



Community
Economic
Resilience
Fund

Backbone Support & Governance Meeting 2

Agenda + Minutes

Thursday, July 14, 2022; 12 pm to 2 pm via Zoom

Agenda

- I. **Welcome and Introductions** (~10 mins)
 - Evan begins at 12:04 pm with thanking everyone for joining and supporting the effort.
 - Attendees joining for the first time introduce themselves. Others introduced themselves via zoom chat.
- II. **Meeting 1 Recap** (~5 mins)
 - Isa shares an abbreviated overview of the previous meeting.
- III. **Overview of Proposed Governance Structure** (~30 mins)
 - Isa shares the proposed governance structure and the various components.
- IV. **Initial Q&A + Reflections** (~30 mins.)
 - Feedback on Proposed Governance
 - Q: For the committees, is there a goal set in mind? Are they producing a report?
 - A: The specifics of that would be for the committee to determine. They each have their area of activity to explore but in terms of actual projects and how they communicate their findings to the Leadership Council, that will be shaped by the committee itself.
 - Comment: Strong work on this Isa and team! Really good structure!
 - First great work on this. I would like to heavily advocate for the Leadership Council to provide more weight to disadvantaged communities. Right now there is equal distribution instead of equitable distribution. A possible change would be to bring the representatives to the other 2 categories (subregions and committees) down to 10 and boosting up the other category.
 - To get this onto 4 pages is pretty impressive. I'd like to echo the comment about increasing the number of disinvested community members and reducing the number of the other two categories. Some of the smaller subregions may have a lot of overlap with the same people holding multiple positions which would maybe provide us a way to work through that.
 - Maybe we could increase the number of representatives on the Leadership Council? If it makes the Council more diverse. For example, may be someone who doesn't exactly fit those categories but would be a great fit.
 - For the subregions, could there be some flexibility in the Phase 2 subregion representation? For example, sometimes Yolo County is grouped with Sacramento MSA but other times it is grouped with Yuba & Sutter. Sometimes

our needs fit best with the Sacramento MSA subregion but other times they fit best with Yuba & Sutter.

- Q: What is the timeline?
 - A: 18- 24 months for the planning phase
- Q (from Chat): Nice job! Where would rural communities fit categorically - disinvested communities and/or part of Sacramento MSA (at least those within SACOG)?
 - A: May fit into both, or they may fit into the Truckee-Tahoe Basin Region, Yuba-Sutter Counties, and Colusa County subregions.
- Comment (from Chat): Maybe we have a range for the Leadership Council 8-10 from regions, 8-12 from committees and 12-15 from under-represented - to be determined when we get the funding and move forward
- Q: Will Valley Vision be a member of the Leadership Council and have a vote? Or do you see yourselves only as facilitators? If Valley Vision was to be a part of the Leadership Council, that would bring us to an odd number and maybe help break a tie.
 - A: We haven't quite thought that through yet. We may have a vote. We have to be able to carry out our responsibilities as Regional Convener so in that sense we need to make sure we are protected in decision making to be able to contribute our perspectives. I feel like we would be a voting member but at the same time, really trying to hold true to a space to bring about the collaboration of ideas and not overpower that.
- I definitely think there's going to need to be some delibere outreach and recruitment for us to make sure we're including all of those categories of stakeholders for the Collaborative.
- Comment (from Chat): You're doing most of the heavy lifting, so I think Valley Vision should have a say.
- Comment (from Chat): I also think monthly meetings are too much. Would suggest changing the language to be meet bi-monthly to monthly (depending on stage, agenda needs and strategy). Plus the committees will likely be meeting monthly, so some of the same people and we don't want to burn out folks too early.
- Comment (from Chat) in regards to meeting frequency: "minimum every two months".
- Q: Will there be a process to review this structure during the planning phase and change it if necessary?
 - A: That would definitely be a good thing to write into the timeline. We definitely want to make sure a review is done.
- In regards to the timeline, we could be flexible in case there are things that needed to be continued into the 3rd quarter from the first two quarters
- Q: Will those who are in the HRTC enter into a MOU so that Valley Vision can meet their obligations and the requirements of the CERF. That could be one way Valley Vision has input and be in service of the HRTC.

- A: Yes, we've already started creating some templates for VV being in service to the HRTC, including those on committees and funding needed for some orgs to participate in meetings.
- Q: How often will the Council meet in-person?
 - A: It would be nice to meet at least once to twice a year in person if we choose to change from monthly meetings to bi-monthly meetings. The location could rotate between the subregions.
- Recapping the concerns surfaced and possible ways to address them:
 - Concern: Membership Number for Disinvested Communities (Equitable vs. Equal)
 - a) Possible Solution: maybe we have a range for the Leadership Council 8-10 from regions, 8-12 from committees and 12-15 from under-represented - to be determined when we get the funding and move forward
 - Concern: Flexibility for Meeting Frequency
 - a) Possible Solution: Bi-monthly meetings w/ ability to call additional meetings as needed
 - Concern: Flexibility for Subregions
 - a) Possible Solution: Allowing certain counties such as Yolo to move between subregions as needed or to have representatives in both subregion groups
 - Concern: Making sure there is a review process for the governance structures written in
 - a) Possible Solution: Write a review into the timeline
 - Concern: VV's relationship to the Collaborative and whether or not VV will be a voting member
 - a) Possible Solutions: Being a voting member on the Leadership Council or MOU Agreements
- Any Other Concerns?
- Need more time to review and make more meaningful contributions to this. I acknowledge that this is a quick timeline but I feel like I'm giving input into something that is already fermented... Can we see the values one more time so I can see how they are aligning with the structure?
 - Response: Thanks for bringing the timeline up. We really do understand that this is a short timeline, not only on your end, but for us as well. I'd love to think about how we can provide some additional time for input while also meeting the deadline. I also want to emphasize that none of this is set in stone and that we will be able to revisit creating these foundations in the planning phase.
- Comment (in the chat), regarding the time for input: I agree with that
- One thing that could be added to the values is some language regarding the value of culture and how we will engage the communities in their language and meet their cultural needs. I don't see those and I would like to see more weight given to that.

- For the values, I want to acknowledge there is a difference between Environmental sustainability vs. Environmental Justice. Using the CalEnviro Screen is about Justice
- Q: : Is there language around committees and their budgeting autonomy?
 - A: Right now we're using very broad buckets for budgeting. We want to allow this to be more informed by the planning phase to really meet people's needs. We'll talk about this more in the application. But certainly, there will be an opportunity for those budgets to be informed by the committees during the planning process.
- Comment (From the chat): I like having environmental justice added, but please do not use CalEnviroScreen as a criteria as it does not represent rural areas very well.

V. Next Steps (~ 5 mins.)

- Evan gives an overview of the Collective Partnership Agreement Letter.

VI. Modified Consensus Discussion (~30 mins)

- Consensus: Five Fingers - 13, Three Fingers - 1, 2 Fingers - 1
- How do we have accountability for this? I don't see any accountability for how we will make sure groups will be included, how we will actually apply these values. If we don't get this representation, will we just move forward without them?
- Comment (in chat): Perhaps those in the still have concerns category can work with Isa and team on the final governance document and have it ready for full committee review by end of day tomorrow or Monday?
 - A: The CPA will be an abbreviated version of this which we absolutely have to get out tomorrow. But we will include the feedback we have here in that abbreviated version and our application. Maybe we can continue to work with this committee throughout the application.
- Comment: It seems like a lot of money but once it is spread across regions. I'm really interested to see how we can leverage the Collaborative to go after the large dollars and make a bigger impact on our region.

VII. Closing Remarks (~ 5 mins.)

- Meeting ends at 1:11 pm.