's a sole source type of effort in terms of being able to identify a specific vendor. So my question is, are there any limitations in the funding of being able to say we can select this particular entity, this particular person, or for all of the use of funding? Does it have to be an open process where multiple bids are received and we go through an RFP process? I ask this because this comes up a lot in terms of public money.

50:11
Speaker 7
And so does that have any relevancy here and does that impact any of the decisions that we make as we move forward?

50:18
Speaker 1
In terms for the voting mechanism, the RFP is not needed because the cost would be under what an RFP would be needed for. So I think it's I don't know off the top of my head, it's five or ten grand. If it's over that, then it requires an RFP process. But this is a tool that the HRTC can use however they best feel. So the way it's been somewhat designed now, unfortunately, we don't have any enough time to make any Tweaks, but in the future, if you wanted to use it for something where it could be Tweaked, we have the time to actually do it, then you certainly have that option. But this was never intended to be used. This was only intended to be used for the steering committee, not for the Affinity Hubs and Tables, unless the HRTC found agreed upon a way of using it that works.

51:34
Speaker 3
You've answered my question. Thank you.

51:37
Speaker 1
Okay.

51:43
Speaker 3
All right, so now we have just about nine minutes left in today's conversation and we also have a ticking time in terms of getting towards to August 1. This would be the moment at which we would want to just check in on the pulse of the room and folks that are here. There are some notes that I see going up, but if you could share because part of what we want to be able to do is get some sense as to which direction we would prefer to go as a governance committee, as an overall HRTC functioning as a large group right now. Are there any strong? Again, keeping in mind that there are some nuances and we'll try and work on what those are. Tony Simon I had a question, so.

52:46
Speaker 8
If you want to go with what you're doing and then I'll ask the question afterwards, that's fine.

52:51
Speaker 3
Your question may be helpful, please.

52:55
Speaker 2
I hope so.

52:55
Speaker 8
I wonder if we have a policy or something about a lead person sitting on the steering committee that doesn't do their job.

53:07
Speaker 3
So those kinds of things, once the steering committee is set, the hope was that the steering committee would create its own principles of how and what the expectations were for themselves. So attending meetings, actively participating, those things they could come up with.

53:32
Speaker 8
I know it seems like waiting is, and I understand people defining their own rules, but so, for instance, if my concern is people may find that they're overwhelmed, too busy, can't put the time to it, that might make me more inclined to go with the hybrid model, because we'll be having people look at each individual making specific determinations. If there is a way that there's a process that says if people aren't participating on the steering committee, you're not reading their materials before the steering committee, then they might be removed, then I would say, oh, I'm okay with voting because I see that there's a process. To me, those are two of the biggest things that's the differentiation between we vote and who's ever there, they just decide how it goes and then the other one there's kind of a review. So I see that as kind of essential in understanding, in determining how I might be comfortable.

54:38
Speaker 8
What are the protections around voting? It seems you've built in protections in the hybrid.

54:48
Speaker 3
Again, I don't think we're going to be in a position to have the principle set out already for if

someone is not performing as we would hope or actively engaged as a steering committee member, that's likely to happen after. And those are the differences between the two ways that we could seat the steering committee. From a voting standpoint, we are doing our best as individuals to make some determination about who is the right representative and who has the right capacity to serve. And then under the hybrid model, there are some folks maybe who are closer to that subject matter, maybe even have some connection with that individual or a set of individuals that are similar and they are helping to seat. In either case, though, however they get set, we will have to come up with some ways of determining how long they serve and under what circumstances they serve.

56:10
Speaker 3
But thanks for asking that. Let's make sure we add that to the list. Luis?

56:17
Speaker 4
Yeah. I'm a little frustrated that, again, we're two weeks almost this short time out, and we still haven't figured out this part. I would strongly oppose the whole hybrid model selection because a couple of things. One, its timeline is based on the fact that we open up nominations tomorrow despite the fact that HRTC hasn't voted on this. There's a lot of people who don't participate in this committee who are going to be surprised that, oh, hey, by the way, there was this new thing that you guys didn't get a chance to vote on that we're now moving forward with. I think there's a lot of challenges with trying to get it done in the voting. In the time frame, even if you take the nominations to the HRTC on the 14th, you're still giving people very little time to consider all those nominations. I think the most open process is going to be the voting one.

57:06
Speaker 4
I think it has less chance of us, of people feeling like they were excluded from the process, not to mention the fact that nobody knows on the subject matter leads. We don't have an outline who is going to be selecting it. Is it LAEDC? Is it the full HRTC, in which case are they required to submit any kind of nomination? Things like that. So my recommendation would be let's move forward with the voting process. Let's get it outlined as best as possible and also put in. I think my recommendation would be, I know that the labor request came at the very last minute, but labor has kind of said, hey, if we don't have five seats guaranteed to us, we're going to walk away from this HRTC and tell the governor administration that labor isn't involved, labor has been excluded. So my recommendation would be to also give them five specified seats.

57:57
Speaker 1
Thank you.

57:59
Speaker 3
Thank you for your feedback there, kelly, I see your hand is up. Thank you.

58:05
Speaker 2
Yeah. A couple of quick things I do just want to point out, because I have been part of the governance evolution since the beginning, part of the infrastructure we're created is so that decision making can happen at tables and recommendations can go forward. So I want to sort of caution us from thinking that our governance structure, because it hasn't actually been set that way, that everything has to go back to the full HRTC for a vote to move forward. So I just want to list that up. I do also think there's an opportunity here. Luis, to your point, if there's things that would make one of the other options stronger for you? I think that's on the table here too.

58:53
Speaker 3
Right.

58:53
Speaker 2
So I think for folks, if there's an interest in the hybrid option, but it doesn't make sense for LADC versus HRTC to select the subject matter experts like that's on the table. So I want to lift that up here that these are not sort of like the binary right now. We want to make tweaks to them to make them to be able to get to consensus.

59:14
Speaker 3
Yeah. And Luis, as a reminder, you were one of the most vocal people in our last meeting of the HRTC requesting that we move forward specifically with a set of ideas and timelines. And so that's what's presented today as part of that request that not only you had, but I think the overall HRTC. So it shouldn't come as any surprise that we are marching towards August 1, that everybody's aware of that.

59:43
Speaker 1
I'm sorry. Real fast. Tanua, I think you may want to because you spent a lot of time on designing this but really stressed the importance of your timeline.

59:57

Speaker 3
I'm not sure that's necessary. There is definitely room in the timeline to accommodate not starting tomorrow. Those are things that could absolutely be put on the jamboard. Mark, I see your hand up.

01:00:16
Speaker 1
Yeah. Quick question. Once we make a choice, and as we're going through the process in the upcoming months, are we stuck with what we decide to move forward with, or will there be flexibility that there'll be lessons learned and we determine that maybe we have to course correct.

01:00:41
Speaker 3
So, Mark, where we are is that we need to be in a position, really, today to move in a direction of either vote.

01:00:51
Speaker 1
Oh, no, I get that part. I'm just saying.

01:00:53
Speaker 3
And even if the lesson is learned, we will have set the steering committee, and maybe the opportunity to bring in the lesson learned will be how the steering committee governs itself, but it will be set. And I don't see us having another seating of the steering committee other than having an opportunity to figure out how it governs itself.

01:01:19
Speaker 1
Okay. Yeah. I just want to put it out there that I don't think once we're fixed that, we're stuck with it as far as our ability to adjust it to make it work for everybody.

01:01:30
Speaker 3
Yeah. So maybe we'll go over ten more minutes. I'll try and take these two questions here. I do want to take a pulse of the room in terms of any strong feelings in either direction after that. Zahira. And then Sharon.

01:01:48
Speaker 7

Thank you. Mine's more of a comment. I just wanted to thank you for all of the work that's been done on this. I know we've been having these conversations, I believe, since April of last year, and so we've been able to go through many iterations of what this looks like. I appreciate that there's been some additional commentary over the past week or so but this has been a fairly lengthy process. And I know that for a number of us who have been deeply engaged, it's been a dedication of a lot of time and resources to be able to have these conversations. So I really want to thank all of you. Tanua, Kelly, thank you for leading us through this effort. As we kind of get to this particular point in time, I wonder, in terms of taking the pulse of the room, if it's possible to even do a poll on Zoom or something else that just kind of gets us to our next steps.

01:02:41
Speaker 7
Because I do appreciate the level of urgency, and I know we've already asked for these extensions. The state is not going to give us any more extensions. And it's also just an interesting way to kind of start a process with a funder to just have a series of extensions that we're getting. But hopefully it sounds like we're still in good stead with them, which is great. But yeah, I just mostly just wanted to just thank all of you for all of your time and dedication to this process. I know it's been a lot of back and forth, and I'm really happy that we're finally, at this moment where we have these two decisions to move forward with.

01:03:15
Speaker 3
All right, thank you very much. Appreciate that, certainly for all of us. I know a lot of people have been on these calls a long time. We do, actually, and could take a poll as well. But if Sharon and Kevin could be quick, we are overtime, but I want to give you an opportunity to share and then maybe we can use the poll as a way to take a post.

01:03:45
Speaker 6
Sharon okay, thank you so much. I'll be very quick. I do want to put a stake in the ground and say, can you hear me?

01:03:55
Speaker 3
Yes.

01:03:56
Speaker 6
Okay. Like I said, I want to be very clear that I still believe the voting process is the most democratic, and it says to our members that the reason we're spending capacity building dollars is to help empower them to make choice and give them that knowledge and skill to fully

participate. And their vote is their ultimate form of participation. Two, I'm concerned about the proposal around the hybrid. The HRTC is the deciding body for the voting body for our Surf Collaborative. So we can't make a decision coming out of governance today that would have to go to the HRTC. And the proposal to try and convene a selection committee tomorrow would mean our HRTC doesn't get to vote on the selection methodology. And that is absolutely something we have been very clear with them that they have that vote. So I want to caution us about that because that's potential backlash.

01:04:59
Speaker 3
You'll notice that in the governance committee, we have steered away from the term vote. We have been able to get to our process through consensus building. So it has not been the way that we have operated. I recognize outreach and engagement has operated that way, but the goal has been to try and continue to keep as big a tent as possible. So that is one way to handle how we move forward. We're also on a very tight timeline.

01:05:31
Speaker 1
Kevin, first of all, thank you all.

01:05:34
Speaker 9
For all the work you've put in. I think from my perspective I like to look at, this is a really serious task that we're going to be undertaking for some years now. In order to achieve our goals, we definitely need organizational effectiveness. The way you build that is by amplifying all the voices through a democratic voting process. People then become stakeholders, and in doing so, you ensure that they're going to be in it for the long haul because they feel that they are contributing and that it's not going to be what was mentioned in some original language of the surf program as business as usual. We're going to make sure that everyone has an opportunity to be heard, to participate, to feel that they are able to contribute, and that their voice matters. Not putting down the hybrid, I think it's viable, but I think the best choice would be the voting process.

01:06:49
Speaker 3
So now that we've had an opportunity to hear from everyone and to try and use the overage time that we had set for the last for the next four minutes or so. Thank you for that. Kevin, if the staff would go ahead and bring up the poll. Allen, do you have that still available?

01:07:12

Speaker 1
Yes, just give me 1 second to pull that up.

01:07:15
 Speaker 3
 No problem. And our goal here would be to take a pulse. Keep in mind that there are elements that are not perfect under either circumstance, but we want to be able to move in a direction today so that we can give the staff direction on which way to go.

01:07:46
 Speaker 2
 While we're waiting.

01:07:47
 Speaker 3
 For it to pop up.

01:07:48
 Speaker 2
 There were a couple of other questions.

01:07:49
 Speaker 3
 That were in the chat that I.

01:07:51
 Speaker 1
 Don'T know if they got addressed.

01:07:53
 Speaker 3
 Maybe help me identify what they are. That'd be great.

01:07:57
 Speaker 6
 There was one, it was Kenta.

01:08:01

Speaker 3
For the hybrid option, would the HRTC.

01:08:03
Speaker 2
Just be voting for the subject matter experts?

01:08:07
Speaker 3
That's correct. For the hybrid model. The HRTC, if it chose to vote, would vote for the subject matter leads within the six categories, the poll ready.

01:08:23
Speaker 2
And the only thing can I throw one thing in there?

01:08:26
Speaker 3
Just as if in consideration of the.

01:08:29
Speaker 2
Voting model, if that ends up being.

01:08:31
Speaker 3
Where we land, I think it's important.

01:08:35
Speaker 2
That there's information on the page.

01:08:39
Speaker 1
That.

01:08:40
Speaker 2

Would indicate that's the type of organization or designation that they've included on their HRTC partnership agreement. I just think it's I think more information if that's the path absent in an SME, transparency for the group will be important.

01:09:03
Speaker 3
Oh, sorry, Kelly. Oh, no, sorry.

01:09:05
Speaker 2
Yeah, I just was reflecting on that because I know there's sort of right now, it's like the binary and the opportunity here was to enhance any option that gets moved towards consensus.

01:09:18
Speaker 3
Thank you. So please note at this point, the poll is in the chat. Feel free to open that up. And this will be the opportunity to share the direction that the governance committee and LAEDC staff would go in terms of developing a process to seat the steering committee.

01:09:52
Speaker 1
Can someone please confirm that they're able to access the survey correctly?

01:09:57
Speaker 3
Yes, I was able to access the survey. I could click on it opened up and I could hit submit.

01:10:04
Speaker 1
Okay, perfect. So do we want to just give 1 minute? Yeah.

01:10:08
Speaker 3
Can you see how many you have at least from the people who are on the call now, how many responses you've received?

01:10:15
Speaker 1
Let me go ahead and refresh that while we're waiting.

01:10:20
Speaker 2
That's a question.

01:10:22
Speaker 3
How is this jamboard that we've been.

01:10:24
Speaker 6
Filling out with the pros and cons?

01:10:27
Speaker 2
How is this going to be used?

01:10:32
Speaker 3
Both of the options had jamboard feedback depending on which direction we go. I would encourage LAEDC to look at that feedback and see where and how we might be able to modify the process to be able to address some of these concerns here. We can provide them recommendations on some of those specific areas.

01:11:07
Speaker 1
I'm going to go ahead and refresh one more time.

01:11:14
Speaker 3
Okay. Is there anyone who is not able to vote?

01:11:25
Speaker 2
There's a comment from Benny that he's having issues. He's being asked to register to vote. Not sure if there's technically.

01:11:36

Speaker 1
It should allow you direct access. Let me see if I can grab another poll.

01:11:41
Speaker 3
Sharon, you're not able to vote either?

01:11:43
Speaker 6
No, I was ran into the same red request to registration.

01:11:47
Speaker 1
I don't know if it's because I'm on my phone, if that's the issue, but it's asking me to register might be.

01:11:54
Speaker 2
I wonder if we can send it to the folks emails.

01:11:58
Speaker 1
I don't mind registering if it gets the vote in, but I'm just saying I hope it's not deterring. I hope my vote got through is what I'm asking.

01:12:05
Speaker 6
Yeah, I got the same thing.

01:12:07
Speaker 1
All right.

01:12:18
Speaker 3
I think we've got everybody on this call who can get through.

01:12:27

Speaker 2
It looks like we don't have eight votes for folks on here.

01:12:35
Speaker 3
But the direction is still pretty clear, I think.

01:12:39
Speaker 1
Yeah. Counting our LAEDC surf team and staff, as well as just our staff.

01:12:52
Speaker 3
Okay. All right. Well, we are now at the time that we said we would go over and end today's meeting. I want to thank you all for today's discussion and enthusiastic commitment to trying to ensure that we get to a process. We'll lay this before LAEDC and determine if we move towards a voting process. We may be able to come back to the HRTC and have a presentation, but again, this is the way we've operated previously and before. To get us even to this point has been to have the support of members like you who are on the call and engaging in the conversation at the moment and being able to then move forward with decisions accordingly so that we can continue to hit our milestones with that. Unless, Kelly, you have anything else you want to share? Thank you for co chairing with me.

01:13:57
Speaker 3
Of course.

01:13:57
Speaker 2
Yeah, no, I just echo the thanks for the conversation. I think some of these conversations get us to a better collective resolution, and I think to the point around the jamboard and the conversation today, it looks like there's a clear knot in a direction. I think it will help inform how some of the voting process is presented as well. So look forward to coming in front of the HRTC, and it seems like we did good work today.

01:14:25
Speaker 3
Thank you. Good. And Charles.

01:14:27

Speaker 1
You're good.

01:14:28
Speaker 3
Anything you want to share before we go?

01:14:31
Speaker 1
No. Thank you. You guys, Tanua and Kelly, for being on the call and for putting forth your efforts to present a great option for the HRTC.

01:14:45
Speaker 4
Charles, any update whether the Bay Area or Inland Empire are jumping onto our letter?

01:14:51
Speaker 1
I want to save that for another meeting, district governance. But we will update you on that.

01:15:00
Speaker 3
All right, we appreciate everyone. Have a good evening.

01:15:02
Speaker 1
Thank you.

01:15:03
Speaker 3
Bye bye.

01:15:04
Speaker 1
Thank you.