CJF Thrive Inland SoCal, Phase 2 Strategy Development

**West End SRT Reviewer Group: FEEDBACK ON DRAFT REGIONAL ECONOMIC PLAN**
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## Summary Overview:

We appreciate the hard work that went into the consultants’ analysis. We request that the report take a few steps back to rethink the criteria with which the sectors were chosen so that the clear community feedback is reflected in the assumptions, values, and priorities of all of the stakeholders. We have made some suggestions below.

While we recognize that data might suggest that certain tradable sectors may have a multiplier effect that is a few percentage points higher, we believe the feedback from stakeholders would be better met with a model that prioritizes how local goods and services supply can meet community demand. This would result in a slightly different industrial profile than the one suggested, emphasizing how place-based strategies and circular economic opportunities can replace waste and emissions generation in our passthrough region. Instead of an emphasis on tradable sectors, we would like to develop sectors that are tied to place and that cannot be exported, which can add to the distinctiveness of the Inland region.

The West End reviewer committee as well as the full body of the sub-regional table was quite disappointed with the structure of the plan and the emphasis on “sustainable supply chain” which the group perceived as a greenwashing of the same emphasis on logistics that has plagued our region and caused environmental and community harm. So much so that the full SRT took a formal group decision to direct the West End vote on the IPC to reject this plan if the “sustainable supply chain” section and organization of the full report is not sufficiently reframed and reorganized.

This concern is rooted in a basic understanding that the problems of bad jobs and negative environmental impact are built into the current system of goods movement that exists in the region and cannot be mitigated by establishment of new facilities that have better practices. The limited resources available through this process cannot be used to attract or incubate new logistics activity, no matter how clean or high road. These resources must rather be used to directly change the practices of existing logistics operations,creating systems to internalize environmental impacts and improve jobs without subsidizing global corporations. No state resources must be used to subsidize companies with labor violations or unfair labor practices. Companies should be incentivized to reach “community benefits agreements” with impacted areas to mitigate negative effects on health, infrastructure, displacement, etc. More detail can be found in section 2.e. below.

Once there is more transparency and agreement on the chosen sectors based on criteria that the community stakeholders agree on, we suggest that the “wealth building” categories be integrated with the industries so that each sector reflects the specific needs that are required for each sector to thrive.

## General feedback

### Structure & Organization

#### VISION AND VALUES:

The report should begin with a statement of values and innovative vision that includes multi-benefit approaches and inspires community engagement, not business as usual.

* + - 1. Involving community stakeholders in development decisions, especially land use planning. Equitable economic development means doing things differently. Transparency is key.
      2. Include mechanisms for Community Benefit Agreements that incentivize developers to work with stakeholders to contribute to capacity building and locally defined requirements
      3. Encourage Project Labor Agreements, labor friendly policies - including right to organize, neutrality agreements/card checks, bright lines against inviting anti-union employers into the region, and processes for improving non-union jobs that protect collective action.
      4. project into the next 10 years and include “robustness” checks; ensure economic and community resilience if economic shocks hit particular industries. Economic diversification that serves regional needs is the best way to ensure resilience against external shocks.
      5. take climate change and infrastructural readiness into account while reducing carbon and pollution emissions
      6. ensure value, profit, and equity ownership stays in our region. Encourage local ownership as a top priority. incentivize innovative ownership structures that distribute wealth to workers and community stakeholders.
      7. innovation & technology - integration with university research & tech transfer

#### INTEGRATE INDUSTRIAL POLICY WITH WEALTH-BUILDING:

industrial policy and wealth-building sections should be integrated, incorporating the specific needs customized for each industry for childcare, social and cultural capital, wealth building, land use choices, training, career pathways, opportunities to integrate marginalized populations, economic opportunity, etc.

### Framing

* + 1. Relegating the “community wealth building” to the second section has had the effect - though we recognize this was not the intention - of community perceiving they are not valued, that industry benefits will be prioritized as historical evidence has shown, and their needs will not be addressed. We recognize that this is NOT the intent, but this is the impact.
    2. Further emphasis is needed on original goals of the state initiative - high-road jobs, equity, and climate - in each sector. Priorities from participating CJF agencies and suggested responses for inclusion are listed below:
       1. **Director of the Governor’s Office of Planning & Research - LAND USE**: promoting alignment with General Plan guidelines and land use policies
          1. more attention is needed to land use policies, how the footprint of logistics sector is pricing out affordable housing and alternative uses.
          2. more attention is needed to how land use decisions are made at the municipal and county level. While we understand that municipal decisions are beyond the scope of CJF, this report has the potential to influence incentive structures and define a development culture based on “place” that will move the region toward common goals.
       2. **Secretary of the California Natural Resources Agency - BEYOND CLEAN TECH**: representing nature-based solutions and clean energy industries
       3. **Secretary of the California Department of Food and Agriculture - IMPORTANCE OF LOCAL FOOD SHEDS**: representing the agriculture industry
          1. While we recognize that traditional agriculture as historically practiced does not generate high quality jobs on average, there are ways to preserve agricultural capacity in the region which will be lost if not attended to.
          2. UCR ag research and resources should be utilized to weave capacity and potential for high-road jobs across the region
          3. Agricultural land trusts could serve to preserve rich fertile land that could serve regional needs without relying on external distribution networks.
       4. **Secretary of the California Environmental Protection Agency**: representing the circular economy
          1. agency language mentions the circular economy, how regional outputs can be used as regional inputs.
          2. limit truck traffic and emissions
       5. **Secretary of the California Health & Human Services Agency**: representing the healthcare industry and promoting jobs for disabled and disadvantaged workers
       6. **Secretary of the California Department of Veterans Affairs**: representing the more than 1.6 million former service members that reside in the state
       7. **President of the Public Utilities Commission**: representing opportunities to advance California’s clean energy workforce of the future and economic opportunities for communities
    3. Each of these categories of representation at the state level for CJF has untapped potential in the identification of projects, resources, and directions that align directly with the call and that could place the West End region in a leadership position not only regionally but at the state level. Right now, much of the Inland Valley’s growth, especially in logistics, is an example of what not to do. For example, as logistics-based warehousing expands into the Central Valley, planners utilize the Inland Empire as a cautionary tale.

### Messaging

* + 1. Messaging should emphasize the key assets of the region: a hardworking populace, commitment to just working conditions and a clean environment, willingness to embrace change, the asset of land and rich soil, the idea of interconnection. The West End should become a gateway of innovation and ideas instead of or in addition to goods. It should be a gateway to diversification and transition in energy, water, waste, and nature-based solutions.
    2. Messaging should emphasize the **values chosen by the group** that mirror the Governor’s call: this includes nature-based solutions, circular economies, innovative land uses, all of which need to be emphasized through choices and examples within the document.
    3. Messaging should emphasize how we take detriments and actively turn them into opportunities. Sustainable supply chain is basically a greenwashing ploy rather than true transformation. The plan must address the excess capacity in the logistics industry and the hold that warehouse developers have on municipal and county decision-makers. Language and messaging should emphasize repurposing warehouse infrastructure to bolster a new, circular economy for transformative effects. The report must address how to utilize what we have already have to reshore the economy, provide local jobs and prosperity, including an acknowledgement of severe detrimental effects on the health of the workforce and community.
    4. We want to set the criteria for our own alignment with the state’s goals in a way that anticipates and responds to the needs of future generations.

### Assumptions

much greater transparency is needed to clarify the assumptions that undergird the interpretation of data and how decisions to emphasize certain sectors and strategies were made

* + 1. evaluative criteria for choosing sectors need to be defined by our group and we would like to see more unpacking of underlying assumptions.
    2. tradable sectors vs other models - the emphasis on tradeable sectors was handed down from consultants without an opportunity to discuss this as a criteria for chosen sectors. Each sector must lay out a much more detailed rationale:
       1. data sources and uses, ripple effects on high-quality jobs vs detrimental effects
       2. public dollars - impact of bringing in funds
       3. public workers
       4. policy levers and incentive structures
       5. inflection points where sector growth becomes dynamic & self-reinforcing
    3. As an alternative to the emphasis on tradeable sectors, the group recommends greater attention to matching supply and demand for services as economic drivers
       1. nurturing small businesses that meet regional demand, pathways for growth, access to capital and services
       2. adding health care sector to sector list - HEALTHCARE WORKFORCE
          1. Health/Social Services: 1,321,400 workers - up 6,600 in a month and 67,400
          2. Logistics/utilities: 799,800 workers - up 1,000 in a month, but down 2,600 in a year
          3. Manufacturing: 565,000 workers - down 1,200 in a month and down 9,800 in a year
          4. Professional-business services: 1,123,300 workers - down 1,400 in a month and down 19,600 in a year
          5. these numbers are for southern California which contains SB, Riverside, LA and OC current as of April
          6. good health care has greater ripple effects - good place to retire, brings in wealth, domestic spending power and demand

### CONVERTING SUPPLY CHAIN INDUSTRY

The group recommends removing the “sustainable supply chain” section and treating it as a different section, not in a sector to emphasize. There has been widespread agreement among community stakeholders on this point, which has been repeatedly dismissed by consultants

* + 1. rationale: This concern is rooted in a basic understanding that the problems of bad jobs and negative environmental impact are built into the current system of goods movement that exists in the region and cannot be mitigated by establishment of new facilities that have better practices. The limited resources available through this process cannot be used to attract or incubate new logistics activity, no matter how clean or high road. These resources must rather be used to directly change the practices of existing logistics operations,creating systems to internalize environmental impacts and improve jobs without subsidizing global corporations.
       1. No state resources must be used to subsidize companies with labor violations or unfair labor practices.
       2. Companies should be incentivized to reach “community benefits agreements” with impacted areas to mitigate negative effects on health, infrastructure, displacement, etc.
       3. Projects should clean up the logistics jobs that are already here. That is the only appropriate use of state resources in engaging with this sector. Other action is merely creating small projects that are outstripped by the billion square feet of logistics space in the region and the millions more slated to be built in the coming decades.
    2. This specifically means building in the following measures:
       1. Creation or support of projects like Plug in IE, focused on transitioning warehouses with good union jobs into sites of innovation with electric vehicles and operations - which we recognize is mentioned in the draft plan, and support. These projects can focus on bringing historically disadvantaged groups into occupations in the high tech areas that we believe are the long term logistics jobs that will benefit local residents.
       2. Establishment of healthy community standards through negotiation of community benefits agreements in areas impacted by warehouses. Requiring employers to engage directly with their neighbors and make sure the profits of these facilities are returned to the communities in the area through local hire, infrastructure support and environmental mitigation create massive benefits in terms of health, economic opportunity and livelihood for local communities.
       3. Requirement that employers receiving state resources have no labor violations including unfair labor practices, health and safety violations or wage theft. In addition, we would want to see a limitation on use of staffing agencies as the vehicle for employing workers in these facilities, given their role in creating tiers of exploited and underpaid workers that destabilizes the regional labor market. These are indicators of poor working conditions and union-busting that cannot be tolerated in our region.
    3. language in other sectors sounds like it’s all in service of logistics
    4. report must acknowledge significant excess capacity and turn attention to alternative uses of excess space. supply has outstripped demand (we have 17 years worth of warehouses in the pipeline, and many warehouses remain vacant entirely or have high percentage vacancy)
    5. Report must acknowledge need for economic resilience to shocks in the logistics and distribution sector, emphasize robustness of regional economy that demands diversification .

### language & accessibility -

the report must reduce jargon, spell out acronyms, and avoid industry terms that community members would not recognize

### process concerns -

the lack of community/IPC involvement in the choice of the sectors and even the criteria with which they were chosen is a huge problem.

## Feedback on specific sections

### Integrated table of contents for each industrial sector

Each sector in the industry list should include the following categories, specific to each industry cluster (this section could be considered a table of contents for each sector), helping to justify its inclusion:

* + 1. data sources and references
    2. clear criteria and ripple effects
       1. what are the policy levers in play?
       2. transparency on which industrial sectors are being used to define the sector
       3. jobs - permanent, temporary, construction jobs
    3. union issues, and pathways to improve job quality
    4. career pathways, workforce development
    5. support services, e.g. childcare, transportation, accessibility
    6. future projections - demonstrate job growth
    7. metrics
    8. implementation issues & plans
       1. policy issues
       2. regulation issues
       3. political context
       4. stakeholders and decision makers, professional/industry associations
    9. integration between sectors
    10. **impact on public health - demonstrated positive impact or must not be pursued (aggregate all relevant industrial codes)**
    11. **impact on equity - demonstrated positive impact or must not be pursued (aggregate all relevant industrial codes)**
    12. **impact on local wealth building, keeping value creation in the region, keeping equity ownership stakes in the region**

### Sectors feedback

#### advanced manufacturing -

we like this section

#### business services -

this section is important, and need to emphasize regional needs

#### Clean tech / climate technology -

this is a critical section

#### “sustainable supply chain” -

should be REMOVED OR REWORDED to reflect economic diversification, transformation, and proposals for dealing with current and future excess capacity, resilience to economic shocks, implementation of labor reforms along with health and safety, etc. See section in general feedback section above.

#### ADDITIONS

* + - 1. HEALTH CARE
      2. ARTS & CULTURE - ask Carolyn for aggregated workforce data
      3. ENTREPRENEURSHIP & SMALL BUSINESS

#### “wealth building”

##### development of job opportunities for disinvested populations

* + - * 1. undocumented/ITIN holders
        2. formerly incarcerated
        3. youth
        4. indigenous/original stewards

##### streamlined process for all businesses to get the licensure and legal advice they need.

##### access to equity capital

need a section to address access to equity capital investment (a.k.a. “community development venture capital”) that builds capital resources in our region and preserves regional ownership.

## RAW NOTES FROM PARTICIPANTS

*“I think the pages on "Sustainable Supply Chain" are a non-starter and do not reflect the realities imposed by the massive build up of warehouses in greater Ontario. I feel like this section is perhaps written by "outsiders" who are not from the "real world", who do not have diesel trucks running down their neighborhood streets all day long. The possible jobs listed are not great in number, the possible sources of information are not weighed toward the concerns of the community and do not address the undue influence of developers on City Government.*

*The suggestion of helping small businesses move to zero emission vehicles by talking to them is silly. Subsidizing or purchasing new trucks is the only way to accomplish this, costing far more than this group has to spend. Increasing solar panel rooftop installations is already being done by City or AQMD initiatives.*

*The environmental impact of logistics in our area is already overwhelming and should not be further encouraged.” - Ray Smith, South Ontario resident, SRT participant*

**Notes from May 2 SRT meeting, breakout group feedback and group decisions**

**WSB SRT Strategy Review Meeting Raw Notes**

The following are the raw notes by Carolyn Schutten during the online portion of the hybrid SRT meeting conversation around strategy review as well as notes from Breakout 1. Three individuals in the breakout room (3) included the following affinity groups: business and business services, CBO, and residents. All of Breakout 1 attendees were from the healthcare sector, and they primarily discussed one strategy: Pathways to quality jobs in healthcare.

**SRT Meeting general review notes on the structure and presentation of strategies, strategic development overall, and notes regarding the regional plan**

* Reviewers indicated that the strategy summaries appeared to reflect the research and data perspectives more than community engagement conversations
* Categories are broad which is okay, but categories are “not what we are looking for”, “not what we asked for”
* Categories are fine, but reviewers did not want logistics included or emphasized
* Reviewers wanted to see new a new priority list that highlighted community input alongside a plan for de-densifying and/or repurposing warehouses
* One reviewer recommended an oral histories effort in the West End
* Reviewers recommended reorganizing the strategies around community goals
* Need to address the transition away from logistics
* Also need to plan for places people want to live in, stay, thrive, so we don’t lose talent

**Business services**

* Reviewers wanted to emphasize businesses and Main Street businesses as well as access to education and training
* “We need new businesses”

**Cleantech**

* Reviewers recommended emphasizing cleantech
* Reviewers indicated an interest in transitioning warehouses to cleantech industry

**Sustainable supply chains**

* Reviewers did not want logistics industry emphasized - [KM added: group decision taken to direct the West End vote on the IPC to reject this plan if the “sustainable supply chain” section and organization of the full report is not sufficiently reframed and reorganized]
* Reviewers did not like how all the sectors seemed to support logistics in the plan
* Breakout 2 discussed not investing in Amazon, and attendees agreed that local businesses could prosper more from investment
* Questions to be explored:
  + How can we repurpose warehouses to include cleantech goals and green manufacturing?
  + How can we use warehouses for small business, wellness?
  + How can warehouses be converted to ecovillages with access to mental health, financial health, etc.?
  + How can warehouses become mixed use sites that support community and business?

**Pathways to quality jobs in healthcare**

* Need full time paid internships
* Examine current policy
* Address lack of early career support among health workers
* Increase access and advocacy for workers as well as customers
* Utilize Good Morning Ontario to get the word out
* The health care sector should be a priority sector
* Question to be explored:
  + How do we grow our own health care in the region?
  + How do we prevent the loss of trained health care workers who abandon the region?

**Notes from April 30 Review Committee**

1. Use more accessible language throughout the document. Community will be disengaged by the jargon. Needs to be more user friendly. It can be a problem to those who we are trying to help most.
2. Use of Acronyms without explanation, even in the reviewer guide.
3. It was internally decided by the researchers what sectors would be focused on. We need to know what assumptions these started with, what theories did they base this on. We never had an opportunity to discuss as a collaborative what the criteria are for making the choices.
4. Sustainable supply chain is an oxymoron
5. We are seeing the effects of past policy decisions are coming to fruition now, and it seems we are being given the same information and communities have not been listened to, especially on warehousing.
6. In the tradable industry clusters, all of them are in support of supply chain, further exacerbating our issues with logistics. The very idea of tradable clusters imply that materials need to be trucked in to be made into products that will then be shipped out of the region – all through the logistics sector.
7. This is not new thinking and it is the same cookie cutter approach that has been around since the 1990’s. There is an upside-down quality to this. Be very clear about why sectors were chosen.
8. It makes sense to prioritize clean tech jobs and health care jobs, which have high wages and large demand.
9. We need to be able to generate money within our own area rather than hoping we trade things outside our region, and until someone outside can do it cheaper, and then we lose.
10. Projects and Sector hashed this out last fall, how to select projects which community said was important, local ownership was important. This creates a more resilient, robust economy.
11. We were not involved in the criteria for the sectors.
12. Brookings is working in multiple regions across the state, but they need to use our rubric, not a preconceived or prepared rubric.
13. How do we reorient the whole report. Use the rubric from Project & Sectors. Incentivize insourcing, local ownership, diversify away from logistics.
14. We need to have more entrepreneurial efforts embedded in all the industry clusters. We don’t want to be dependent on larger companies. Keeping ownership local is a top-of-the-list priority in all sectors and recommendations.
15. Need to call out Community Benefit Agreements in all recommendations
16. Reorganize as follows:
    1. Advanced Manufacturing – keep with revisions
    2. Business Services – rework it, take out all mention of supply chain, focus on entrepreneurship
    3. Cleantech – Keep, rework to make it more focused on our young, upcoming workforce
    4. Sustainable Supply Chains – Remove
    5. Health Workforce – moves to the Top list
    6. Focus: Entrepreneurial ecosystem for high-growth startups and Main Street businesses
17. each industry section should include customized issues and plan for
    1. Equitable Childcare
    2. Workforce Housing
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**AI notes from 4/30 Reviewer meeting**

| **Next steps** • Stephanie will prepare for the next Governance Committee meeting to discuss the organization and prioritization of sectors in the report. | |
| --- | --- |
| **AI Summary - Review Committee Discusses Plan and Organization** | |
| The review committee, consisting of Karen, Stephane, Diana, and others, discussed various topics including a discussion document. The main focus was on reviewing a plan from the Brookings Institution, with Karen presenting a calendar slide and seeking feedback from the committee. The group also discussed the organization of the sector and the focus areas identified. It was agreed that calendar invites would be the preferred method for meeting notifications going forward. | |
| **Strategy Summaries Feedback and Review Plan** | |
| Karen proposed discussing how to provide feedback on the strategy summaries - either going through each section collectively, or having individuals provide feedback on each section. The group leaned towards the individual approach. Karen emphasized the need for a holistic feedback section on the overall structure and framing of the document, expressing concerns particularly around the sustainable supply chain sector. She suggested scheduling another review committee meeting after the upcoming Thursday meeting to consolidate all feedback, both section-by-section and holistic. The plan was to present a status update on the review process at the Thursday meeting, with one member potentially reporting out. Stephane volunteered to give this status update. | |
| **Improving Plan Accessibility and Comprehensibility** | |
| The team discussed their concerns about the accessibility and comprehensibility of the plan. Chris and Stephane highlighted the need for user-friendly language, and Diana agreed to take notes to better understand the plan. Karen requested that Cristina repost the reviewer packet in the chat for Jamie, who missed the initial distribution. The team also discussed the challenges posed by the use of acronyms and agreed to add this issue to their list of accessible language strategies, which included spelling out the first occurrence of acronyms. | |
| **Refining Economic Focus and Addressing Concerns** | |
| Karen presented the results of surveys conducted at various locations, which yielded 15 suggestions for overcoming barriers and focusing on four economic sectors: industry clusters, advanced manufacturing, business services, and clean tech. However, concerns were raised about the internal decision-making process, with Chris and Diana pointing out that policies based on warehousing and a 'sustainable supply chain' could negatively impact the local community. The team discussed the need to reframe the discussion to accurately reflect their project's scope and agreed to reject the current definition of 'tradable industries'. Instead, they proposed adding the healthcare sector, which they noted as having high growth potential and a need for trained workers. The team suggests incentivizing certain industries and generate revenue within their region. | |
| **Addressing Project Selection and Ownership** | |
| Karen raised concerns about the current criteria for project selection in the Projects and Sectors Committee, particularly the lack of consideration for local ownership and equity investment resources. Stephane questioned the relevance of their input if it wasn't being used, while Chris questioned the logic of being asked for data if it wasn't being considered. Karen proposed that the subregional table could reject the current organization and criteria of the sector evaluation. The group also discussed who was paying for the work done and agreed on the need for changes and the rewriting of the plan, emphasizing the importance of local ownership and diversity. They decided to propose an alternative plan and seek more input from the Inclusive Planning Council. | |
| **Improving Board Representation and Addressing Tensions** | |
| Karen, Diana, Stephane, and Chris discussed the need for more representation on their board and the importance of their committees in ensuring their collective voice is heard. They also referred to a previous meeting where tensions were high and problems such as a lack of direction were not being addressed effectively. Karen and Stephane agreed that these issues should be included in the agenda for the Governance Committee, with Diana emphasizing the need for positive action rather than just negativity. The group also recognized a need to better organize their suggestions. | |
| **Revising Priorities and Diversifying the Economy** | |
| Stephane, Diana, Karen, and Chris discussed the current organization and priorities of their business services. Stephane and Diana raised concerns about the relevance of various topics such as cybersecurity and warehouse management, suggesting that some sectors could be replaced or revised. Karen emphasized the integration of all sectors into logistics as a problem and proposed reintegrating certain priorities, like entrepreneurship. The group agreed that they should focus on independent business and entrepreneurship rather than catering to larger companies. Karen also expressed concern about fair project labor and community benefit agreements and the need for local ownership. Chris suggested referring to a document from a previous Projects and Sectors Committee meeting for guidance, which Karen confirmed should be the basis for the stock. Karen further highlighted the need to diversify the region's economy to improve resilience, as it is currently heavily reliant on logistics. | |
| **Addressing Decline, Entrepreneurship, and Sustainability** | |
| Stephane, Chris, Diana, and Karen discussed the decline of traditional industries, its impact on the local economy, and the need for a shift towards advanced manufacturing and entrepreneurship. They proposed inviting a legislator to their next meeting to discuss the issue from an environmental justice perspective. The team prioritized issues based on their importance and feasibility, emphasizing the interrelationship between access to childcare, education, and training, building cultural and social capital, and improving housing and health workforce. They agreed to revise their plans to better address these issues, with a focus on sustainability, and considered strategies such as affordable housing in job market areas and integrating healthcare. | |
| **Sustainable Supply Chains and Climate-Resilient Buildings** | |
| Stephane, Karen, and Chris discussed the concept of sustainable supply chains, concluding that the term was a contradiction in terms. They debated the idea of converting warehouses into climate-resilient buildings, with Stephane and Karen suggesting that existing land might be better utilized for housing. The team agreed to build consensus on their upcoming report and to consider the influence of the Iep on decision-making processes. A one-page summary of the meeting was planned for distribution the following Thursday. | |
| *AI-generated content may be inaccurate or misleading. Always check for accuracy.* | |