

This document was generated by AI and is not an official meeting record. It may contain errors.

Transcript

November 26, 2025

VM **Vega, Michelle** 0:45
VM Great. OK. OK, perfect.
So we will go ahead and call today's operation cluster meeting to order.
It is November 26th.
It's 2:01 PM and we will begin with introductions starting with SD1.

OT **Omoto-Frias, Tamela** 1:01
Can you tell me more chores with supervisor please?
Office and I think that a couple of my colleagues are on as well.

CA **Cespedes, Anthony** 1:08
Hi, this is Anthony.

VM **Vega, Michelle** 1:09
Do they want any?
Hi, Anthony.
Anybody else from SD one?
No. OK.
We will now go to ST2.

AC **Angius, Carolyn** 1:21
Oh.

SK **Shelton, Kirk** 1:22
Charlton here for SD2. I'm joined by my colleagues who are presenting today.

VM **Vega, Michelle** 1:29

OK.

And then SD3AS, John is not on SD4.

SG Schauerman, Grant 1:35

Hey, Grant, Sherman for supervisor Hahn and my colleagues are also on the presenting today.

HN Holden, Nick 1:40

Yes, Nick Holden also here at SD4.

VM Vega, Michelle 1:43

Great. And I'm Michelle Vega with SD5 and I'm the only one on from SD 5.

With that, we will move on to general public comment.

Deri. Did we receive any public comment requests?

DC Dardy Chen 1:56

Not not at this time for public comment, but as we move through the motions, it will becomes common.

I believe so.

No general public comment.

Thank you.

VM Vega, Michelle 2:05

Great. OK. Our first item today is a board motion from SD 2, which is strengthening the transparent policy making process, enhancing the review of substantive policy motions at county cluster meetings.

SDE two. Would you like to present?

CT Caroline Torosis 2:22

Can everyone hear me OK?

VM Vega, Michelle 2:24

Yes.

CT Caroline Torosis 2:24

Great. Hi everyone.

Carolyn Tarosa second district.

I'll go ahead and kick us off, but of course if there are any technical questions, we'll defer to my colleagues who are also here.

Darde, I think you you might need to share in presentation mode, although this is totally fine as as well.

DC Dardy Chen 2:39

Yeah, I'm trying to figure that.

Sorry about that.

CT Caroline Torosis 2:42

No, no, no problem.

DC Dardy Chen 2:44

You see it now.

CT Caroline Torosis 2:44

All right. So Yep, I think you might have just clicked on it.

No, but that's OK.

I think we can.

We can go ahead and get started in this format and I'll just tell you when it that we have next slide.

DC Dardy Chen 2:52

OK, OK.

CT Caroline Torosis 2:57

To go to great so you can go ahead and go on to the next slide.

DC Dardy Chen 3:05

OK.

CT Caroline Torosis 3:06

I I can't see it, unfortunately.

Can anyone else see it?

DC **Dardy Chen** 3:08

Weird. OK.

Should be sharing. Can someone?

AB **Anthony Baker** 3:13

We can see it.

DC **Dardy Chen** 3:14

Confirm. Oh.

AB **Anthony Baker** 3:15

I can see.

I can see the the prime the the cover slide.

CT **Caroline Torosis** 3:17

You you can see the. Yeah, but you can't see the 2nd.

DC **Dardy Chen** 3:20

On purpose.

CT **Caroline Torosis** 3:21

Yeah, background on purpose.

Let's advance to that one if possible.

DC **Dardy Chen** 3:25

Yeah. Is that the one that you guys that can't see the background on purpose on the 2nd?

The second page of the prompt PowerPoint everyone.

KK **Kieu-Anh King** 3:31

Slide one.

AB Anthony Baker 3:32
I'm seeing strengthening the transparent process.

CT Caroline Torosis 3:32
No.

SK Shelton, Kirk 3:32
Yeah, we're still seeing intro.

DC Dardy Chen 3:34
Weird. OK, I'm gonna. I'm gonna reshare.

EB Erika Bonilla 3:36
No darde meeting.

DC Dardy Chen 3:37
Why don't you go ahead?
I'm gonna reshare again and see if that helps.

EB Erika Bonilla 3:39
Where's?

CT Caroline Torosis 3:41
Yeah, no problem and I don't.
For whatever. Sorry for the technical difficulties, everyone. If you go to like slideshow mode at the bottom right corner next to like how big it is, it should go OK.

DC Dardy Chen 3:51
Yeah.

CT Caroline Torosis 3:52
Yep, I see it.
I see it.
We. Yeah, I mean there's it.

DC Dardy Chen 3:53

You got it, OK.

CT Caroline Torosis 3:55

Yeah, this is totally fine. This will work.

DC Dardy Chen 3:57

OK.

CT Caroline Torosis 3:58

OK.

So, hi, good afternoon everyone. Again. Caroline's second district, as everyone knows, for over a year now, we have been taking.

Motions, which are also known as like pieces of legislation that the board.

To the cluster process for increased transparency, clarity and also to get more feedback from both members of the public, stakeholders and county departments.

Our office and the E OS report has found that this has been an effective way for board offices, departments and stakeholders to collaborate before items reach the board for a full vote, and that it has been fruitful and making sure that we have stronger motions that are fully.

Informed before they're voted on.

I think many of you know that before this process we would sometimes see items on a board agenda on a Friday and then on Tuesday they were voted on and this process is an attempt to invite public into the decision making process as well as our DEP.

Stakeholders the motion before you today.

Clears some administrative discrepancies that we've had with the executive office, and it also takes into account many of the lessons that we've learned from the cluster process over the past year.

In terms of how do we actually strengthen this process and make it fully transparent and accessible for everyone? The motion before you takes these lessons and makes some substantive changes, including making this process permanent, further defining what qualifies as a substantive versus a non substantive motion and form.

The way that we treat clusters across the original 5 clusters and we'll add.

Two additional fully formed clusters.

Just by way of background, if you could go to the next slide.

Thanks. In case everyone hasn't had the opportunity to read the report back.

A comprehensive evaluation of the pilot by the executive officers found that motion quality has improved.

Departments themselves gave feedback that they appreciated earlier access to the motions to give feedback. There have been Shankar collaborations and opportunities for synergies between departments as they've been made aware of what other folks are working on.

And there's been more robust opportunity for public participation.

And effectively, 2 bites that the apple as you know, we have invited the public into these cluster meetings.

So in addition to just hearing board letters, we are we are now hearing motions. Next slide please.

Substantively wanted to give everyone a preview.

The motion was in the packet, but just to reiterate the directives before you directive one would make the cluster process permanent to revise the rules of the board.

To make sure that this process stays in effect until it's repealed in an August motion by our office, that clause was in there and we're just reiterating that and making it clear. We also are making a clearer process to determine who determine has the final determination as to.

Whether a motion has to go through the cluster process by distinguishing what substantive versus non substantive.

And directs County Council to work with the EO and CEO on that.

It would also give the board chair authority to approve the exemptions and resolve disputes about whether or not the motion would have to go through a cluster or not, and whether it was applicable. The process was applicable to a particular motion and of course the board chair would.

Do that in consultation with the CEO, who publishes, who collates.

All of the motions and publishes these agendas and then also directs department heads to ensure that the appropriate subject matter expertise is at the cluster meeting.

The whole purpose of this process is to ensure that not only the public weigh in, but that members of departments that are subject matter experts have the opportunity to weigh in, give feedback and provide context.

And so we just want to make sure there have been a few circumstances where maybe departments haven't always been present just to make sure that all of them are there and able to answer questions or respond to the directives in the motion.

Next slide please.

Further, the motion director for is directing the CEO to improve access.

We are are very clear that there needs to be language access, disability access, public participation needs to be standardized, the number of minutes per public comment should be standardized and the hybrid access to the cluster should be standardized.

So we are asking the CEO and the EO to consult and and ensure that the process across all the seven clusters directed by this motion.

And would be the same.

We also are looking to have CEO work with ISD to upgrade any technology and work with the board.

CEO work with the board Chair's office to establish a standardized format, so there's some sort of consistency around the expectations and of what members of the public will see on those agendas and and how they're formatted.

And then finally, in the August motion, there was a request that.

The economic Development Policy Committee be elevated to a cluster and and that motion passed, but now we're just.

Again, standardizing because there have been quite a few members of the public who've given feedback that the homeless deputies should also be its own standalone cluster, and so an acknowledgement of of both of those things, and in an effort to standardize the process, we're elevating both of those.

Bodies to official clusters. Both the workforce and economic development cluster and the homeless cluster with the appropriate support and standard agenda access.

And public comment process across those bodies.

And then the final slide is just the timeline here.

Thank you so much for for being here today.

Listen, I know we're going into the Thanksgiving holiday this we anticipate that this would be voted on by the board on December 9th.

And so with that being said, I'm happy to take any questions or if any of my colleagues wanted to add anything, happy to defer to them as well.



Vega, Michelle 10:11

Offices have questions.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 10:16

I don't have a question, but I just wanted to make clear that when it comes to like all the room accommodations and like the IT system, it's actually the EO 'cause we're at the hall. And so the EO is the one that needs to be lead Gen. and. Take lead on that, since it's their room.

CT Caroline Torosis 10:33

Yeah. And we did receive some of that feedback as well. Kirk, I don't know if you wanted to add anything about that.

SK Shelton, Kirk 10:41

Yeah. So, so we agree that that's my process is so valuable. 'cause I got a chance to get that kind of feedback.

So we're open to making those kind of changes to to line that up correctly with the with how it should be.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 10:51

OK.

VM Vega, Michelle 10:53

And I know we've got some hands raised if there's no other questions from any board office, we can go to some of the hands that are raised and we can begin with CEO Mason.

MM Mason Matthews 11:05

Hi, good afternoon, everyone.

Mason Matthews from the CEO budget team did want to come and talk with you today about a couple concerns and and comments I have about the motion.

First I want to start by saying I do like the current process we have in place to bring motions to cluster. I think it's been very positive, has allowed for additional discussion.

Before motions are finalized and and head to the board and I've actually availed myself of the opportunity to attend.

End a cluster meeting and and make some comments similar to today.

So I've done this before, so I do appreciate that. I think it's a great process about the motion. Specifically, I think my concerns are probably a little more technical and I think we just touched on one of them and I'll go through a couple things, maybe some suggest.

Changes to the motion if if you would.

All consider them and my team can provide a copy of the changes.

To you if that would be helpful.

But first, just in direct, so mostly.

Directive sports through seven, so nothing about 1-2 or three.

Suggestion that Directive 4 be maybe split into two directives, so along the lines of the EO being the lead on handling the logistics for the various board meetings.

Perhaps that they should be the lead on directive #4 and it could direct looking at the technology options to improve public access and engagement and ensure language access.

And accessibility standards are consistent.

And then maybe if we took a second piece of it, that could say the CEO and the board chair could standardize public comment rules across the meetings, come up with the the standard agenda.

When public comments are invited and how the hybrid participation protocols would work, and the primary reason for the split is again because the EO would be the lead on some of those.

And then my team might have input on some of the other items.

So it might be kind of better defined for us, who is supposed to do what if if we're able to split that?

For directive #5, again I would ask that EO be the lead and they could consult with ISD and the CEO if needed. If the CEO needs to be there but we don't support the technology for the meetings. So again feel pretty strongly that should be directed to. The EO.

And then for Directive 7 and eight, I don't have a concern with the meetings being elevated to the equal standing.

But my and my team does attend all the meetings, but we don't have the bandwidth to take on.

The workload of the two additional meetings and I would ask that the departments that are handling it now if they could be added to the directives, so it would be DEO and the homeless services and Housing Department, the new department, to

continue that work.

We could kind of continue to do the work that we do in those meetings, but I do feel like it would be difficult for us to take on handling those two meetings with the staff that we have.

And so again, I think it's just wanted to underscore that for certain things that are in these directives that feel that the EO is more in the role to support the board as these are board meetings and that we are helping to facilitate in various areas.

Is so with that I will end my comments. And like I said, I can provide any changes to the board offices if that would be helpful.

CT **Caroline Torosis** 14:44

Yeah, I think those comments would be very helpful.

I know that there were some discussions yesterday with that feedback, so not unanticipated and absolutely hear what you're saying.

I don't know if anyone from the first district had wanted to say anything since they're the incoming chair just related to the.

Standardization across these two additional clusters.

CA **Cespedes, Anthony** 15:09

Yeah, I'll jump in here.

Thank you, Carolyn and Mason.

Appreciate that feedback.

I, you know, obviously defer to the second is the author of this motion with respect to what to do with those directives with respect to the two other clusters. I know we've been having some conversation as in chair transition with like how to best address those given the.

Expanded discussions in those and I think my only kind of concern with what you flag there, Mason, is that for the EDPC right now.

I was just DEO, but I think there's been talk about expanding the departments that go there and the same for like the homelessness department. Like, potentially, it's just HSH.

But if there is an expanded scope for additional departments are going there too, it no longer becomes like one department owning one cluster. And in the spirit of I, I think what I heard Carolyn say is trying to elevate those two to be consistent with the others it.

Would just seem a little odd that those two would be operated differently than the other five.

Again, that's what's coming from the kind of third chair management sort of perspective.

I don't know if other folks have thought.

CT **Caroline Torosis** 16:13

Thanks and yeah, I know that SD one has said we're going to have more robust discussions at some of these clusters.

So I I point well taken, Anthony.

OT **Omoto-Frias, Tamela** 16:24

I agree.

I know that is a single single department cluster which we have never had before, and we're not talking about making any changes budgetarily and how they lie and where they fall. But when it comes to cluster, we want to make sure that those two departments have the support.

In the backing of the CE OS that when they summons other departments or other agencies that those other agencies and departments respond.

I don't know if there's going to be an issue or not, I don't know, but.

We would definitely want to see the CEO with your.

Still engaged.

To the extent possible.

MM **Mason Matthews** 17:00

Yeah, and and happy to be engaged. And if there's any issue there, happy to work on that. I I think there is a lot of kind of back office work that goes into preparing the agenda and all that that I'm I'm a little more concerned about and I.

Think it's working well now and so I would love to continue to get that support from the departments, but if we need to do anything to facilitate, you know, if people aren't being responsive and so forth, happy to help with that.

So it'd be great if we could consider.

You know, adding those two departments to the motion and then we can, as we figure out who has to do what we we can definitely be involved in that.

VM Vega, Michelle 17:44

OK. Anything else with regards to the CEO concerns before I go to County Council?

EB Erika Bonilla 17:50

Hi Michelle, this is Erika Bonilla with Ceoi.

Just wanted to.

Kind of echo Lisa's comments.

So I was the facilitator for the health and minaja health services question meeting for several years.

Like in a couple of different iterations, I'll just say we're happy to do it in the current environment, right?

We're supporting the departments directly, putting the board in that capacity.

It is very time intensive and I think some of these changes.

Get more into like the non specific.

Big subject matter expertise that CEO has into more administrative, technical type activities coordinating and so forth.

So just kind of wanted to flag that the departments are well suited, at least for the two other policy clusters in that they have full departments, right?

Hundreds of employees to help support in our office, we typically there are a couple of exceptions, but we typically have a one to one analyst to department ratio.

So behind the scenes on the CEO side.

You know, if we're supporting, let's say, like a typical department, there might be like four or five staff total.

You know, not all of them.

Like necessarily with the with the capacity to be able to do what's required in this function.

And so again, I think from the resource perspective wanted to find that last thing I'll say from the standpoint of the public. You know, we're we're going from what we would call compounded, you know buckets of departments and the process format. Right. So there's a a grouping that we've identified as black or similar.

So the public and their engagement, they now only review 5 agendas. You know, in theory, if they want the other policy areas, they can review that as well.

But if we if we kind of change the status, the blocks of time like in order to engage with the public, we're now like every meeting is usually blocked off for like a general

2 hour time frame.

Like, we're kind of expanding really I think, to a degree where the ability to continue to have a level of public engagement is going to get diluted because of the fact that they're, you know, where is the agenda, what what agenda do I need to check for the?

Issue that I'm looking for so there might be kind of some some kind of difficulty there with, you know, all day, all day, Wednesday partial day, Thursday every other week in some instances, I think difficulty for like the public to be able to just.

And more easily on like an item that they might be looking for.

So just a couple more.

VM **Vega, Michelle** 20:24
OK.

CT **Caroline Torosis** 20:24
Thanks.

VM **Vega, Michelle** 20:26
Sorry. Anything else on that?
No. OK noro.

I know you had some questions as well from or comments on behalf of County Council.

NZ **Norayr Zurabyan** 20:37
Yeah. Thank you. Hi everyone.

I'm Nora from County council's office.

Just wanted to ask a few logistical questions.

In terms of directive, #2 is the intent for County Council to bring it back again to the board for an approval or is this the directive for County Council to go ahead and work with the EO basically to make the changes and it's in a way that?

We don't to bring it back to the board.

For another approval.

CT **Caroline Torosis** 21:04
Make the changes so we don't have to bring it back because again, we we feel pretty

strongly that we already directed this in August.

So we're being real real clear here and we can edit it if you have suggestions on how to edit it.

I don't know Kirk, if you wanted to say anything about that.

SK **Shelton, Kirk** 21:20

Yeah, I agree.

I think the best we don't just come back to the board again. So if we needed to change up the language a little bit to to clarify that very open to suggestions on how to do that to to make that with with the intent being we just we.

NZ **Norayr Zurabyan** 21:29

Yeah, yeah.

SK **Shelton, Kirk** 21:33

Bring non substantive stuff and I know there have been questions about what that non substantive means.

So there's need to help and tighten up that language, so that's clear to everyone.

NZ **Norayr Zurabyan** 21:40

Yeah. Yeah, exactly that was.

You know what?

I was trying to get at so maybe if we can work on language to make that part clear so that nobody's confused and then.

On.

Directed number directives number I was gonna say seven and eight on those, but we already based on your latest motion, right?

We've already added the workforce and economic cluster to the list of the clusters.

They're subject to this rule.

So is this basically reinforcing that?

And then is the intent to also add the homelessness cluster to that list in a way that now you're gonna have 7?

Instead of the six.

CT **Caroline Torosis** 22:23

You so right now it's still called the active members Development Policy Committee and I will say that we did have just full transparency.

We did have conversations with SD1 about how we wanted to do this as they are the incoming chair. We want to make it clear that this is a full cluster body for seven, for director of seven, and the intent was to have that same level of support.

Because there there potentially will be additional departments.

For better coordination, coming to that body.

And then again creating a 7th body, the homeless cluster homelessness cluster.

NZ **Norayr Zurabyan** 23:00

Got it. So all right and then?

SK **Shelton, Kirk** 23:03

Let me let me add on just just to just to put a finer point on that.

NZ **Norayr Zurabyan** 23:03

Would you mind changing? Yeah, go ahead.

CT **Caroline Torosis** 23:05

No.

SK **Shelton, Kirk** 23:07

So so yes, the rules of the board to need to change to include the 7th class, the 7th place where they would.

NZ **Norayr Zurabyan** 23:12

Right.

SK **Shelton, Kirk** 23:13

The other stuff would happen administratively, outside of the rules of the board in terms of the actual procedure and administrative of how those are operated.

NZ **Norayr Zurabyan** 23:21

Yeah. And then.

I think in terms of the language, maybe we could use the same language for seven

and eight where it says we can say instead of establish for #8 we can say standardized the same way standardized the homeless policy deputies meetings on an unequal standing and then maybe.

Just remove establish and also as a cluster body.

I say that because.

That way.

'Cause the intent is to basically have the same support, right?

You're not re establishing a brand new body, you're just taking the existing body and just asking for there to be extra support.

And renaming it.

CT **Caroline Torosis** 24:10

Yeah. So I would just suggest that if you have any any specific like line item edits like we're happy to to look at those and and make them.

NZ **Norayr Zurabyan** 24:23

That's it on land. Thank you.

CT **Caroline Torosis** 24:25

Thank you.

VM **Vega, Michelle** 24:28

OK. And then I know that there are a couple folks that want to provide public comment, but before we do, I'm going to continue to let the departments speak. Kevin Anderson with DEO had his hand up.

KA **Kevin Anderson** 24:39

Yep. Thanks Michelle.

Just wanted to briefly comment on Directive 7.

As Department of Economic Opportunity currently Staffs and administers the economic Development Policy Committee, we're certainly happy to continue doing so.

I think our the request and hopefully consistent with the goal here of this motion is just consistent infrastructure and support across.

All clusters and just ensuring that if if there's standardized support being provided to

those that are housed within CEO that they're provided across all 7 clusters, whether or not you know the primary staffing is occurring within or outside of CEO. And so we just look forward to to.

Working with with everyone on that, whether it's IT support or consistent procedures and policies, language access and so forth.

Thanks.

CT **Caroline Torosis** 25:36

Thanks Kevin.

Does anyone from the?

Anyone representing the EO on here?

OK.

Well, that will be changed on the going forward basis. If this motion passes.

But Kevin, maybe we can address that with the EO as well.

VM **Vega, Michelle** 25:58

Great. OK.

Any other comments from board offices or departments before I move over to public comment?

OK. Darde, would you please go through the public comment for individuals who have indicated that they would like to speak on this motion?

DC **Dardy Chen** 26:16

Will do all right.

First Janet Gargan.

We'll start your one minute when you start speaking.

JA **Janet Gagnon - AAGLA** 26:22

Janik AGN from the Apartment Association of Greater Los Angeles, we represent approximately 10,000 rental housing providers with 80% owning 20 or fewer units.

We strongly support this motion and making the clusters permanent.

It is a vital tool for transparency and to have that active engagement of all stakeholders.

We also support the homelessness deputies being added as a cluster.

It's a very important group.

And many of those staffers, staff both homelessness and housing.

So we would ask that there be clarification that the all housing issues go through the new homelessness cluster just so that no one is missing anything and everyone is fully informed and able to provide proper input on those issues.

Up to now it's been split.

Sometimes it's in operation, sometimes it's in homelessness, sometimes it's somewhere else. So.

We housing impacts everybody, residents and businesses.

And we request that. Thank you.

DC **Dardy Chen** 27:24

Thank you very much.

Next we have Andrew Andrew Kazakhis.

Please send mute and we'll start your time.

Andrew, go ahead.

Andrew can't hear you.

AK **Andrew J. Kazakes** 27:39

Can you hear me now?

DC **Dardy Chen** 27:40

Yes, go ahead.

AK **Andrew J. Kazakes** 27:41

Thank you.

Hi everyone.

My name is Andrew Kazakhis.

I'm a managing attorney at the Legal aid foundation of Los Angeles and just wanted to register my support for the motion as well.

We found that the cluster process helps improve the transparency of board business and enables stakeholders to better understand the county's decision making process and a meaningful meaningfully contribute to that process.

So yes, we we support that we support the motion and.

That's all I have to say.

Thank you.

DC Dardy Chen 28:10

Thank you very much.

All right. Next we have Jared Wright.

Jared, we'll start your your minute when you start speaking.

JW Jerard Wright 28:16

Alright. Good afternoon. Gerard Wright with the Greater Los Angeles Realtors. Just a 12,000 member realtor Trade Organization that covers most of the West side of Los Angeles.

We wholeheartedly agree with Supervisor Mitchell's motion on the continuing of clusters we've seen in just some examples already with the maximum door temperature and a few others where that dialogue was vitally important to improve something that was at first daunting, but it actually.

She came to some consensus and some dialogue that helped provide much needed clarity. Because of this cluster process.

That's the whole idea of the cluster process to help provide better information, provide more clarity and come up with better resolutions that help all county residents.

And that's that's the intention.

That's and I think this is one of the good things that is coming thus far through in 2025 and we want to commend the supervisor and her team for bringing this forward.

Thank you so very much for your time and attention.

DC Dardy Chen 29:17

Thank you very much.

Next we have Raquel Durfler.

We'll start your time when you start speaking.

RC Raquel Derfler CTC 29:23

Good afternoon.

This is Raquel Darthlough with cancel the contract and check the sheriff coalition.

We strongly support this motion as the cluster review process is the only opportunity for stakeholders to meaningfully participate in the decision making process.

It allows CTC to have a real part in LASD SRD contract approval process back in the summer of 2024, which led to shoe protections for students being included in that contract without the cholesterol process, LASD would have been able to have. The Board of Supervisors Rubber stamp the same boilerplate contract that failed to give clear guidelines for Sr. D roles in schools and prohibited certain behaviors. So once again, we strongly support this motion.

DC Dardy Chen 30:08

Thank you very much.
Next we have Yasmine Yamani.
We'll start your time when you start speaking.

YM Yasmine-Imani McMorris 30:16

Good afternoon. Can you hear me?

DC Dardy Chen 30:17

Yes, go ahead.

YM Yasmine-Imani McMorris 30:19

Wonderful. Good afternoon, everyone.
I just wanted to register my support of this motion.
My name is Yasmine. Amani mcmoran.
I'm calling in my capacity as Director of Education Equity for Children's Defense Fund California.
We've really had really appreciate Supervisor Mitchell's team and all of the board offices that are present today and really just hold that this process continues.
I know.
Raquel spoke a little bit about the shares process that we were a part of last year. As well as some other children centered motions that really we were able to provide meaningful input and I think hopefully shape the process in a way that allows community to be at the center.
So we're really supportive of this. We hope that this process continues so that we can continue to build LA County where everyone shares in.
So thank you so much for this time and your leadership.

DC Dardy Chen 31:13

Thank you very much.

Next we have Jamie Kenrick. If you want to start speaking, we'll start your time.

JK Jamie Kennerk 31:18

Hi all.

Jamie kiner. I'm speaking on behalf of Planned Parenthood at Los Angeles County, also in support of the motion to continue the cluster process.

I'm really echoing what everyone else has said today that the process has been an effective tool for Community informed policy making, allowing departments, stakeholders and the public to identify various issues early as well as continue to to provide necessary input before motions reach the board.

Also has been touched on.

The motion includes a number of measures to improve the existing.

Process. So without any action today it will automatically end December 31st which would be a step backward.

So just appreciate everyone else that's here today and support the county Supervisors Office and all of you all here. Thank you.

DC Dardy Chen 32:03

Thank you very much.

Next we have Matt Buck.

We'll start your time when you start speaking.

MB Matt Buck 32:09

Matthew Buck, vice president of public affairs for the California Apartment Association. We support supervisor of Mitchell's motion to preserve the integrity and transparency of county policy, making the cluster review process strengthens transparency and public access to county policy making by ensuring that motions are thoughtfully reviewed by.

Subject matter experts before board action, it is essential to continue this approach to ensure well informed decisions by the board are made. Thank you.

DC Dardy Chen 32:36

You very much.

Next we have Scott Hornick.

Oh, we'll start your time when you start speaking.

Scott the mute.

SK **Scott Korinke** 32:43

Good afternoon.

My name is Scott Carinke and I'm calling in on behalf of the Marina del Rey Tourism Board in strong support of Supervisor Mitchell's motion to continue the cluster review process.

We've appreciated the cluster policy process as an opportunity to provide more time for county stakeholders to clean those in the tourism hospitality industry to weigh in and provide their feedback and perspective on proposed county policies. As the past months have shown, as others alluded to.

It's already spurred broader feedback from a variety of stakeholders, resulting more meaningful input and better policy ultimately.

And this motion will help improve clarity, transparency for the process and while making it a permanent and ongoing part of it, which we're excited for along with the district cluster on homelessness, all the changes will help further advance the initial goals of the policy cluster process. And we.

Really thank you for working on it and bringing forward these improvements.

Thank you for your time and we are due to support the motion.

DC **Dardy Chen** 33:37

Thank you very much.

All right. Next we have Ryan Bell.

Ryan Bell will start your time when you start speaking.

Please tell me Ryan.

Ryan Bell.

RB **Ryan Bell** 33:46

Yes. Can everybody hear me?

DC **Dardy Chen** 33:48

Yes, go ahead.

RB **Ryan Bell** 33:49

OK, great.

Hello everybody.

Ryan Bell calling in from the Children's Defense Fund and I just want to reiterate what folks have already said. We want to support this motion.

We want to support advocacy, we want to support transparency in our cluster meetings.

We want to continue this going on as we know December 31st, this will automatically end.

So we want to prioritize transparency and equity in these settings. And so I just want to reiterate all of the positive things that have been.

Been said so far and thank you all for your time and happy holidays.

DC **Dardy Chen** 34:22

Thank you so much.

Last, we have Byron Jose.

We'll start your time when you start speaking.

BJ **Byron Jose** 34:29

Good afternoon, Byron, Jose coalition and Reimagine LA.

Thank you, Supervisor Mitchell's team for advancing this processes around transparency in our policy making and developing this structure for true community engagement for CEO. In addition to yeah, not creating a precedent where like clusters are run by department for the homelessness and housing. Does this mean that?

CEO.

I mean, they're part of the budget.

So unless they're gonna continue no longer getting you like funding through HI or PA, then it probably wouldn't make sense for them to run these clusters and equally elevate EM and to Carolyn and County council's point, yeah, this already been voted on as part of the one.

Very few people from reimagining still on, we want to make sure that this moves forward without having to go back to the board and unnecessarily processes. Thank you.

DC Dardy Chen 35:19

All right.

Thank you very much.

All right.

Any other public comment for this item, please speak up.

Raise your hand on teams.

OK, seeing none, back to you chair.

VM Vega, Michelle 35:32

Thank you so much darde for that, OK.

Now we will move on to our next item, which is another motion by SD2, implementing a Community hiring pilot in county procurement.

+16***55** 35:44

Hello. I'm sorry. Can I can I make a public comment on the agenda?

CT Caroline Torosis 35:45

Yeah.

+16***55** 35:48

Item one with the cluster.

VM Vega, Michelle 35:51

Yes.

DC Dardy Chen 35:52

Already state your name and we'll start your time.

+16***55** 35:53

Thank you.

Of course.

Yes, my name is Margaret and I'm a resident of the unincorporated LA County and I just wanted to call in in support of continuing with the cluster review process.

So with the passing of Measure G and the voters asking for transparency, I just

believe that here is an opportunity to provide that space for input from the public with a motion that can guarantee no further disruption in keeping public opinions and or concerns out of the process.

Public elected officials are elected to serve the public, keep the residents a priority, and the process available.

Thank you so much.

DC Dardy Chen 36:37
Michelle, back to you.

VM Vega, Michelle 36:39
OK, now.

+16***55** 36:39
Happy holiday.

VM Vega, Michelle 36:40
Thank you. You too.
Now we will go back to ST2 for their second motion, implementing community hiring pilot and county procurement.

CT Caroline Torosis 36:49
Fantastic. I will go ahead and get started on that as well.
Jordy, is it possible to share our second PowerPoint?

DC Dardy Chen 36:56
Yes, I am working on that right now.

CT Caroline Torosis 36:58
Thank you so much.

DC Dardy Chen 37:00
No problem.

CT Caroline Torosis 37:01

And and while he's getting that up, I'll just go ahead and get started.

We the motion is in the packet, but this is a OK.

You can.

Yes, we we know the title.

We're implementing community hiring pilot with this motion, so if you could go to the second slide that would be fantastic.

I just wanted to give everyone a little refresher and I know that we also have the director of ISD and representation from DEO here. But just as a background to why, why this motion?

Why now?

We actually had a 2020 January 2024 motion.

That asked IST with a work group including County Council. DEO to look at whether our on our largest county contracts because the county procures 6 to 8 plus billion dollars of goods and services annually.

Is there a possibility that on our largest county contracts, we can use our powers and market participant to actually catalyze the types of jobs we want to see?

We know that we.

And and hiring from our local communities.

We know that we already have a robust.

Small business preference program.

Social enterprise preference program and we've worked really hard as a board over the last decade to increase the amount of contracts going to our small diverse local businesses.

But there's also potentially an opportunity to look at how do we hire people from our local communities, many of whom may have barriers to employment on to some of our larger county contracts.

So as a result of the work that this workgroup did.

In response to the January 2024 motion.

ISD issued 2 reports back that looked at the largest county contract, the top 10% of all county contracts.

There's actually a listing of that in the reports back that were competitively procured over \$5,000,000. Because we said, look, if we're going to look at potentially incentivizing or requiring.

Community hiring. We need to do it on potentially larger contracts so that we could do this at scale.

ISD extracted some of this procurement data and they identified 163 competitively procured contracts that are over 5 million annually.

You know, many of which are quite large in range.

All the way up to 262 million and then some of these employers employ up to over 6600 workers just in California alone.

Next slide please.

We know that community hiring, if you could just click on the next dirty.

Slide 3.

DC Dardy Chen 39:28

Yeah, I'm not quite sure on mine, everyone on seaside food.

CT Caroline Torosis 39:31

That's so weird, no?

DC Dardy Chen 39:34

OK, once you start, keep keep. I'm gonna.

CT Caroline Torosis 39:35

Does anyone else see slide?

Does anyone else see slide three? Is it my problem?

GW Gomez, Wendy 39:40

No, I don't see it either.

SI Sulic, Ivan 39:42

Yeah, I see historical background.

DC Dardy Chen 39:42

August, we do it again.

SG Schauerman, Grant 39:42

Yeah.

CT **Caroline Torosis** 39:45
Sorry guys.

DC **Dardy Chen** 39:45
Oh my goodness, Sherry.

CT **Caroline Torosis** 39:50
You want me to do it dirty?

DC **Dardy Chen** 39:52
What about now?

CT **Caroline Torosis** 39:53
We got it. Yep. Perfect.

DC **Dardy Chen** 39:55
All right.

CT **Caroline Torosis** 39:56
Great. So we know that in our public workforce system, for example, there are actually people who are targeted workers that have barriers to employment that the federal government mandates that we do outreach to and potential prioritization for hiring through through our, you know, private enterprises and businesses just. Through the public workforce system, community hiring has worked in other jurisdictions. Many there are many across the country. That have you know, publicly available dashboards. In New York City is actually an exemplar of this. They they launched community hiring program. And their local hire policy on these contracts is estimated to create 36,000 new jobs for these low income individuals in the communities that are, you know, most in need and have the the most barriers to employment. We've also found that this is actually good for business. If you look at the research. This does not reduce bid prices. Or the number of bidders on many of these contracts. And so ISC did a deep dive

and I'm happy to have them answer any specific questions on, you know whether you you could potentially incentivize it by issuing additional points on some of these procurement forthcoming procurements or if.

You could even potentially require it next slide please.

So in taking some of the data and information that I see has given us in their reports back and in discussions with the department, both ISD and DEO.

Because DEO operates our public workforce system and our High Road training partnerships and has a pool of work ready, individuals who have gone through these programs.

And of course, we know that the Department of Public Works has the large contracts for our local and targeted worker hire program.

That's part of our Community workforce agreement.

There is definitely a pool of people that we can source that are work ready and able to be employed on some of these opportunities.

So the the 1st 3 directives of the motion that you have in your packet, we would actually be directing ISD to coordinate with DO and Co to design and implement a 36 months of three-year community hiring program. We're starting at a reasonable scale we believe for.

Five large solicitations to embed some of these community hiring goals and incentives onto those forthcoming procurement opportunities. IC has already done the analysis of which large contracts are forthcoming.

They would be reporting back to us, letting us know which five they were recommending to to pilot this on.

Additionally, we upon completion of the 5th pilot procurement, we would ask that IST in assuming that it is going well, we would ask IST and County Council to develop standardized solicitation language that other departments could use to implement some of these community hiring goals. And then we of.

Course would have DEO in the lead on compiling and maintaining a list of some of these approved all sources doing some of the matchmaking and helping vendors. If they wish to avail themselves of the pool of individuals that the county has to to source individuals to hire onto these large contracts, next slide please.

Like I briefly mentioned, public works.

Public works already has a way for our large public infrastructure contractors to track their local and targeted workers that they are employing on these large contracts.

So we are asking ISD to coordinate with public works already does this at scale to

make some sort of reporting system available for vendors to track and report out on these five?

Contracts that we or procurement opportunities that we would be putting forth. So that the community hiring metrics would be publicly available and we could determine, you know, where where these workers have been hired and on which contracts.

Including where they've been referred from and the demographics of the individuals hired. And then finally we would ask is D to be, you know again this is a 36 month pilot to be working with DEO to provide annual written updates to the board, constantly evaluating what it.

Is how the outcomes.

Are proceeding.

If the process is going well, who's participating?

And of course, any sort of challenges so that the board can make informed decisions on a going forward basis throughout the duration of the pilot and then ultimately any decisions after the three years.

So with that being said, next slide, I think this is the the last one.

Just to give everyone some dates.

This again, we would anticipate going to the board on December 9th and we would anticipate that the pilot would start in March of 2026 given the directors in the motion through March of 2029.

With that being said, I'm happy to take questions, concerns, comments, feedback.

And and I don't know if anyone from ISD wants to say anything or not not to put you on the spot.

VM Vega, Michelle 44:47
Are there?

MO Michael Owh 44:55
I think you said it all, but we're happy to be here and to support.

CT Caroline Torosis 45:00
Thanks and I do want to give a big thanks to Michael and also to Lawrence on Michael's team who's been really working with us on digging in.

Because again, if we're in pretty austere budget times, how do we create economic opportunity for our local residents through our purchasing power?

VM Vega, Michelle 45:19

Actually was going to ask a couple questions on that front.

So my my first question is I just wanted to get a little bit more clarification on potential cost impacts to the county if if we anticipate contracts might cost more to ensure local hiring etcetera.

So that was my first question.

CT Caroline Torosis 45:40

I think we don't know that at this point.

We know that there.

I don't know, Michael, if you want to say anything about the DPSS contract that you guys already procured that you had previously identified, and if you've been seeing any sort of increases in cost?

VM Vega, Michelle 45:52

S.

CT Caroline Torosis 45:55

But I I think that's why we're only choosing 5 contracts and we're doing this as a pilot.

There's some school of thought that you would assign additional points to during the solicitation if someone wanted to opt into this.

Rather than forcing them to.

And so I think there are ways to mitigate the potential cost impacts.

But Michael, if you had additional information, we'd be happy to refer to you.

MO Michael Owh 46:17

Yeah, I don't have the details on the DPSS contract in front of me.

However, we do not anticipate that the cost would be higher because, as Carolyn mentioned, the idea would be to create a section within the business proposal evaluation to give point the actual salaries that the vendors will be providing would be subject to what their what they decide to.

Provide it's really.

A.

A hiring program and not necessarily an increase in salaries.

VM Vega, Michelle 46:48

OK.

And then I wanted to ask because Directive 2, the the language and it reads, you know potential for the pilot would include requirements such as 30% of Labor hours performed by residents in tier one or one higher from the local community for every 500,000. What?

If it's not, what if those individuals are not available or they don't apply?

Are we boxing ourselves in by having language that that uses terms like requirements?

Especially if then the contracts potentially may be more expensive at a time when you know we are facing curtailments.

CT Caroline Torosis 47:28

Yeah. I mean, I think we could be amenable to softening that language.

The reason that we used the we're trying to make this as easy as possible and the Tier 1 Tier 2 ZIP codes is something that's already being used as a as like a standard definition for both our local and targeted worker hire policy, and the CWA, the one. Hire for every \$500,000 in contract value is part of the work. I think that the workgroup analyzed but.

You know, I think we we are fine with the best effort quote.

Requirement and having you know other steps that an individual can take after they've made best efforts.

VM Vega, Michelle 48:05

OK.

MO Michael Owh 48:05

Yeah. Yeah, Michel, I think the best efforts requirement gives you that flexibility to work with the vendor in those cases where it would be very difficult to identify in source candidate.

VM Vega, Michelle 48:20

OK.

Alright, that's on my end.

I don't know if SD one.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 48:29

Thanks. Thanks, Michelle, and thanks. Carolyn, you know that Super Sneeze was the champion for the local and targeted worker hire policies.

VM Vega, Michelle 48:30

Ask questions.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 48:37

So we were pleased to see that and we agree that this should be doable, but there's a lot of report backs in here and I just want to make sure that I'm understanding what is going to be due in the directive #1 because first we have like.

120 day come up with a plan, a pilot, and what it would look like, but then also in the same directive we have a 90 day report back for the solicitation list, the draft contract language.

And the implementation plan, which to me sounds like the whole plan.

So I wasn't clear on #1 like what the difference is between the 120 day report and the 90 day report in #1.

Can you explain that a little more?

CT Caroline Torosis 49:12

Yeah, I'm just reviewing the directive right now.

Yeah, I think.

The full pilot program design comes in 120 days, but I hear what you're saying that you don't feel that the 90 that solicitation list drop.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 49:30

What's the difference?

CT Caroline Torosis 49:32

Yeah, I believe, Michael, we changed the 120 days, the 90 days to 120 days in the first part. Based on your feedback.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 49:33
Yeah.

CT Caroline Torosis 49:41
I would refer to you if you think that you need more than 90 days in order to come up with the.
Proposed solution list.
I think we were envisioning that.
IST would propose the solicitation list.
We would discuss it.
They would come up with an implementation timeline and then fully implement the program or start implementing the program in 120 days.
But I I your point is well taken if you.

MO Michael Owh 50:04
That's the way I read it as well.

CT Caroline Torosis 50:06
Yeah. I mean, your point is well taken, Tammy.
I think we could make it more clear.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 50:10
OK.
Thank you. And I see that my teammate will cost us has a sign up.

CT Caroline Torosis 50:15
Great. Hi, wakaas.

RW Rehman, Waqas 50:17
Hi, Caroline.
Great motion. Thank you and.
Just one quick question on the same basis, one to clarify, there's not gonna be any

change or formal change to the policy itself, local and targeted higher as a result, right?

CT **Caroline Torosis** 50:34

No, absolutely not.

RW **Rehman, Waqas** 50:35

The policy stays OK and the other piece won't bring up was.

With the pilot, with the five big contracts, do we have a sense? Are they?

Read out throughout LA County.

There are specific to one area or typically DPSS another larger related contracts.

I don't think they're like that zip code specific, so just want to make sure like there is a broader sense.

I'm not saying like the pile should cover every corner of the county, but just an equitable selection of those big 5 as a pilot, so.

All zip codes.

Specifically, the underserved ZIP codes.

The crowd.

CT **Caroline Torosis** 51:18

Yeah, that's a great point.

I'm writing a note to myself.

We can make sure that we add something about like geographic diversity.

I think that some of these big contracts are covering local county, but some of them I if I I don't have the list up right in front of me.

But DHS also had a lot of the the large contracts, so we can just go back and you know, I will defer to Michael on which five make the most sense.

MO **Michael Owh** 51:41

Yeah. And I'll go back to the team and get more details, but the contracts and the departments that we've been in discussions with.

Tend to be larger and countrywide waco's.

So I think we should be able to meet the concern that you're raising or at least address the concern that you're raising.

RW **Rehman, Waqas** 52:00

Thank you, Caroline and Michael. Appreciate it.

VM **Vega, Michelle** 52:09

Any other questions from any board offices?

No. Are there any members of the public that would like to speak on this item?

Please raise your hand and Darty will call you.

Jordy, are you?

DC **Dardy Chen** 52:23

Alright. Yep, I don't see anyone.

VM **Vega, Michelle** 52:27

OK.

DC **Dardy Chen** 52:28

So.

VM **Vega, Michelle** 52:29

Wonderful. Then we can move on to the next item on our agenda, which is going to be item C from SD4, which is the potential development of the Rancho Los Amigos South campus.

Do we have representatives from SD4 to present?

SI **Sulic, Ivan** 52:46

Yes, Michelle, thank you. Ivan Sulek, homeless and housing deputy for Supervisor Hahn.

And in addition, my other hat field, deputy for the supervisor covering the Downey area.

And so this motion comes after some initial conversations with our amazing partner, who is the city of Downey, who has a really good foundation in the development of their city.

If for the my colleagues, individuals on the line, we have a property called Rancho South.

Which is a 70 acre piece of property which is in the lower part of imperial in the southernmost West part of Downey, which is used to be a part of the entire Ratchoulis amigos property. It is separate from the hospital and has been vacant for many, many years.

Within that area, a small portion, about 20 acres will be eventually touching the Southeast gateway line when it eventually.

One day comes through the Southeast cities and there will be a stop right there, the Garfield.

Stop. And so the city and city has had a want to develop that area to be a destination. Having housing there in addition to retail. And so this is merely the first step in allowing for the CEO to work with the city putting together.

Terms.

To then eventually come back to the board. And so that's what this motion seeks to do.

Do that initial first step.

VM Vega, Michelle 54:31

Thank you.

Are there any questions from any members of the board offices?

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 54:38

Hey Michelle, I have a couple questions.

I don't know what's going on with my camera, but I have a couple questions.

VM Vega, Michelle 54:40

Yep.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 54:43

Thanks Ivan.

I appreciate it.

Sounds really exciting.

I just wanted to make sure that it was clear to me like.

What space?

We're talking about because in the first two paragraphs of the preamble we

reference AA70 acre and then 172 acres and I'm not clear on what what piece of property you're talking about.

SI **Sulic, Ivan** 54:53

Yes.

OK.

It might allow to share my screen to maybe. Maybe I can clarify.

DC **Dardy Chen** 55:10

Yes, I'm it should be.

OT **Omoto-Frias, Tamela** 55:12

OK.

So so I don't.

DC **Dardy Chen** 55:12

You should be able to.

SI **Sulic, Ivan** 55:13

Oh.

OT **Omoto-Frias, Tamela** 55:13

I'm sorry I don't necessarily need to see the map.

I appreciate that, but I don't necessarily need to see it, but but I just mean in the preamble. The first sentence is Rancho Mingo.

SI **Sulic, Ivan** 55:16

OK.

OT **Omoto-Frias, Tamela** 55:21

South Campus is 70 acre property owned by the county and then the second paragraph says that it's approximately 172 acres of land.

SI **Sulic, Ivan** 55:23

Yes. Yeah.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 55:29

Is it? Is it 70 acres that we're talking about?

SI Sulic, Ivan 55:32

So 100.

So it's 100.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 55:33

That's in the 172.

SI Sulic, Ivan 55:34

100 so and and thank you for that.

Maybe I need to clarify.

So 170 is the whole thing. North and South campus and then the South Campus, which is just below Imperial, that is 70 acres.

But we're not talking about the entire 70 acres because on the South campus, you have the Downey Sports Complex. You have a couple of warehouses that are on long term contracts.

You have.

Rachel's Creek goes housing.

Project you know, for individuals who are seeing their family members, there's like little housing there run by the assistants league.

So it's not.

It's we're not going to be negotiating the entire South campus, just the southern utmost portion of the 70 acres, which is about 2020 acres of it, which will be touching the eventual SE gateway line of stock.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 56:28

So the 70 that you're talking about is, well, you said 20, but it's 62 acres of the 70 acres that we're looking at.

Because the 7062 is in the specific plan.

SI Sulic, Ivan 56:40

The specifics plan touches the entire S South campus, and that's not the entire area, which we're negotiating the potential development.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 56:51

OK. Can you take a look at the first two paragraphs of their motion and just make sure that it's it's clearer?

SI Sulic, Ivan 56:56

Sure.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 56:57

Thank you.

And then I have a few other questions.

Is the city of Downey going to follow the county's P3 policy?

Because that includes, like affordable housing, local targeted worker hire like we just talked about and also the project labor agreement and labor peace agreement that we just passed by motion last week.

SI Sulic, Ivan 57:12

Yes.

Yes.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 57:20

OK.

So all of that will be included in like the the the Ena or is that not, is it gonna be reflected in there?

SI Sulic, Ivan 57:24

Yeah, I think I think.

I don't know within the Ena, and I don't know if someone from COI think when we were initially discussing that with CEO real estate that we emphasize that that needs to be included in the eventual agreement in terms that will eventually come back to the board.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 57:45

OK.

So it's not gonna be in this document that that's that's gonna come. But the next document, but it it will be in there.

SI **Sulic, Ivan** 57:49

That's my that's that's my understanding that this just allows them to start negotiating and speaking to the city pertaining to the property and then a final agreement for approval will come which will have all the terms will come back to the board for approval.

OT **Omoto-Frias, Tamela** 58:04

OK.

The only because you know those are policies that are important. The board which have been approved by the board and want to make sure that all the projects we do, especially large big ones like this and this is going to be significant, right.

SI **Sulic, Ivan** 58:15

Absolutely.

OT **Omoto-Frias, Tamela** 58:16

A significant project that it meets all the policies as the board's already approved and then why is the county not doing the RFP but the city?

SI **Sulic, Ivan** 58:18

Mm-hmm.

That's that's a good question.

I think the supervisor in our office.

In, in seeing the leadership that the city has wanted to work together in allowing the city to take lead to sort of complement all the all the development that's going within the city.

But I I think it's not.

We're not going to be all removed from it. I think the county will still be involved, but I think our from our thought of our office is that we wanted to allow the city to take a lead.

In the development of this site, and the city has shown shown great interest also in working with us and taking the lead for it.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 59:02

OK.

And then we'll the board offices get to see the Ena before it gets approved for the delegated authority. Will that be shared?

SI Sulic, Ivan 59:15

I you know the I.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 59:17

Or can it be shared?

Maybe that's a different question.

SI Sulic, Ivan 59:19

Yeah, you know, I don't know the answer to that.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 59:19

Can it be shared?

SI Sulic, Ivan 59:22

Let me follow up with a CEO and then let me get back to you.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 59:25

OK. And then lastly.

JC Joyce Chang 59:26

Hi Ivan.

SI Sulic, Ivan 59:27

Oh joy.

JC Joyce Chang 59:28

Hi. Hi.

I'm sorry it's trace.

Yes, hi.

SI **Sulic, Ivan** 59:30

Oh, great. Joyce. Great you can.

JC **Joyce Chang** 59:33

Yes. So the Ena when it's ready to be signed, we will come back to get authority to get a signature. And at that time we can share the Ena with you, Tammy.

OT **Omoto-Frias, Tamela** 59:45

OK, good. And then is the city gonna take on like the responsibilities for like the liability insurance indemnity because we know that like with our projects, those become very costly.

So are they going to be taking on that costume?

SI **Sulic, Ivan** 59:59

That is my understanding that that is part of it.

JC **Joyce Chang** 1:00:01

Yes.

OT **Omoto-Frias, Tamela** 1:00:03

OK.

This is so exciting. Very exciting.

It's just that it, like I hadn't seen it like this before.

SI **Sulic, Ivan** 1:00:06

Mm-hmm.

OT **Omoto-Frias, Tamela** 1:00:08

We hadn't seen it.

Like what the city is going to be driving a lot of this. So just had some questions about board and county policies already.

SI **Sulic, Ivan** 1:00:12

Mm-hmm.

Yeah.

OT **Omoto-Frias, Tamela** 1:00:17

And then I know my my teammate will pass it on to Focas. Has any other questions?

RW **Rehman, Waqas** 1:00:24

Questions. Thank you, Tammy.

You covered it all. Great background, Ivan.

Love it.

Thank you everyone.

VM **Vega, Michelle** 1:00:32

Stop.

SI **Sulic, Ivan** 1:00:34

Thank you.

Thank you.

Yeah, we really see an opportunity here to for this area and for this Community that for many years, I mean it has been a vacant property which you know hasn't been a lot of liability. You know there have been fires, there have been, you know, other incidences so.

VM **Vega, Michelle** 1:00:36

Are there any other?

SI **Sulic, Ivan** 1:00:52

I think the the Community has wanted and so the supervisor of time to really develop this, especially with the the rail line eventually coming to make this a destination for the Community.

VM **Vega, Michelle** 1:01:08

OK. Are there any other questions from any of the board offices?

CT **Caroline Torosis** 1:01:12

I don't question but a comment.

Hey, it's Carolyn.

I I would just wholeheartedly agree with Tammy.

I think this is great. I think it's important. I would just say we have a Community benefits policy on these big P3 projects. Would hope that we're adhering to that and making sure that there's enough housing.

If if that's something that makes sense for the site and I just put a link to the policy that probably needs to be updated because this was before.

Our new economic opportunity department, but.

Just wanted to remind everyone of that. Thanks.

SI **Sulic, Ivan** 1:01:46

Thank you.

VM **Vega, Michelle** 1:01:51

OK.

DC **Dardy Chen** 1:01:52

Here.

VM **Vega, Michelle** 1:01:52

Any other questions from the board offices?

No. All right, Darde did.

Are there any members of the public that have signed up to speak?

DC **Dardy Chen** 1:02:01

Whether anyone here for speaking or if they want to speak, please raise your hand on teams or speak up.

Hey Cena, back to you chair.

VM **Vega, Michelle** 1:02:10

Wonderful. Thank you.

We will now move on.

SI **Sulic, Ivan** 1:02:12
Thank you everyone.

VM **Vega, Michelle** 1:02:14
To thank you. Thanks, Evan.
To our final board motion, which is from SD4, supporting the polluters pay Climate Superfund Act of 2025.
ST4.

HN **Holden, Nick** 1:02:32
Good afternoon. Operations cluster nicole den here to present on this bill.
And motion.
In my capacity as the legislative deputy for Supervisor Hans Office.
So this motion is focused on environment, air quality, climate change and legislative regulation.
That kind of wraps it all together.
Right now, the bills that have been identified are Senate Bill 684 and Assembly Bill 1243, which essentially establish the polluters pay Climate Superfund Act.
And because there's a fee associated with this, we need a motion to take any action.
And you might notice with the directives of this motion, it's very broad and open-ended.
It encompasses, you know, the actions and that create alignment with our county goals.
Values and priorities in this space and the reason for that is we don't wanna be too prescriptive with taking this action because we may be expecting heavy amendments or cutting amend actions that could change the intent of these specific bills.
So it's the language is drafted in a way that allows us to still take action, and if things do change, we can determine if it's still good for the county or not.
Or if these actions come up.
And another bill with another name that we can still take, you know, certain action swiftly without having to go through a process of motions and needing to.
Wait and see. So.
Essentially, the polluters pay Climate Fund Act is recognizing that for the most part of our last century, the carbon cost emissions have been socialized, while the profits

associated with oil and gas have been privatized.

So it's looking to not only address the current aspects of climate change and greenhouse gas emissions, but also looking at historical cost.

And it gets very complicated.

There's a lot of provisions.

That kind of specify who has to pay and why and.

Determining the amounts which is up in the air. But these two bills have essentially kind of stalled in their their policy committees.

And will be brought back in January, so that will be their next opportunity to be heard and for us to weigh in. And this will kind of be perfect timing for us to take these actions given you know what the the state may be doing in which dire.

The others are going in so so yeah.

With the Colluders pay legislation, we are looking to, you know, make sure that the county.

Can weigh in. I'm not too sure about any statute of limitations around motions and if. This motion would allow us to take the action next year or the following year because of that fee component and needing.

A.

You know, authority to take action, but it's it's it's drafted in a way that it would allow us to still have that flexibility and to move so.

So yeah, that's essentially the.

But just of the the motion and the bills, I see a hand from Caroline.

CT **Caroline Torosis** 1:06:03

Yeah, I mean, I understand that there was quite a bit of controversy around these bills in Sacramento at the end of last session and that there could be significant amendments in bringing them back or sorry, at the end of the last year of the two year session I.

Wondering why we didn't take the route to actually include it in our legislative agenda as a concept rather than giving this kind of broad authority before we've even seen what?

The bill amendments look like.

HN **Holden, Nick** 1:06:33

So in terms of amendments, we're we're not gonna really see anything there, but.

Fees and taxation are two areas that we don't necessarily have specific policy to take action because it can be so broad and we're not sure you know for any potential new fees or taxation bills which way that could go.

So I don't know if that's something that we could include in our legislative agendas or platforms.

But.

You know, we can certainly look into it as that process revamps and if there's ways to make it more efficient with this specifically in the environmental aspect, it would cover that aspect of it.

And I don't know if there's anyone from layer here, but they were notified about the motion in advance and gave feedback.

So they did include, you know, their expertise.

CT **Caroline Torosis** 1:07:27

I see Cameron's on camera now.

CG **Cameron Gil** 1:07:31

Yes, I can say that we did see and it does align with the environmental component does align with other things we've, we've acted on what is in platform and I can speak more to that side of it as well. If you do want.

CT **Caroline Torosis** 1:07:47

I'm curious to know Cameron if there's a possibility of us including, like amending our legislative platform to include this, even though there's a fee component rather than take up like have a board motion taking a specific position.

Oh, Angela has her hand up too.

AO **Angela Ovalle** 1:08:03

Hi, Carolyn.

So we're not.

We're actually not updating the legislative platform until.

CT **Caroline Torosis** 1:08:09

Next year, OK, OK, got it.

AO Angela Ovalle 1:08:09

Recess in 2026.

HN Holden, Nick 1:08:15

So this will be helpful for us to take action in until that opportunity arises for us to. You know, address gaps or shortfalls in the policy, we will have an opportunity to move and take advocacy positions in this way in a Broadway.

So it's not just these two pills. And if they change, it could be something else that, but that there's flexibility.

CT Caroline Torosis 1:08:41

And I would also want to know from Lara, like if they think it's advantageous for us to take a position right now before the the next year of the session has started and before we know exactly if and where this bill is moving these bills.

CG Cameron Gil 1:08:58

On that so.

We will next these bills will need to have a lot of action and I believe a month or a month and 1/2 time frame because they are keyed fiscal, they do have a little bit extra time as a second year bill, but it will happen really quickly.

We will likely see the amendments suddenly and can quickly at that point.

It would it.

That would be best to review those amendments likely.

Discuss with your offices and see how substantially it has changed at that point.

If it has changed the fee aspect, if it's changed the calculations, and if it's changed, how the funds that these bills would generate the funds that these bills would generate, how that would be allocated so.

It would likely be advantageous to continue to engage with the author's offices to see if they what they're expecting and actually see that imprint.

Before taking a stance because there may be something that the county would want to amend, depending on the nature of those amendments.

Because there's a lot of uncertainty with these bills itself and also other legal action from other states that have similar bills.

And what's going on over there?

Those states being New York and Vermont, to be clear.

HN Holden, Nick 1:10:12

Right. And and with these we we're not saying take action today. Go now that this motion is approved support these bills. It's more so an ability to engage with the authors to engage on amendments and to ensure that we're at the table 'cause right now we can't necess.

Really do much of anything in terms of engagement.

And correct me if I'm wrong with that but.

CT Caroline Torosis 1:10:41

That's helpful to hear that that we're not like immediately going to take any sort of position 'cause it does say support legislation, but it's like not clear that it wasn't clear to me that we weren't like immediately going to take a position. So thank you.

VM Vega, Michelle 1:10:58

Are there any other board offices that have questions or comments?

OK, I'm not seeing any.

Darty is anybody signed up for a public comment on this item?

DC Dardy Chen 1:11:09

Let's see anyone here for public comment. Please raise your hand on teams or speak up please.

All right.

See none.

Back to you chair.

VM Vega, Michelle 1:11:21

Great. OK. That was the last discussion item for today's pre holiday operations cluster meeting.

We don't have any presentations so it is 3/12 on November 26th and we can adjourn today's meeting.

Thank you to CEO and all the department staff and to the board offices for participating and presenting today right before the holiday.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 1:11:46
Thanks Michelle.

DC Dardy Chen 1:11:46
Here have a good one.

SK Shelton, Kirk 1:11:47
Thanks everybody.

VM Vega, Michelle 1:11:47
Thanks everybody.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 1:11:47
Thanks everyone.

DC Dardy Chen 1:11:48
Everyone. Take care. Bye.

VM Vega, Michelle 1:11:48
Have a great holiday. OK, bye bye.

SG Schauerman, Grant 1:11:50
Think so?

VM Vega, Michelle 1:11:52
Yes, I'm done.

DC Dardy Chen 1:11:54
You done officially.

VM Vega, Michelle 1:11:54
And I still have to do board agenda.
Oh sorry guys.
I'm ready to call it.

DC **Dardy Chen** 1:12:01

That's all the transcription, Michelle.
Come on.

● **Caroline Torosis** stopped transcription