

BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA CLEAN ENERGY JOBS ACT
CITIZENS OVERSIGHT BOARD

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
IMBRECHT HEARING ROOM - FIRST FLOOR
1516 NINTH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

This meeting of the Citizens Oversight Board will include teleconference participation by one or more Board Members. Per Government Code section 11123(b)(2), the teleconference locations, in addition to the address above, are:

ARUP
12777 W. JEFFERSON BLVD #100
LOS ANGELES, CA 90066

FRIDAY, APRIL 3, 2020

9:30 A.M.

Reported by:
Martha Nelson

APPEARANCES

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT (*Via telephone and/or WebEx)

*Adrienne Alvord, Chair, California Citizens Oversight Board

*Randall Martinez, Vice Chair, California Citizens Oversight Board

*Darrell Park, California Citizens Oversight Board

*David Dias, California Citizens Oversight Board

*Barbara Lloyd, California Citizens Oversight Board

*Heather Rosenberg, California Citizens Oversight Board

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT

*Commissioner McAllister, California Energy Commission
Commissioner

*Fritz Foo, Advisor to Commissioner McAllister, CEC

COB STAFF PRESENT

James Bartridge

Jack Bastida

CEC STAFF PRESENT

*Manuel Aquila

Deborah Godfrey

*Raj Singh

*Ian Baird

*Jennifer Masterson

*Sarah Williams

I N D E X

THE BOARD WILL CONSIDER AND MAY TAKE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING ITEMS:

1.	INTRODUCTION AND ROLL CALL OF BOARD MEMBERS TO DETERMINE QUORUM. (Chair Alvord)	4
2.	APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM FEBRUARY 13, 2019 CITIZENS OVERSIGHT BOARD MEETING. (Chair Alvord)	12
3.	UPDATE ON THE SCHOOL BUS REPLACEMENT PROGRAM. (Manuel Aguila, California Energy Commission)	14
4.	UPDATE ON THE ENERGY-CONSERVATION ASSISTANCE ACT - EDUCATION COMPETITIVE PROGRAM. (Deborah Godfrey, California Energy Commission)	29
5.	PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE VOTE ON THE ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE REPORT OF THE CALIFORNIA CLEAN ENERGY JOBS ACT. (Chair Alvord/Jim Bartridge)	38
6.	PUBLIC COMMENT	--
	Adjourn	58
	Reporter's Certification	59
	Transcriber's Certification	60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

P R O C E E D I N G S

APRIL 3, 2020

9:34 A.M.

CHAIR ALVORD: Thank you.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Good morning, folks. It's 9:30.
We'll just give it a couple more minutes, we're waiting for
another Board Member or two to join. We'll be back with
you shortly. Thanks for your patience.

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Hello there.

CHAIR ALVORD: Hello?

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Hi, this is Randall
Martinez.

CHAIR ALVORD: Hi, Randy. This is Adrienne.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Hi, Adrienne.

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: All right, I have the
technology.

CHAIR ALVORD: And there's Heather.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Yes. Can you hear me?

CHAIR ALVORD: You're a little soft, Heather.

MR. BASTIDA: I can't hear you.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Can you hear me now?

CHAIR ALVORD: Excellent.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Okay, great.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Jack, I need Barbara, on yet?

MR. BASTIDA: Barbara Lloyd, have you joined?

MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay folks, just a minute or two.

1 I just spoke with Barbara on the phone, so I expect her to
2 join shortly. We'll get started in just a minute. Thanks.

3 COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Hey Jim and Board
4 Members, this is Andrew McAllister. I just wanted to say
5 thank you actually. Just to kind of informally -- not part
6 of the agenda -- but I just wanted to thank you for all
7 you're doing on the Oversight Board and kind of just
8 highlight the ongoing importance of this with the stimulus
9 and then with the schools out, and sort of all this
10 opportunity to continue energy efficiency in schools and
11 all the need that we have.

12 And the track record that the program has
13 established is notable. And I'm actually having
14 conversations at the federal level to leverage and to see
15 how much traction there could be to channel some more
16 resources to these activities. And the foundation that was
17 laid in the Prop 39 General Grant Program is really
18 resonating in other states at the federal level. So we'll
19 see if something positive can come of it. But I just
20 wanted to say thank you for all of your diligence. And I'm
21 hoping I have it.

22 CHAIR ALVORD: Well thanks, Andrew. This is
23 Adrienne Alvord. Can you hear me?

24 COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Yes, I can.

25 CHAIR ALVORD: Well you're echoing some things

1 that I planned to say. And I also want to express our
2 appreciation to the Administration for taking such swift
3 action on that pandemic. I'm usually grateful to be a
4 Californian, but unusually grateful this last month for the
5 swift action and for postponing this meeting initially
6 because of the need to protect peoples' health all of the
7 sudden.

8 COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Yeah.

9 CHAIR ALVORD: It's early action that was much
10 needed. And I think we're hopefully going to continue just
11 to see some benefit from that. So thank you.

12 COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Yeah, well thank you.
13 So I think we're all trying to do the right thing. It's
14 really nice to be in a place where we all are just so
15 clearly on the same team and trying to achieve the same
16 awesome results. And kind of balance it with life and work
17 and health and all of the other things that are important
18 to ourselves and our families. So thank you all again.

19 CHAIR ALVORD: Indeed. Thank you.

20 MR. BARTRIDGE: Barbara Lloyd, have you joined?

21 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yes, I'm here.

22 MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay, great. And with that
23 folks, if everyone's ready we'll go ahead and get started.

24 Thank you all for joining today. And we're
25 actually in Hearing Room B, Jack and I, very social-

1 distanced apart. But it felt like it was worthwhile to
2 actually be in the room and try and make a difference here.

3 So good morning, and welcome to the second
4 meeting of the Citizens Oversight Board. I'm Jim
5 Bartridge, Board staff. I'm joined by Jack Bastida here,
6 as well Board staff. I'm going to skip the room
7 housekeeping since there's no one with us.

8 But as you know, the Citizens Oversight Board
9 typically meets three to four times per year. The first
10 meeting typically occurs in February when we receive annual
11 reports on Proposition 39 activities from reporting
12 agencies. This year we heard from the Energy Commission,
13 as always The California Community College Chancellor's
14 Office, and the California Workforce Development Board.

15 The Board set its second meeting. It's typically
16 held in March where we review the Draft Report, receive
17 input and seek approval from the Board to finalize the
18 report before submitting it to the Legislature, which we
19 usually do by the end of March. We did cancel our March
20 17th meeting, given the outbreak of COVID-19 and the need
21 to protect public health and safety through social
22 distancing in order to slow the spread of the virus. So
23 today's meeting is being held electronically consistent
24 with Governor Newsom's

25 Executive Order N-25-20. Today's agenda includes

1 two non-voting information items on Proposition 39 funded
2 programs: the School Bus Replacement Program and the ECCA-
3 Ed Competitive Program, which you'll hear about before we
4 provide an overview of the draft annual Citizens Oversight
5 Board report and recommendations to the Legislature.

6 Thereafter Board Members we will seek your
7 approval of the Draft Report. And after the meeting we'll
8 make any changes you request, finalize the report and
9 submit it to the Legislature as soon as possible. I
10 understand the Legislature is in recess. Now, I'm hearing
11 April 13th they may be back. I'm not clear on that.

12 So then after that we'll see you sometime in July
13 for our next meeting, which will focus on audits the Board
14 receives from the State Controller's Office.

15 And with that let me turn it over to Chair Alvord
16 for any opening comments.

17 CHAIR ALVORD: Thanks very much, Jim, and good
18 morning everybody. I'm Adrienne Alvord. I'm the Western
19 States Director for the Union of Concerned Scientists and
20 was appointed to the Citizens Oversight Board in June of
21 2018 by State Controller Betty Yee and elected Chair last
22 year.

23 As everyone knows here California voters approved
24 Proposition 39, the California Clean Energy and Jobs Act in
25 2012 to create jobs, save energy and reduce energy costs

1 and greenhouse gas emissions by investing in California
2 schools and community colleges. These investments were
3 also intended to provide job training and workforce
4 development in order to promote the creation of new
5 private-sector jobs to improve the energy efficiency of
6 commercial and residential buildings throughout California,
7 to help meet our climate and GHG reduction goals.

8 Program funding came from a change to the
9 Corporate Income Tax Code and revenues were allocated to
10 the Clean Energy Jobs Creation Fund for five years, from
11 July 1st, 2013 through June 30th, 2018.

12 The Citizens Oversight Board was created as a
13 nine-member Board to audit, review expenditures and
14 maintain transparency... I think somebody may need to
15 mute.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

17 CHAIR ALVORD: Okay -- anyway, to audit, review
18 expenditures and maintain transparency and accountability
19 of the Clean Energy Job Creation Fund. And Board Members
20 are appointed by the Attorney General, the State Controller
21 and the State Treasurer. The Board currently has six Board
22 Members and I'd like to thank you all, especially today,
23 for your service.

24 And I think it bears repeating what I said
25 earlier to Andrew McAllister that we owe a debt of

1 gratitude to Governor Newsom and his administration for
2 their swift action to contain COVID-19, which resulted in a
3 brief postponement of our in-person meeting that's
4 protecting all of us, and especially the staff and the
5 public.

6 And I also want to thank the staff, especially
7 Jim Bartridge and Jack Bastida for pulling this remote
8 meeting together with their usual swiftness and efficiency
9 and excellence. And I certainly want to thank fellow
10 Citizens Oversight Board Members for making time in your
11 lives, which are already no doubt disrupted to attend this
12 important meeting where we are going to discuss the program
13 recommendations for the future.

14 And in doing so I think it's important just to
15 acknowledge that we're in a substantially different place
16 than we were a month ago when we were first thinking about
17 the recommendations here. And I think there's a high
18 degree of uncertainty that we should acknowledge about how
19 much disruption we may experience as a result of the
20 pandemic, including two state revenues and the state
21 budget. But my hope is, as Commissioner McAllister said
22 earlier, that these important job-creating and money-saving
23 investments could be part of an economic stimulus that is
24 clear we're going to need. But I'm sure we agree that we
25 need to be flexible about our priorities and expectations

1 in the face of a public health crisis, the scope of which
2 is still unfolding.

3 So with that I'd like to ask if we're joined via
4 WebEx by any agency or public representatives that haven't
5 already identified themselves, and if they could please do
6 so.

7 MR. FOO: Good morning. This is Fritz Foo from
8 Commissioner McAllister's Office.

9 CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Thanks, Fritz.

10 Anyone else? Any Board Members that would like
11 to make any opening comments this morning?

12 BOARD MEMBER PARK: This is Darrell Park. I just
13 wanted to second your remarks. Thank you everybody for
14 everything that you guys have done during this really
15 trying time.

16 CHAIR ALVORD: Thanks, Darrell.

17 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: If you had a motion on that
18 you'd get unanimous approval. (Laughter.)

19 CHAIR ALVORD: Okay, thank you very much.

20 VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Absolutely. So Adrienne,
21 this is Randall Martinez. You know, I would benefit from a
22 roll call.

23 CHAIR ALVORD: Ah yes, we're about to have a roll
24 call. That's our next item.

25 VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Thank you.

1 CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Jim, go ahead

2 MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay great. Let's go for a roll
3 call.

4 So first, Chair Alvord?

5 CHAIR ALVORD: Here.

6 MR. BARTRIDGE: Vice Chair Martinez?

7 VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: I am here.

8 MR. BARTRIDGE: David Dias?

9 CHAIR ALVORD: Dave I think you may be on mute.

10 MR. BARTRIDGE: Dave we know you're there.

11 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: (Indiscernible.)

12 MR. BARTRIDGE: There you go.

13 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Hello? Oh, okay.

14 MR. BARTRIDGE: Barbara Lloyd?

15 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yes, I'm here.

16 MR. BARTRIDGE: Heather Rosenberg?

17 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Here.

18 MR. BARTRIDGE: And Darrell Park?

19 BOARD MEMBER PARK: Here.

20 MR. BARTRIDGE: And with that Chair, we have a
21 quorum.

22 CHAIR ALVORD: Excellent. Thank you everyone.

23 Okay, so with that we can move on to the approval
24 of the minutes from the February 13th meeting. Sorry,
25 going through a lot of paper here. Is there any discussion

1 of the minutes? Corrections?

2 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: This is Barbara Lloyd. I'd
3 like to count as abstained, because I was not at the
4 meeting.

5 CHAIR ALVORD: Thanks, Barbara.

6 Any other comments or corrections for the
7 minutes?

8 Hearing none, I'd entertain a motion.

9 VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: So moved, Randall Martinez.

10 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Second, Dave Dias.

11 CHAIR ALVORD: Thank you.

12 Can we go by affirmations, Jim?

13 MR. BARTRIDGE: We can do a roll call. Chair
14 Alvord?

15 CHAIR ALVORD: Aye.

16 MR. BARTRIDGE: Vice-Chair Martinez?

17 VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Aye.

18 MR. BARTRIDGE: David Dias?

19 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Aye.

20 MR. BARTRIDGE: Heather Rosenberg?

21 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Aye.

22 MR. BARTRIDGE: Darrell Park?

23 BOARD MEMBER PARK: Aye.

24 MR. BARTRIDGE: And Barbara, we know you'll
25 abstain. So very good, we're good to go.

1 CHAIR ALVORD: Yes.

2 MR. BARTRIDGE: The minutes are approved.

3 CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. And after that I think
4 we're ready for the update on the School Bus Replacement
5 Program. Manuel Aguila?

6 MR. BARTRIDGE: Just give me two seconds to load
7 that up, Manuel. Okay, we're ready. Go ahead and just
8 tell me "Next slide," and I'll take care of that.

9 MR. AGUILA: Hello, can you hear me?

10 CHAIR ALVORD: I can hear you.

11 MR. BARTRIDGE: Yes.

12 MR. AGUILA: Okay, perfect. Excellent. All
13 right, first off I want to start by thanking everybody for
14 their time. Again, it's a very (indiscernible) that we're
15 in, but we're definitely very appreciative of your time
16 today. Again, my name is Manuel Aguila with the Fuels and
17 Transportation Division. And I'm here to provide an update
18 to the School Bus Replacement Program. Next slide, please.

19 Okay, for the School Bus Replacement Program
20 there are three complementary funding components. The
21 first component is the school bus replacement itself, where
22 the Energy Commission received a \$75 million allocation
23 from SB 110 to replace the oldest, dirtiest diesel school
24 buses with battery electric school buses.

25 The second component is for the charging

1 infrastructure. We received a \$14 million allocation from
2 the Clean Transportation Program. This provides up to
3 \$60,000 per awarded bus for charging infrastructure.

4 And our third funding component is for the
5 workforce training where we received a \$1 million
6 allocation from the Clean Transportation Program for
7 workforce training.

8 Next slide, please. Now eligible applicants for
9 the School Bus Replacement Program are school districts,
10 county offices of education, and joint power authorities.

11 And priority was actually given to the oldest
12 school buses, school buses operating in disadvantaged
13 communities, and to schools with a majority of the students
14 eligible for free or reduced-price meals during the prior
15 year.

16 And there's a requirement that any replaced
17 school bus must be scrapped.

18 Next slide, please. Now this slide actually
19 shows some of the minimum requirements for each school bus
20 type. So the minimum battery range is based on the size of
21 the vehicle. The Type A school bus is a smaller school
22 bus. Type C is a larger school bus. And the Type D is the
23 largest. So the Type A had a minimum battery range of 70
24 miles. Both Types C and D had a minimum range requirement
25 of 100 miles.

1 Now we also have the seating capacity minimum
2 requirements based off the size of the vehicle as well. So
3 Type A receives a minimum of 16 students, Type C is a
4 minimum of 44 students and Type D is 70 students.

5 Now one of the most exciting requirements
6 actually from this Electric School Bus Replacement Program
7 is for these battery electric buses to actually be VGI or
8 V2G-capable. So I just want to explain briefly the
9 difference between VGI and V2G. So VGI is vehicle-to-grid
10 integration, and this is more of a broad term that
11 encompasses different aspects in which the vehicle can
12 provide benefits, such as vehicle-to-building, or V2B, and
13 vehicle-to-grid, also known as V2G.

14 So the V2G portion is a bi-directional energy
15 transfer. And so this allows the discharge from the
16 battery to a facility circuit via a combined charging
17 system Type 1 or CTS 1 inlet. This allows for AC and DC
18 charging and discharging of the battery. So this will
19 actually allow us to export stored power from the battery
20 packs to any island-grid load consisting in on-site
21 resiliency in the event of a public safety power shut-off
22 or a PSPS. And it's also able to export the grid to assist
23 in kind of a peak shaving. But this does require an
24 interconnection agreement with the utility provider.

25 Some of the potential benefits that we can

1 hopefully realize from the V2G capabilities or VGI
2 capabilities is utilizing the vehicle-to-building aspect,
3 or V2B to offset power usage where the bus is actually able
4 to charge during off-peak hours. And then utilize the
5 stored energy during peak hours in order to lower the
6 electricity costs. Also the capability of charging during
7 peak hours, or I'm sorry, charging during off-peak hours
8 and potentially being able to sell back to utilities during
9 peak hours and this may be a potential revenue stream in
10 the future.

11 And the way that we're actually going to do this
12 is through the infrastructure funding that we have where,
13 again, it's up to \$60,000 per bus awarded. And one of the
14 things that are required is an internally networked
15 charging station. This actually assists in setting
16 charging times to off-peak hours and remote accessing
17 capabilities of the vehicles on discharging the battery
18 themselves. Next slide, please.

19 Okay. And the Energy Commission actually awarded
20 six bus types: Type A, C and D, with and without outlet.

21 Now Type B was not awarded. The reason for that
22 is when (indiscernible) developing this solicitation
23 manufacturers actually confided that they weren't really
24 producing any Type Bs whether it be electric or standard
25 internal-combustion engines. So we kind of removed those

1 from the equation. So we actually went to just the Type A,
2 C and Ds for awards.

3 Now in awarding the manufacturers we had a two-
4 step process. The first step was a technical stream where
5 a manufacturer's application was required to pass in order
6 to get to the second step. Some of the items that we did
7 review were their relevant experience in battery electric
8 buses, project readiness, the innovation of the
9 manufacturers and the economic benefits to California.

10 Now once the manufacturer actually passed this
11 portion of the screening process we moved on to a low bid,
12 so where the low bid was actually awarded. And as you can
13 see in this case the awardees are Lion Electric Company,
14 which were awarded for the Type A without chair lift, as
15 well as the Type C and D with and without chairlifts. And
16 A-Z was awarded the Type A with the wheelchair lift. And
17 we (indiscernible) the bulk purchase price. We're actually
18 able to lower the price per seat to \$6,148 per seat. Next
19 slide please.

20 Now here we can see our estimated delivery
21 timeline --

22 VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Are you taking questions?

23 MR. AGUILA: At the end, if that's okay?

24 VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Okay.

25 MR. AGUILA: Okay. So the delivery timeline here

1 as you can see we're just bid delivery of 5 percent by the
2 end of 2019; 25 percent accumulative total by the end of
3 2020; 50 percent by 2021; and 100 percent by September 30th
4 of 2022. And our first goal of 5 percent was met, so we
5 did deliver that 5 percent by the end of 2019. And we are
6 anticipating meeting our next goal of 25 percent or 58
7 buses by the end of 2020. Next slide, please.

8 This slide shows the distribution of the
9 completed deliveries thus far. We do have five recipients
10 that have received buses. You can see that they're
11 distributed throughout California. Next slide, please.

12 So again the \$75 million was distributed equally
13 within four regions based on average daily attendance. So
14 each region received approximately \$18.75 million each. I
15 want to first point out that the scale difference in North
16 and Central. It looks as if Central is receiving a lot
17 fewer buses. But the reason for that is they are
18 requesting quite a few Type Ds with outlets whereas the
19 North actually has more even distribution within the bus
20 types. So North is actually receiving 58 buses, Central is
21 receiving 57 buses. Next slide, please.

22 Los Angeles, so you can see, is receiving 59
23 buses and our South region is receiving 57 buses. So
24 they're all roughly receiving the same number of buses.
25 Next slide, please.

1 And one of the next steps is to actually collect
2 data. So some of the things that we're looking at
3 collecting is maintenance cost data. So we want to look at
4 the cost of the diesel bus being replaced and our
5 maintenance as well as compared to the electric buses'
6 maintenance.

7 We're also looking to obtain the fuel efficiency
8 to replace diesel school buses. So we're looking at the
9 average fuel costs and then of course, mileage. And then
10 the electric bus efficiency is well, with the cost of
11 electricity and the number of miles that actually are run
12 as well.

13 And we're also looking at collecting telematics
14 data as well, so we can kind of figure out their route and
15 driver efficiency. And then this will actually help us in
16 future program planning as well. Next slide, please.

17 This map actually shows the distribution of
18 recipients based on CalEnviroScreen 3.0. So this is a
19 screening tool that's used to help ID communities
20 disproportionately burdened by multiple sources of
21 pollution and with population characteristics that make it
22 more sensitive to pollution. So this was developed on
23 behalf of CalEPA and we can see the distribution of our
24 recipients. One of the great things about this program is
25 the districts provided information regarding their routes

1 in disadvantaged community areas. And approximately 90
2 percent of our recipients actually operate in the high-risk
3 and (indiscernible) areas. Next slide, please.

4 And this map actually shows a distribution of
5 recipients based on California Public Utilities Commission,
6 Tier 2 and 3 Fire Threat. So Tier 2 Fire Threat are areas
7 where there's an elevated risk, including likelihood and
8 potential impact on people and property from utility-
9 associated wildfires. Whereas, Tier 3 is areas where there
10 is an extreme risk including likelihood and potential
11 impact on people and property from utility-associated
12 wildfires. So one of the things that we kind of wanted to
13 show on here is the distribution of our recipients based
14 off the Tier 2 and 3. And with the VG or V2G capabilities
15 of our buses they may be able to assist with onsite
16 resiliency in the event of a wildfire. Next slide, please.

17 And our final slide is going to be workforce
18 development. So this is available to all of our
19 recipients. And this is the Electric School Bus Training
20 Project. And this is done in conjunction with community
21 colleges for training of maintenance technicians and bus
22 operators. And it's also training topics include high-
23 voltage safety, troubleshooting, and proper operation of
24 electric vehicles. And training schedules and curricula
25 are currently in development. But one of the plans is to

1 have this long-term bus electrical vocation training
2 through community colleges for certification and degrees.
3 So we're looking and hoping this is more of a long-term
4 project. And next slide, please.

5 That is it. And I am available for questions.

6 CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Thanks very much, Manuel.

7 I think we heard a question. Was that Randall?

8 VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Yes, thank you.

9 Thank you for the information, a question about
10 the Lion Company that was awarded the buses. By chance are
11 they a California-based company or is any of this work at
12 least being done in California?

13 MR. AGUILA: No. So the batteries, oh sorry, the
14 buses are actually being manufactured in Canada. And
15 they're coming -- and the final touches are actually being
16 put on in California.

17 VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Thank you.

18 MR. AGUILA: You're welcome.

19 BOARD MEMBER PARK: Hi, this is Darrell. I have
20 one more question.

21 MR. AGUILA: Yes?

22 BOARD MEMBER PARK: My concern on making sure
23 that the school districts and the people doing the charging
24 of the buses understand the difference in electrical
25 pricing based on timing and other things in their

1 districts. So I'm happy to have a conversation with you
2 offline, but the numbers can be, once the school systems
3 get back up and running probably during the next school
4 year, my concern is that those electrical cost numbers can
5 be really thrown off if you're charging at peak times or in
6 peak costs versus nonpeak costs. You know, there might be
7 a one-to-five or a one-to-ten ratio on that.

8 So I don't know what you guys are doing in terms
9 of teaching folks about that that have never had to worry
10 about anything other than filling up the buses with diesel.
11 One, is there a program to help with that? And if not can
12 you guys just do the bare minimum now to get the word out,
13 so that people know how to access the cheapest electricity?

14 MR. AGUILA: Yes. So one of the things that
15 we're actually doing is we are working with local utility
16 providers. And there, we're working closely with them and
17 the school districts, so there our utility providers are
18 actually providing all of this information. And we're
19 having monthly conference calls with our utility providers
20 as well to kind of make sure that recipients are aware of
21 the pricing. And to make sure they're utilizing it at the
22 most efficient and effective times.

23 We are requiring that all of our charging
24 stations are networked, so that will actually assist in
25 charging the vehicles during off peak hours.

1 BOARD MEMBER PARK: Okay, great. And there may
2 be high-use school -- or high bus-usage situations where
3 they can't. And if you can just in your data have a note
4 for that, so that we truly understand the costs. There
5 will be places that will be using those buses, so much in
6 the morning and so much at night and so much in the
7 afternoon that they're going to need to charge sort of in
8 that midday period when the electricity is more expensive.
9 And as long as we have a break-out in the data, understand
10 that, I'm comfortable with where we are.

11 MR. AGUILA: Yes. And we're definitely working
12 again with the utility providers and they -- excuse me --
13 in trying to make sure that we can gather as much data as
14 we possibly can to ensure that we make this as -- I'm
15 hoping that we can reduce the costs as much as possible for
16 charging the vehicles and making sure that the recipients
17 are charging them at the optimum time.

18 BOARD MEMBER PARK: And the very last question I
19 promise, and then I'll be quiet. With the maintenance and
20 maintenance costs, if we can be clear about what the
21 maintenance costs actually are in terms of breakdown for
22 things like brakes, tires, electric motor versus just
23 general overhead that would be amazing.

24 MR. AGUILA: Yes. So we're actually looking at
25 kind of breaking down all of the data, so we're separating

1 it as much as we can, so we can ensure that we're kind of
2 tracking all of the individual aspects of that maintenance.

3 BOARD MEMBER PARK: Okay. Sorry for hogging more
4 than my fair share of time.

5 CHAIR ALVORD: They're great questions, Darrell,
6 no problem.

7 Anybody else? I've got a couple.

8 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: I have one, Chair. I --

9 CHAIR ALVORD: Fine. Go ahead.

10 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Sorry.

11 CHAIR ALVORD: Sorry. Yeah, please do.

12 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Hi. This is Heather
13 Rosenberg. I have two questions. First I want to say I
14 really appreciate how you have gone through all of the
15 different aspects trying to captured all of the
16 interrelated co-benefits of this documenting from resilient
17 and (indiscernible) and job training and all of that, it's
18 a really great example structurally in terms of thinking
19 through the (indiscernible).

20 And my first question is will all of this data be
21 publicly available? Because working with other transit
22 agencies outside of the school districts that are moving
23 towards electrification, I think there are a lot of lessons
24 learned here. Is that something that will be easily
25 accessible?

1 MR. AGUILA: Yes, it's definitely one of the
2 things that we want to do. Because one of our major goals
3 is not just the program itself, but actually the adoption
4 of better electric school buses overall. So even if they
5 don't just go with our program we want to make sure that
6 everybody is aware of the actual benefits of the buses
7 themselves, whether it be the reduced costs in maintaining
8 the vehicles or the reduction of any particulate matter in
9 the air. We just want to make sure that we're providing as
10 much information is possible to everybody.

11 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: And the other question I
12 have is has all of the funding from this already been
13 allocated? Where are you in that?

14 MR. AGUILA: Yes, thus far it has been allocated.
15 Now there may be a little bit of fallout, but we don't
16 anticipate really any changes thus far. We're fairly far
17 in the process where all of our recipients are pretty
18 steadfast that they are accepting the vehicles. And we're
19 moving forward with that assumption as well.

20 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Great. Thank you.

21 MR. AGUILA: You're welcome.

22 CHAIR ALVORD: Thanks, Heather.

23 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Hi, it's Barbara Lloyd. I
24 really only had one question and that is how long is the
25 pricing that you guys have negotiated going to be available

1 if districts or other entities are able to come up with
2 funds to buy additional buses? How long would these terms
3 be available?

4 MR. AGUILA: So for our program's specific
5 purposes we did a bulk purchase pricing in order to get the
6 lowest possible price for our solicitation. But there was
7 no specific length of time that was negotiated with any of
8 this.

9 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Okay.

10 CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Dave, any questions?

11 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: No. I read through it all.
12 I get it.

13 CHAIR ALVORD: Okay, a couple of quick questions.
14 Just curious because the PSPS events we've been having tend
15 to be in the fall and at the beginning of the school year.
16 And you mentioned that these buses might, in the slide on
17 the fire danger, that the buses might help with resiliency.
18 Is that somehow through the battery? Or is there -- how
19 would that work?

20 MR. AGUILA: I'm sorry, can you repeat the
21 question?

22 CHAIR ALVORD: In the event of fire events, I
23 think you mentioned that the buses might help with
24 resiliency. And I was wondering what that referred to, if
25 that was use of the battery or something else?

1 MR. AGUILA: Yes. So it would be the using the
2 battery electric school buses to run evacuation centers.
3 Typically school districts or schools will actually be some
4 of the most heavily used evacuation centers.

5 CHAIR ALVORD: Right.

6 MR. AGUILA: So one of the thoughts is to
7 actually utilize these buses at these schools to kind of
8 assist with. You know, if the utilities are not able to
9 deliver electricity to a particular area, to have these
10 school buses go in there and kind of help out with
11 maintaining some sort of a normalcy.

12 CHAIR ALVORD: I think that's great. It leads me
13 to a second question about vulnerability in terms of
14 ability to recharge. And if there are contingency plans in
15 place in case there are events where the electricity is cut
16 for some kind of backup generation that can be used for
17 these buses?

18 MR. AGUILA: Yes. So some of what we're funding
19 as well with the Clean Transportation Fund is the battery
20 electric storage as well. So not just the buses but actual
21 stationary storage that could actually assist with in the
22 event of a power failure the buses are still able to charge
23 on site and be able to deliver the electricity storage
24 where it's needed.

25 CHAIR ALVORD: Well that's great. And I hope

1 they don't have to come in handy that way, but the way
2 things are going you never know. So that's great.

3 MR. AGUILA: (Indiscernible.)

4 CHAIR ALVORD: Those are all my questions.

5 MR. AGUILA: I agree. And that's one of the
6 things that we're hoping is not necessary, but we want to
7 be prepared in case it is.

8 CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Okay if there are no other
9 questions, Manuel, thank you very much.

10 MR. AGUILA: Thank you.

11 CHAIR ALVORD: So next on the agenda we have the
12 ECCA-Ed Update with Deborah Godfrey. Deborah.

13 MS. GODFREY: Good morning everyone.

14 CHAIR ALVORD: Good morning.

15 MS. GODFREY: Start it here. As you remember,
16 the purpose of the background was the Energy Conservation
17 Assistance Act, which is a program that has existed since
18 1979. And SB 110 added additional Prop 39 funds to the
19 ECAA-Ed programs to be dispersed on a competitive basis.
20 The loans were at 0 percent as they had been for the ECAA-
21 Ed Subaccount for quite a while, so that didn't change.

22 And as you may recall there was the money, this
23 is an allocation from the remaining Prop 39 money. And we
24 didn't have quite as much as we had hoped for. There was
25 about \$113 million that was remaining. The first \$75

1 million was the School Bus Program as we've just heard; it
2 was fully funded. Up to the next \$100 million was
3 available for the ECAA-Ed Competitive Loan Program. We've
4 received slightly under \$38 million and of course there was
5 no funds remaining to extend the Prop 39 K through 12
6 Competitive Grant Program.

7 We kept the structure similar to the earlier
8 version of ECAA-Ed. And that was available to public
9 school districts, county offices of education, charter
10 schools, and I believe there were also two state schools in
11 there. The funding structure was we kept it the same as
12 for our regular ECAA programs, maximal of \$3 million. The
13 interest rate was different. They used the interest rate
14 for our regular ECAA program as 1 percent, still a pretty
15 good deal. And it was based on the total energy cost
16 savings over the estimated useful life of the measures or
17 the actual project costs.

18 And the list of eligible projects remained from
19 our other ECAA programs that have been successful over the
20 years as you can see.

21 SB 110 based the priority for the competitive
22 portion of this program on geographic diversity, the
23 diversity in the size of the LEAs student population, the
24 percentage of students eligible for the FRPM program in the
25 previous year. That was given a weight of 50 percent. And

1 then the energy savings also was added to the total score
2 for up to another 50 percent.

3 Geographic diversity was divided as such into
4 four regions: North, Central, South, and Los Angeles
5 County. It was divided this way to keep roughly 1.55
6 million students in each of the four districts. And there
7 is about 6.2 million students in the State of California in
8 the K through 12.

9 We just broke it up by tiers up to 1000 students,
10 Tier 2 up to 1,000 two 2,000 students, and Tier 3 greater
11 than 2,000 students. This is all for the first
12 solicitation. As you'll see in a minute we did make
13 changes.

14 The money was allocated by the tiers and the
15 size, basically we called them buckets, 12 buckets with \$3
16 million in each for a total of \$36 million. The reason why
17 we went 36 when we had 38 was it would have been
18 \$3,333,000.16 kind of thing, so we wanted to keep it nice
19 round amounts and up to a full-size loan in each of the
20 regions.

21 The solicitations that were received were spread
22 throughout the state. We received these counties that did
23 submit applications. And the applications that were
24 received are as such. The pink are, as you can see, where
25 we received none. We received a total of 21, and 5 of them

1 were administratively disqualified. So had everyone been
2 eligible we would have been able to get about --

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can anybody else still
4 hear her?

5 MS. GODFREY: -- \$20 million out.

6 But the summary of the loans awarded was
7 unfortunately a lot smaller than we had hoped for. We were
8 able to get out 3 to the smalls, 1 to a medium-size school
9 and 1-3 to a large school for a total of 7. So out of the
10 \$36 million we were only able to allocate \$6.7 million to 7
11 schools.

12 The reason why or as such out of the 21 that we
13 received, 5 were administratively disqualified for very
14 interesting reasons. Frequently there were pages that were
15 missing, they were signed by someone or signed or submitted
16 by someone that did not have authority and so those
17 immediately came out. Of the 16 that remained they were
18 reviewed and 7 did not pass technical review. Two passed,
19 but there was no funding remaining in that size or region.
20 As was -- there we go -- and those, as you can see from the
21 earlier slide. We received in some cases such as if you
22 look at this slide for the Central and the Large we
23 received 4 applications, which would have totaled 7.7
24 million. So there was not an adequate amount of money in
25 that fund to fund more than 1 for the \$2.75.

1 Reasons for the disqualifications were missing
2 pages and information, wrong document formats. We had one
3 very interesting one. They were directed to submit
4 documents in Excel format. And we received one that just
5 sent a statement, didn't send them in an Excel format, just
6 sent a statement and, "Yeah, we did them in Excel," which
7 is kind of interesting. An unauthorized person signed the
8 application or the Board resolution authorized a private
9 firm to submit and accept the loan, which unfortunately
10 cannot occur. And the calculations were not shown on
11 spreadsheets or were not openable. Or the R formulas that
12 are embedded had been overwritten and information was not
13 accurate. So based on that, approaching the second
14 solicitation, which of course is still competitive.

15 Based on our applications we expanded the tier
16 size to less than 1'000 and it added up 1,000 to 2,000;
17 2,000 to 10,000 and greater than 10,000. There is a big
18 difference between a school with 2,000 students and a
19 school with 25,000. So because of this we did expand those
20 LEA tiers.

21 And also based on the applications that we
22 received we lessened the amounts in Tiers 1 and 2. And to
23 accommodate the additional money that was necessary to have
24 now 4 regions, I mean 4 tiers for the 4 regions.

25 And we have done a mass marketing on trying to

1 explain how you will be a successful applicant. We made
2 things in the second solicitation a little bit bigger and
3 bolder and underlined and highlighted it and everything
4 else we could think of, to stress that the application
5 instructions need to be strictly adhered to.

6 It's interesting that most of our applications
7 were submitted on behalf of LEAs and came from our usual
8 consultants that submit applications to us for our other
9 programs. And the interesting comment whenever we were
10 unable to modify or even contact the applicant to correct
11 items, the consultants later said, "Well we always send you
12 in stuff about like this. And you always correct it for
13 us." And unfortunately with a competitive program that
14 interaction between staff and applicant and consultant was
15 not allowed.

16 So we are now in our second competitive
17 solicitation phase. We have recently published, or excuse
18 me, posted the questions and answers that we received at
19 our webinar and the workshops and that also that were
20 submitted to us. The application date is June 29th. That
21 may be extended, because of our current situation. At this
22 point we're waiting to hear from that. But we're hoping
23 that with the changes that we made to the second
24 solicitation we will have greater numbers and have better
25 quality submissions, so we will be able to fund a greater

1 amount of money.

2 This was a drastic change not only for staff,
3 which rose to the occasion, but it was a drastic change.
4 And very -- what shall I say -- disconcerting for a lot of
5 the LEAs, because just the word "competitive" scared a lot
6 of them off. They felt that if they spent all the time and
7 effort to submit an application and because their
8 neighboring school district was a little bit better that
9 they would expend that energy and effort for nothing.

10 And that takes me to the problems between a
11 competitive and a noncompetitive solicitation. They each
12 have things in their favor and they each have things not.
13 We were able to distribute the money potentially throughout
14 all the sizes and all the regions. And it could really
15 assist with those schools that have a high FRPM
16 participation, but unfortunately it does not allow for any
17 changes to their original submission, which usually have
18 flaws and can't be corrected, because like I said we cannot
19 go back and forth between staff and competitor. And it
20 left unfortunately a lot more money on the table than we
21 wanted.

22 The non-competitive program as you may have heard
23 we have received quite a few complaints about it being
24 competitive. There has been the comment that it was so
25 much easier and workable when it was non-competitive. And

1 that is true to some extent, but unfortunately the
2 direction of SB 110 did want to make sure that it was
3 fairly distributed amongst size and region. And this
4 competitive program does allow for that.

5 And that's all I have. If anybody has any
6 specific questions I can include them in a presentation at
7 our next COB meeting if you have anything specific you'd
8 like addressed.

9 CHAIR ALVORD: Thank you, Deborah. Does anybody
10 have questions?

11 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Yeah, this is Dave Dias. Can
12 you hear me?

13 MS. GODFREY: Yes, I can.

14 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Oh good. And I'm great, we
15 have great reception at home. Yeah, the only question -- I
16 did read through all this and seeing how the first go-round
17 didn't fare too well with people not doing the paperwork
18 right and all that or somebody not authorized to sign it
19 and all that, does it seem like it's going to get better
20 this go-round?

21 MS. GODFREY: I think so. We had a lot more
22 people inquire in the interim. We also had a lot of
23 unsuccessful applicants that requested a debrief, some of
24 them numerous debriefs. And we have stressed in through
25 our hotline and as calls have come in, and while we cannot

1 answer specific questions regarding specific projects, we
2 have really stressed that at all points that this really
3 needs -- you really need to read it. Don't just give it
4 the cursory glance as you would with the regular ECAA,
5 knowing that when the regular ECAA application comes in
6 staff looks at it, contacts you, goes back and forth and
7 eventually it's massaged into an eligible application.

8 But unfortunately with the competitive process,
9 and we involved our Contracts, Grants and Loans in every
10 meeting we had, who would slap our hands and make us stop
11 if we even went off in any direction that was not allowed
12 in the competitive process. And because of that I feel
13 that we really have gotten the message out. Although I
14 think, I really could've sworn we got the message out the
15 first time as to follow instructions, don't treat this as
16 if you already know what's expected, really follow
17 everything. So I'm hoping that we'll have greater
18 participation. And I've heard from a lot more people this
19 time than we did the first. I think we --

20 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Awesome.

21 MS. GODFREY: -- allayed some fears that
22 competitive is not as scary as it sounds.

23 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: That sounds great. Thank
24 you.

25 CHAIR ALVORD: Anyone else? That's so ironic to

1 everybody, because the first thing you learn in school
2 supposedly is follow instructions. (Laughs.) So hopefully
3 you'll have more success next time.

4 MS. GODFREY: The scary thing was frequently the
5 math was incorrect.

6 CHAIR ALVORD: Oh dear. Okay, well hoping for a
7 better outcome. Thank you very much for the report.

8 MS. GODFREY: Thank you for the opportunity.

9 CHAIR ALVORD: Okay it looks like we're ready for
10 the presentation on the Legislative Report. And Jim that
11 means you're up.

12 MR. BARTRIDGE: Give me just a second here to
13 load this up. Okay, so let me give you an overview of the
14 report. I know you all have had it and read it. We've
15 exchanged some emails back and forth on it. And again, the
16 goal today is to give you the overview of the report,
17 understand any concerns you may have and then address those
18 prior to us turning around and submitting it to the
19 Legislature, so (indiscernible).

20 So the Annual Report, we're supposed to
21 distribute it within 90 days of the end of the calendar
22 year, by March 30th. We're a little bit late this time
23 given -- well this would be the first time that we've been
24 late, so we'll work within those bounds. There's a lot of
25 extraneous things going on.

1 The report is supposed to include the activity of
2 the previous year, our findings and recommendations based
3 on annual reports from the agencies that report to us and
4 then findings on quantifying total employment. The
5 Workforce Development Board you'll recall in the February
6 meeting presented us with their last report , so we won't
7 have new data -- I did include in the report those findings
8 from last year, because there's no additional project
9 funding going out. The job calculation wouldn't have
10 changed.

11 So Chapter 1, what we looked at. The objectives
12 of the Clean Energy Jobs Act, an overview of the original
13 programs and then the SB 110 changes for 2018 and beyond,
14 which was the ECAA-Ed School Bus Replacement Program, which
15 you've just heard about. And then one other key point
16 about SB 110 is it did remove the sunset date for the
17 Board, which has the opportunity to continue indefinitely.
18 And we do have a recommendation towards that end at the
19 end.

20 The objectives of the Clean Energy Jobs Act,
21 particularly relevant at this point is to put Californians
22 to work repairing and updating and improving energy
23 efficiency in public schools and universities and public
24 buildings. And promote private-sector clean energy and
25 energy efficiency jobs. And then finally to leverage

1 existing energy efficiency and clean energy programs to
2 create increased economic and energy benefits for
3 California.

4 In Chapter 2 we take a look at the mandates of
5 the Citizens Oversight Board, we go through our meeting
6 history from last year. Again, this report covers from
7 June 30th, 2018 through June 30th, 2019.

8 And then we talk about the financial audits and
9 program audits that we work with the State Controller's
10 Office to provide. And then of course all of our Board
11 documents, including the audits are online at that
12 location.

13 And as an aside, they are now ADA Compatible,
14 one point to that is that we did have some great assistance
15 from staff in the last several weeks to convert almost 200
16 existing documents up there on the Oversight Board to ADA-
17 compliant. And they've been reposted in that format. So a
18 lot of things going on that you don't necessarily always
19 see , but there are a lot of things we're trying to take
20 care of at once.

21 So again the mandates, review the Clean Energy
22 Job Creation Fund expenditures, the annual independent
23 audit of the fund on selection of projects, publish the
24 accounting, which we do. Again, that's posted. And then
25 submit an evaluation to Legislature identifying changes

1 needed to Clean Energy Jobs Act programs. So that's what
2 we're required to do as the Citizens Oversight Board. And
3 that's what we try to cover in some of the chapter.

4 Chapter 3. Again many thanks to all of the
5 agencies that report to us. This is the information they
6 provide to us. And then we report the information they
7 give us. So there's a lot of folks out there doing a lot
8 of great work to pull this information together and then we
9 try to summarize it.

10 The Energy Commission, so first, we cover energy
11 grant programs. And the first was the Energy Commission's
12 local agency, K through 12 Award Program. It's the largest
13 share of Prop 39 funding: 1,750 of 2189 local educational
14 agencies participate in the program. And they submitted
15 over 2,121 energy expenditure plans at 7,100 school sites,
16 almost 7,200 school sites, from 2013 through 2019.

17 It was about \$1.5 billion in funding, plus \$154
18 million for project planning. And they were very
19 geographically diverse with high county participation rates
20 as well. And so here you can see 22 counties participated
21 90 to 100 percent, 19 counties 80 to 90 percent, 11
22 counties 70 to 80 percent, 5 counties 60 to 70 percent, and
23 1 county between 40 and 60 percent.

24 Here's a look at that distribution
25 geographically. And you may recall in past reports that we

1 had some counties that hadn't participated. Now they're
2 fully participating and everyone's in the loop.

3 More on Chapter 3 here, the work at the
4 Chancellor's Office. There were between 2018 and 2019, 284
5 projects completed at 60 community colleges. About \$103
6 million in total project costs, including incentives and
7 district funding. And the annual savings is about 37.5
8 million kilowatt hours; 588,000 gas therms; 5.8 million in
9 annual energy cost savings; and 4.4 million in one-time
10 energy incentives. Let me just catch up here with slides
11 real quick.

12 And then we also took a look at the Energy and
13 Sustainability Awards that the Community Colleges give out.
14 They recognize excellence in energy and sustainability for
15 Prop 39 projects, faculty and student initiatives and
16 sustainability champions. The 2019 award winners include
17 projects and faculty throughout the state including North
18 Orange County Community College District, Chaffey Community
19 College District, Victor Valley Community College District,
20 Saddleback College and De Anza College.

21 Chapter 3, also the Loans and Technical
22 Assistance Programs, we just heard about ECAA-Ed
23 Competitive. Here's an overview of the ECAA-Ed existing
24 program. So the loan program, it did start in 1979. This
25 revolving loan program was started in 2013. So far there's

1 35 approved project loans totaling \$52.3 million; 3 of
2 those totaling \$4.8 million with final reports due after
3 6.30.19; 4 projects totaling over \$4 million; 28 completed
4 projects at \$43.1 million. And that came to 21.5 million
5 kilowatt hours of electricity and over 15,000 gas therms
6 and those are savings projected.

7 ECAA-Ed Technical Assistance Program, this is
8 used to identify energy efficiency measures in existing
9 facilities, and help them apply for Prop 39 funding. 5.5
10 million funding from ECAA as of June 30th, 2019. There
11 were over 200 technical assistance energy study requests
12 totaling \$3.3 million: 2 requests are currently in process
13 and 3 were withdrawn. The 195 requests completed to a
14 total \$2.8 million. And over 28 million kilowatt hours of
15 electricity saved and 305,000 gas therms saved.

16 Finally, on the Workforce Development, and again
17 this is the results from the previous year, but the
18 workforce through Prop 39 invested over \$13 million,
19 developed 12 construction pre-apprenticeship programs.
20 You'll remember that they gave us a great presentation back
21 in February on this. The workforce-training and supportive
22 services prepares at-risk youth, women, veterans, ex-
23 offenders, and other disadvantaged job seekers to complete
24 a state registered apply-and-enter and complete a state-
25 registered building trade apprenticeship program.

1 So of the 2,700 enrolled, 2,100 completed
2 training and earned the Multi-Craft Core Curriculum
3 Certificate. And after program completion, 1,660 graduates
4 were placed in state-registered apprenticeship programs, 41
5 percent of them; construction or energy-efficiency specific
6 employment, 23 percent; post-secondary education, 10
7 percent; and other employment, 26 percent.

8 And then workforce training grant programs with
9 the Community College, Workforce and Economic Development
10 Program received \$27, almost \$28 million through June 30,
11 2018. The funds were directed to align with SB 350 and SB
12 100. You'll recall SB 350 is the Clean Energy and
13 Pollution Reduction Act. And it established clean energy,
14 clean air and greenhouse gas reduction goals including
15 reducing GHGs to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 and
16 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.

17 And then SB 100, which we're working on now,
18 which is requires that renewable energy and zero-carbon
19 resources supply 100 percent of electric retail loads to
20 end-use customers by 2045. So that's great that the
21 Community Colleges were then able to take these directives
22 and turn those into programs for workforce development.

23 This includes supplemental funding for clean
24 energy education at 96 colleges. And students earned
25 almost 9,000 degrees and certificates in various programs.

1 Over 1,600 received Associate Art or Science degrees; over
2 4,000 certificates requiring 18 units or more; over 2,300
3 certificates requiring 16 to 18 units and 887 other or non-
4 credit awards, including apprenticeship certifications.

5 Okay Conservation Corps, they stopped reporting
6 last year as well after they no longer received Prop 39
7 funding. So this is based on the previous information they
8 had submitted to us. But they did receive over \$26 million
9 through June 30th, 2018 and thereafter received funding
10 from GGRF, the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund. And again,
11 they did provide their final report in 2018.

12 They trained 708 Energy Corps members to conduct
13 energy surveys and 408 to perform energy efficiency audits.
14 They completed more than 1,300 energy surveys at more than
15 13,000 buildings, representing over 79 million square feet.
16 They completed 93 retrofit projects, including 124,000
17 lighting fixture replacements and more than 8,000 control
18 retrofits. And that saved schools more than 6.5 million
19 kilowatt hours per year.

20 And then they told us in 2019 they were
21 continuing to install energy efficiency lamps, controllers,
22 ballasts, other equipment purchased by the LEAs with Prop
23 39 funds and were using the GGRF to cover their labor
24 costs.

25 Proposition 39 Job Creation, again this goes back

1 to last year's report for the actual numbers. But it did
2 create significant economic and fiscal benefits for
3 California. It increased economic activity and employment,
4 on top of energy savings and greenhouse gas emissions. And
5 those reductions and savings would not have otherwise
6 occurred without Proposition 39. So I think that's an
7 important point to get across as well.

8 Through the end of 2018, they estimated more than
9 \$3.3 billion in economic activity in California. And I
10 think again in the times we're in now that's an important
11 note that this program has been successful as sort of a
12 stimulus program as well. And there may be opportunities
13 ahead. So we'll see where that goes.

14 And then through the end of 2018 the program
15 created nearly 20,000 jobs and again provided their final
16 report in February of 2019.

17 Here's a look at those jobs. And the economic
18 activity again from the previous report through 2018,
19 \$3.349 billion in economic activity. That's direct jobs,
20 indirect jobs and induced jobs.

21 And then for the employment the number of jobs
22 created: 8,700 direct jobs, over 3,800 indirect jobs and
23 almost 7,300 induced jobs. Workers in other industries who
24 benefit directly from the spending, so almost 20,000 jobs.
25 Again, \$3.3 billion in economic activity in California as

1 it relates from this program.

2 This, again in Chapter 3 this is from the latest
3 Workforce Development Report provided to us in February.
4 It takes a look at the distribution of hours and types of
5 projects that were worked on. You'll see a high percentage
6 of building envelope jobs and these are construction-
7 intensive jobs that do provide work. And then you see the
8 average hourly rate for apprentices and selected trades.
9 So electricians over \$48 an hour, carpenters over \$44 an
10 hour and the list goes on, sheet metal \$44 an hour. A lot
11 of good jobs associated with the Prop 39 program and good
12 paying jobs, so --

13 SB 110 Programs, we took a look at this again in
14 Chapter 3, and the ECAA-Ed Competitive Loan Program. And
15 we just had an overview on that, so I'll let that stand.
16 And then the School Bus Program received \$75 million. We
17 had a presentation on that as well, 200 applications to
18 replace more than 1,600 diesel buses. And that funded in
19 total 233 electric school buses.

20 So with that I'd like to go on to our findings
21 and recommendations and looking for any input,
22 conversation, adjustments we need to make here to these
23 findings and recommendations.

24 So Number 1, provide annual appropriations to the
25 Clean Energy Jobs Fund to allow for continued energy

1 savings, emission reductions, and jobs in California public
2 schools. We see that the investments were substantial and
3 benefits continue to accrue as projects are completed.
4 It's resulted in significant economic and employment
5 activity throughout the state. And the program has
6 demonstrated success and should be funded through annual
7 appropriations to allow progress to continue now that the
8 initial five-year term has concluded. In particular, the
9 Board recommends the Legislature appropriate a minimum of
10 \$175 million per year for the Proposition 39 Program.

11 Recommendation 2, absent the annual
12 appropriations from Recommendation 1, would be to provide
13 direct appropriations to the Energy Commission for the
14 development of a Proposition 39 K through 12 Competitive
15 Grant Program. Again, the SB 110 established three
16 programs: The School Bus Replacement and ECAA-Ed, the
17 Proposition 39 Competitive K through 12 wasn't funded. So
18 given the success of the K through 12 program to date, we
19 recommend the Legislature provide a one-time appropriation
20 of \$125 million to support a K through 12 Competitive Grant
21 Program.

22 And then 3, Recommendation 3, again absent annual
23 appropriations to the Clean Energy Jobs Fund in
24 Recommendation 1, we recommend the Legislature provide
25 direct appropriations to the Community Colleges

1 Chancellor's Office to support continued energy savings and
2 projects there. Given the success of the program to date,
3 we recommend the Legislature provide a one-time
4 appropriation of \$50 million to support continued progress
5 at Community Colleges.

6 So again, the first recommendation is for a total
7 of \$175 million-a-year annual appropriations. Should they
8 not do that then we ask in Recommendations 2 and 3 that
9 they think about one-time allocations directly to the
10 Energy Commission to continue the work of the K through 12
11 schools and directly to the Community Colleges to continue
12 the work there as well.

13 And then the fourth recommendation, we've been
14 particularly impressed with the School Bus Program and how
15 that's moved quickly. And we recommend a one-time
16 appropriation of \$75 million to the Energy Commission's
17 Clean Transportation Program to continue replacing diesel
18 school buses throughout California. They were able to move
19 that first \$75 million resulting in 233 buses. I think
20 it's worthwhile that the Legislature consider again more
21 funding to continue the progress and develop electric
22 school buses throughout the state.

23 And then Recommendation 5, as you know we're sort
24 of closing up shop slowly here at the Citizens Oversight
25 Board. If the Legislature feels that the work of the

1 Oversight Board and independent audits are useful and
2 worthwhile to the Legislature, we recommend that they
3 provide funding for the two positions and at least \$300,000
4 a year for the independent audits. Those were initially
5 funded though the Energy Resources Program Account, but
6 that fund is experiencing what we call a structural deficit
7 and is phasing out support of the Board. And so if the
8 Legislature believes continued oversight is warranted, a
9 direct appropriation to the Board from an alternate funding
10 source would be necessary.

11 And there you have your overview of the report.
12 And I'll entertain your questions, comments or otherwise.
13 Thanks.

14 CHAIR ALVORD: Great. Thanks very much, Jim.
15 Just for the purposes of efficiency maybe the
16 first thing is to see if people have any questions about
17 the overall report. And then we can go into the discussion
18 of the recommendations if that works for everyone. And
19 hearing no objection I'll entertain questions for Jim about
20 the overall report. I have one small one, so I'll start
21 with that. Jim, how are jobs defined, the 19,812, are
22 those full-time equivalent?

23 MR. BARTRIDGE: I believe they are full-time
24 equivalent.

25 CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. And it's the \$3.35 billion

1 approximately for approximately 20,000 jobs. Is there any
2 kind of a state metric in terms of expenditures and jobs
3 created? Is there any kind of a way to evaluate those
4 numbers relative to other types of programs for
5 construction or energy?

6 MR. BARTRIDGE: You know, I have to put that over
7 to the Workforce Development Board and Shrayas. (phonetic)
8 I know that they worked with UC Berkeley to develop the
9 calculations and the metrics for the program. Forgive me,
10 I don't know the actual specific details around the
11 workforce development calculations, but I can certainly
12 reach out to Shrayas and see.

13 CHAIR ALVORD: It might be interesting to know
14 just in terms of defending the program. You know, how this
15 compares and what the metrics are based on.

16 MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay. I'll do a follow-up.

17 CHAIR ALVORD: If it's possible. If it's
18 possible, right?

19 MR. BARTRIDGE: Yes, certainly.

20 CHAIR ALVORD: Okay, so at this point I'll open
21 it up for discussion on the findings and recommendations
22 unless anybody else had a question? Okay, hearing none who
23 would like to make some comments or if anyone has any
24 comments on the findings and recommendations?

25 MR. BARTRIDGE: Nobody raising a hand or does

1 everybody feel comfortable with the way the recommendations
2 look at this point?

3 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Well this is Dave Dias.
4 Yeah, I'd like to see our Recommendation 1 go through.

5 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: This is Heather, I
6 agree. Yeah.

7 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Great.

8 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: This is Barbara. I think
9 we've been reasonable in sounding similar -- making similar
10 suggestions in prior years. And they haven't resulted in
11 the desired outcomes, but I still support them.

12 MR. BARTRIDGE: Thank you, Barbara.

13 CHAIR ALVORD: Randall, are you here? I'm not
14 seeing you.

15 VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: I am. And I've worked with
16 Jim in the draft so none of this is surprising to me. I do
17 support it. I'm just curious Jim, about the reality of
18 Recommendation Number 4 is not agreed upon. Oh I'm sorry,
19 next recommendation, yeah, that one.

20 MR. BARTRIDGE: Well at this point, Randall, we
21 have \$300,000 expiring this year and \$300,000 in the budget
22 for next year to support our audits with the State
23 Controller's Office. And as you know the staffing, Jack
24 and I are both Energy Commission employees, but a portion
25 of our time is spent on the Citizens Oversight Board. And

1 so they have covered that. But I think I don't know about
2 the realities of this, but I would definitely like to, if
3 the Board's going forward we do need to find some sort of
4 alternative funding mechanism to support our work. And so
5 that's a discussion that needs to be had in the
6 Legislature.

7 VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: I agree. With Number 5,
8 if we're not able to find funding essentially we can't
9 operate.

10 MR. BARTRIDGE: Correct. And so what we've
11 slowly been wrapping up and, as you've seen, the
12 Conservation Corps has stopped reporting, the Workforce
13 Development Board has stopped reporting because they're no
14 longer receiving funding. The programs are -- there's
15 still a lot of work going on out there from projects and
16 project funding. But yeah, I think we're in a situation
17 where we're getting ready over the next couple of years to
18 sort of close up the doors on the Citizens Oversight Board,
19 which is why we have this recommendation in there.

20 CHAIR ALVORD: Yeah, I think the thing that
21 concerns me is that -- and Randall I had a similar question
22 -- is I mean clearly there is if you're talking about
23 oversight of expenditure we have a couple of years to go
24 here. And so there may not -- even if there's no more
25 money in the pot for the types of programs that we think

1 provide value, there presumably is still some kind of a
2 value in providing oversight to how this money is spent.
3 And the Legislature may or may or may not ultimately agree,
4 but I guess I'm concerned that we could run out of funds
5 for the Board's activity before the projects are completed
6 and the audits are done and all of that. And so I wonder
7 if there's been discussion within the CEC for that
8 eventuality and how that would be handled.

9 MR. BARTRIDGE: I think at this point the way it
10 looks to us is that we have two more years. And certainly
11 Jack and I would continue to support for those next two
12 years. And then with our audits, the way we've considered
13 the audits going forward would be a program on it this
14 year. And then in the second year we would do a final
15 program audit and a final financial audit. And after that
16 I think we'll have to have -- I think that's where we're
17 going but I'd certainly be fine to take it up within the
18 Energy Commission. But again I think there needs to be a
19 conversation with folks at the Legislature.

20 CHAIR ALVORD: Uh-huh.

21 MR. BARTRIDGE: And so we're going to put this
22 report over to them and hopefully there's some follow-up
23 conversation.

24 CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Is this something that the
25 CEC is planning to bring up at the Legislature?

1 MR. BARTRIDGE: Well as you know we're an
2 independent agency within the Energy Commission, so I
3 haven't had that conversation with Energy Commission folks.
4 I think that's a conversation that might be best come from
5 the Board themselves.

6 CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Well the other question I
7 have is it sounds like Commissioner McAllister referred to
8 the federal stimulus when he was with us. And I'm just
9 wondering if there's any activity that we should be aware
10 of in terms of what the state is asking for in the federal
11 stimulus where this program could be leveraged somehow.
12 And it sounds like it's possible. So that might be
13 something, if there's any report on that for our next
14 meeting that would be helpful.

15 MR. BARTRIDGE: Very good. I did work on some
16 potential stimulus things with the Energy Commission a
17 couple of weeks back, but Prop 39 was not one of the things
18 that we were looking at, at that point.

19 CHAIR ALVORD: Okay.

20 MR. BARTRIDGE: But I'll follow up with
21 Commissioner McAllister's office.

22 CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Okay, great. So it sounds
23 like we're ready for a vote to accept the report.

24 VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: And this is Randall, so
25 moved.

1 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Dave Dias, second.

2 MR. BARTRIDGE: Then we'll go ahead and do a roll
3 call vote. Chair Alvord?

4 CHAIR ALVORD: Aye.

5 MR. BARTRIDGE: Vice-Chair Martinez?

6 VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Aye.

7 MR. BARTRIDGE: David Dias?

8 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Aye.

9 MR. BARTRIDGE: Barbara Lloyd?

10 DBOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yes.

11 MR. BARTRIDGE: Heather Rosenberg?

12 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Aye.

13 MR. BARTRIDGE: And Darrell Park?

14 BOARD MEMBER PARK: Aye.

15 MR. BARTRIDGE: Great.

16 CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. So the Annual Report is
17 accepted, and it will go to Legislature. Thank you so much
18 for your hard work Jim and Jack and everyone who was
19 involved.

20 MR. BARTRIDGE: Sure, absolutely.

21 CHAIR ALVORD: Okay, it sounds like we're ready
22 for Public Comment. Is there anyone in this meeting who
23 would like to step up and have up to three minutes to talk
24 on a matter concerning this Board?

25 MR. BARTRIDGE: Hoang, are you on the line from

1 Community Colleges?

2 (No audible response.)

3 MR. BARTRIDGE: No, okay. I will point out one
4 thing which in the development of the report this year we
5 did find some issues with Community College's reporting.
6 And so we do have this letter that we received from them.
7 We worked very closely with them. There were some project
8 differences, some were closed in one year, some were closed
9 in another year. And then we worked closely with them. As
10 we were pulling together the final report they did a
11 cumulative summary report for us and they found some
12 discrepancies after some of the discrepancies that we had.
13 And they did -- this letter is posted on our website.
14 There are references to it. And we're waiting for
15 additional information from Community College's Office. So
16 that was just one point I wanted to make sure that you were
17 aware of.

18 I know Chair we had discussed it. We worked very
19 closely with them as some of the numbers weren't adding up
20 and so it worked very well. And again, a great
21 relationship with Community College Chancellor's office and
22 they were able to quickly turn things around. And so
23 that's reflected in the report and we refer to that in this
24 letter.

25 CHAIR ALVORD: Okay, thank you. And I think we

1 kind of --

2 MR. BARTRIDGE: Any other --

3 CHAIR ALVORD: Oh, go ahead.

4 MR. BARTRIDGE: Any other public comments out
5 there?

6 (No audible response.)

7 CHAIR ALVORD: Okay, with that I think we can
8 adjourn.

9 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Okay, thank you.

10 CHAIR ALVORD: Thank you everyone very much.

11 MR. BARTRIDGE: Thank you, Board Members. We'll
12 be back in touch with you. And we'll look forward to a
13 July meeting to go over audits. And Chair, we'll talk
14 before then.

15 CHAIR ALVORD: Absolutely. Okay, thanks
16 everyone. Meeting adjourned.

17 ALL: Goodbye. Have a great day. Stay safe.

18 (Adjourned at 10:52 a.m.)

19 --oOo--

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3

