



Sierra Jobs First Transition & Future Planning Process

Transition Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #1

SUMMARY NOTES

October 29, 2025 | 2-3pm

TAC Members

Tribal: Travis Nabahe, Nabahe Global Group (not present)

ESCOG: Elaine Kabala, ESCOG

Rec & Tourism: Mat Galvan, Sierra Focus Media

Healthcare: Dr. Jen Burrows, Jen Burrows Consulting

Rec & Tourism: John Wentworth, MLTPA Foundation

Agriculture, Natural & Working Lands, Healthcare: Alex Bloom, Mother Lode Job Training (not present)

Facilitation: Seana Doherty, Agnew::Beck

Notes: Kaela Frank and Heather Hawkins, Sierra Business Council

SUMMARY NOTES

TAC Roles

- Intentional naming of "Transition and Future Planning," because it may not be a transition, added the word "future," because we may decide to memorialize the work we did together, or there may be something that emerges, yet to be determined
 - Role of Governing Council: Technically the decision making body for Sierra Jobs First, will have stamp of approval on outcomes of this process but recommendations from TAC will be critical.
 - Industry Coordinators: Critical leaders in this process right now, your recommendations will be going to the Governing Council for stamp of approval.
- Agnew::Beck started interviewing TAC members

- Agnew::Beck was introduced to all the other coordinators for CJF regions, and will bring their input back to the TAC

Input received so far

- Agnew::Beck completed 8 interviews, 10 more scheduled, goal to complete by first week in December
- Timing feedback from those interviews- why are we asking about the future when they're focused on what's happening right now?
- Mixed opinions on need for maintaining formal regional collaboration - related to capacity of the individual/group interviewed
- Some can imagine functioning without a formal regional collaboration (health, outdoor recreation)
- Some groups (arts) have less capacity, might benefit from regional convening body that can help with technical assistance, etc.
- Funding regional collaboration in the future will be challenging
- Everyone is saying the value is in the relationships/partnerships, and they will continue no matter what. This planning process is more about the infrastructure of regional collaboration - is it necessary or valuable for you to be able to do your work?

Open Discussion/Q&A

(Condensed themes)

- **Collaboration vs. Projects**
 - Clarification needed between general collaboration and project-specific partnerships.
 - Value seen in periodic gatherings and resource investment for collaboration.
- **Current Collaborative Efforts**
 - Organic traction developing around funded initiatives (e.g., Towns to Trails, wildfire alliances, ESSRP).
 - Rec & Tourism working group preparing a *Recommendations for Implementation and Collaborative Action (RICA)* document to share learnings and policy suggestions.

- **Sustainability and Future Planning**

- Broad agreement that collaboration should extend beyond September 2026.
- Need to identify how relationships, projects, and communication continue after current funding ends.
- Sustainability should be codified (e.g., via MOU, resolutions, or strategic plans).

- **Funding Realities**

- Future collaborations likely to organize around funding streams (e.g., Prop 4 wildfire funding).
- Limited state appetite to fund regional collaboratives.
- Future funding might need to come from local sources and/or alignment with existing funding programs.

- **Opportunities for Cross-Sector Collaboration**

- Examples include partnerships in wildfire response, EMT training, food sustainability, and regional agriculture connections.
- Potential to leverage existing initiatives and tools (e.g., Visitor Connection Package).

- **Governance and Communication**

- Need for a mechanism to connect existing collaboration hubs.
- Suggestion for low-cost, ongoing communication (e.g., quarterly newsletter, updates on grants and projects).
- Recognition that collaboration needs institutional support beyond individual staff.

- **Engagement and Leadership**

- Elected officials currently not engaged or aware; lack of directive or funding from the state.
- Election season adds uncertainty.

- **Statewide and Policy Context**

- CA FWD is exploring models for convening, governance, and incentives, but changes may take several years.
- Local feedback being collected for these discussions.

- **Evaluation and Next Steps**

- Survey: A survey will capture experiences, lessons, and regional value from the five-year process (SWOT-style). Agreement to send a survey out in November.
- First-round of feedback will be presented to the Governing Council on December 12.
- Final Deliverable: The resulting document from Future Planning work is not a state deliverable but will be shared publicly and with interested local stakeholders.