STATE of CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA CLEAN ENERGY JOBS ACT

CITIZENS OVERSIGHT BOARD

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

ROSENFELD HEARING ROOM - FIRST FLOOR

1516 NINTH STREET

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

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:

LOS ANGELES CLEANTECH INCUBATOR

525 S. HEWITT STREET

LOS ANGELES, CA 90065

Thursday, March 22, 2018

1:03 p.m.

Brittany Flores, CSR 13460
APPEARANCES

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Kate Gordon, Chairwoman
Mark Gold, Vice-Chair
David Dias
Barbara Lloyd
Randall Martinez
*Chelina Odbert
*Heather Rosenberg
(* denotes via telephones and/or WebEx)

CEC STAFF PRESENT

James Bartridge
Jack Bastida
Michael Murza, Law & Policy Advisor to Chair

Weisenmiller
## INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Introduction and Rollcall</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Approval of Minutes from the February 23rd, 2018 Board Meeting</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Presentation of Design Update of the New School Bus Replacement Program</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Presentation, Discussion, and Possible Vote on Annual Legislative Report of the California Clean Energy Jobs Act</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Public Comment</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjournment</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporter's Certificate</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROCEEDINGS:
March 22, 2018

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Great. Welcome, everybody, to this meeting of the Citizens Oversight Board for the California Clean Energy Jobs Act. I'll turn on my microphone now so that everybody will be happy with me. Sorry.

Welcome, again, to this, this meeting of the Citizens Oversight Board of the California Clean Energy Jobs Act. Thrilled to have so many people in person. It's great to have the southern California constituents coming up for this meeting. Thank you, guys. So let's call roll.

Jim, you want to do a rollcall.

MR. BARTRIDGE: I will. Before we do that, let me do the housekeeping items real quick. So if you're not familiar with the building, restrooms, across the hall. Snack bar on the second floor. Am I on?

In the event of an emergency, follow employees across the street to the park. We'll reconvene at, at Roosevelt Park if something -- once that's resolved, we'll be back in the building. So that's, that's that side of it, and let me go ahead and call the roll.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Board Chair Gordon.
CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Here.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Mark Gold.

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Here.

MR. BARTRIDGE: David Dias.

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Here.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Barbara Lloyd.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Here.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Randall Martinez.

BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: Here.

MR. BARTRIDGE: And offsite, Chelina Odbert.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: She's going to be here, but she's not here yet.

MR. BARTRIDGE: And Heather Rosenberg.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: That's me.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: What time is Chelina joining? Do we know?

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Nope. She was supposed to be here.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Okay. Will you just let us know when she gets there? Just give us a shout.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Yep.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: We have a quorum any way, but I just want to make sure we know when she's here.
All right. The first item, as always, is to approve the minutes, which were, hopefully, already reviewed by Member Barbara and I think are now accurate. So can people take a quick look at the minutes from last meeting and make a motion if you would like to approve them.

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: So move.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: All in favor?

(Simultaneous voice vote.)

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Anyone opposed?

Any abstentions? Great. And just to make sure we note that Chelina is not here yet, so it's a vote of however many people that is.

MR. BARTRIDGE: And I wasn't looking up, but who made the motion?

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Mark and Barbara seconded. We're going to get better about that, recording that -- the, the motion -- the motions.

So before we go to Item 3, I just want to remind folks that the meeting today is primarily -- well, there's two different pieces of it. Primarily, the vote is to do two things. One is -- those from last week,
you were -- last week. Feels like week -- last month, remember that we talked about some of the program changes from SB 110. One of the program changes that, in some ways, is the most significant because we have never dealt with it before is the school bus electrification program, and we're going to talk about that today. And we're, we're going to hear how that's going to work and, and how that program is going to function. And then the other main part of the meeting today is to review and I hope approve our report from this Board to the legislature, which is due at the end of March every year.

So this is always a crunch time for this Board. We always have two quick meetings in a row in the spring, and I just wanted to thank everyone again for being here and for putting your time and volunteering energy into this, because we, we all know that it's an extra thing on your plate and just wanted to say we all, everyone, appreciates it. So thank you.

All right. We're going to move to Item 3. And I think --

MR. BARTRIDGE: We have a Liz Shirakh.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: I was going to say, that's not Jennifer Masterson.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Jennifer is here with us
but --

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: I should say to the Board, all of you know Liz from all of the years that she spent on staff working on this project on the K through 12 side, and we are fortunate that she's moved over to work on the school bus program, so we have someone who has deep knowledge of this program working with us.

So it's great to see you back, Liz.

MS. SHIRAKH: Thank you so much. So I'm Liz Shirakh. I now work with Building Transportation Division, and I'm a supervisor for the unit that will be overseeing the school bus program. Jennifer Masterson is the staff lead for the program, and there's other staff in the audience if I can't answer any question or I get stuck today. So happy to be here to share with you where we are with the school bus program. This is an informational item.

Can you hear me okay?

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: This is Heather, I just want to let you know --

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Oh, great. And Heather, you're breaking up, but I think you just said Chelina is there, right?
BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Great. Thank you so much.

MS. SHIRAKH: Okay. Can you hear me?

Okay. So I was saying this is an informational item, and we are really at the program development -- as far as concepts go, we haven't formulated official recommendations on this. So again, this is high level concepts that we're considering right now and getting public feedback.

So for today's presentation, I'd like to give you a little bit of background on the legislation, on SB 110. Next, talk about the development -- program development concepts and implementation ideas that we're currently considering. And then finally, at the end, I'd like to have, you know, opportunity for you to ask questions if you have additional questions.

The primary goals of the program and objective is to implement SB 110, the Clean Energy Job Creation Program that created the school bus replacement program, but we also recognize this provides an opportunity to support the Governor's executive order to boost the supply of zero emission vehicles and zero emission infrastructure in California. And, of course, there are other goals of the program; children's health and
safety; equitable distribution of these funding throughout California; building a zero emissions school infrastructure to support future needs; and, of course, reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

So SB 110, a trailer bill in -- was passed in July of 2017 and it created three new programs with the remaining funding of the existing Prop 39, K through 12 grant program. It states that the first 75 million that's remaining from the program be used for a school bus replacement program. And SB 110 has some specific requirements for the school bus program. First is eligible applicants, and these are school districts, public school districts, and County offices of education. SB 110 also says -- gives us some priority when considering the school buses that we're replacing. We're to look at the oldest school busses or school buses operating in disadvantaged communities and the schools that have the majority of students eligible for the free and reduced price meal from the prior year. Additionally, any school bus that's replaced should be scrapped. In addition to these really specific requirements, the school bus program must also follow many of the rules that apply to the K through 12 grant program, such as the cost effectiveness. The total benefits must be greater than the total project cost
over time. Also, annual report to the Citizens Oversight Board. So for example, next year, the Commission's report to the Citizens Oversight Board would include the school bus program. All projects are subject to an audit. Again, an area that relates to the Citizens Oversight Board. And also, many of the requirements, such as no sole source -- those types of requirements from the previous program do follow into the new school bus program.

But the legislation does differ slightly in some areas. For example, there are no guidelines required in the school bus program, where guidelines were required in the K through 12 program. And there are no set allocations for each LEA like they were in the competitive -- I mean, in the K through 12 program. This will be more of a competitive program based on criteria such as age of the bus. And the eligible applicants are somewhat different in the original program, K through 12 grant program. Local educational agencies included public schools and County Offices of Education, but they also included charter schools and the State special schools. Those will not -- the charter schools and state special schools are not eligible applicants in the school bus program.

So now to talk about the conceptual design of the
school bus program. This really can be looked at as three parts, and the first part is the actual replacement of the school buses. We have 75 -- we hope to have 75 million for replacing of the school buses. And this is -- can be -- is in two phases. The first phase will actually be identifying the eligible school buses for replacement and that, most likely, would be in a application from school districts. And the second phase would be solicitation from bus manufacturers to design, construct, and actually deliver the school buses. Again, that would be the 75 million for Prop 39, but we're also proposing two additional components of the program that would be more leveraged funding to Prop 39, which would be funding coming from the Energy Commission, Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program, and the first part would be infrastructure. So providing an incentive to schools that choose an electric bus, we're proposing that we would complement that by providing infrastructure funding for the charging stations. And third --

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: I'm sorry, Liz. Would that funding be from the same --

MS. SHIRAKH: That would be from the Alternative and Renewable Fuel and --

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Got it.
MS. SHIRAKH: -- Vehicle Technology Program.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Thanks.

MS. SHIRAKH: Also known as ARFVTP.

And with that same funding source, we're proposing a third component, which would be workforce training. This would be training needed for the maintenance and operating of the buses and the charging stations. So that's just, kind of, the overall concept, and now I would like to talk a little bit about the specific school bus part.

So we're -- the first phase is to identify where the oldest school buses are and make awards to schools that have the oldest school buses. And once we have a list of eligible buses established, these awards would be made directly to school districts in ranking order until the funds are exhausted. School districts purchase the buses from a bus manufacturer who's already participated in our competitive solicitation.

The second phase is the bus solicitation. In this process, the manufacturers would submit a grant application demonstrating the ability to make the -- manufacture the school buses. Applicants would describe the types of buses available; number of buses; cost of these buses; maybe some bulk pricing or, or price reduction for, you know, volume; and timing of delivery
of these buses. Our goal is to fund bus -- to fund bus manufacturers with the most competitive price, fastest delivery, and most robust customer service package for the buses.

Once the bus manufacturers are selected, they'll enter into an agreement with the Energy Commission for the construction of the specific number of buses. And then the school buses -- the school districts will pay manufacturers directly with the Energy Commission's grant funding.

So what have we accomplished to date, as I said at the beginning, we're in program development phase, and we have conducted quite a few focus group meetings. We have met with representatives from organizations that have run similar bus program -- incentive programs to gather information in existing programs; obtain lessons learned; identify co-funding opportunities; and seek support and outreach for the program. And we have also reached out to school districts to better understand their needs. We've held three public workshops in February to gather public input and stakeholder input. We have a school bus replacement web page that is linked to the Prop 39 K through 12 grant program web page. And finally, we have established a hotline, a phone number. So if people have questions, they can call the Prop 39
hotline, and now there's a specific number for the bus program.

During our recent workshops -- as I said, the purpose is to gather public information and -- or public input. And so we asked three major questions. And, you know, how, how do we identify the oldest buses? What makes the most sense? How do we distribute the funding awards, and what type of replacement buses should we allow? We asked the participants to provide written comments to our docket and one -- I just wanted to give you an example of the question. Our first -- or one of our questions -- you know, how should the funds be distributed? This is a sample of what we did at our workshop. We presented two scenarios. This is the first one, where we would distribute the funding evenly in four areas or four regions of California. These were identified or broken up by average daily attendance. Each of these regions is approximately one and a half million students and these four areas, you can see, northern, central, southern, and then we have LA County. The funding -- with this scenario, each of these regions would receive about $18.75 million, and then we would prioritize the oldest buses in these regions and, and also based on other points, such as some points to disadvantaged communities or, you know, the majority of
students that are receiving the free and reduced price meal program, and that's how the funding could be distributed.

Another scenario we presented is distributing the funding solely based on the age of the school bus and not necessarily looking at the region or area of California. There is some data available from the California Highway Patrol and the DMV on age of school buses. We also did some phone surveys, reaching out to schools to verify some of this information, but this is what we saw. And as you can see, if we distributed the funding in this scenario, majority of the funding would land in the Central Valley. And in addition, some of the data is dated, and so we would have to do additional work to, kind of, refine and mine that data to be able to identify the oldest buses that are actually still on school districts -- or owned by the school district.

Some of the other questions we asked at the workshops, just so you have a flavor for what we did, you know, is there anything missing from our proposed approach? Infrastructure, would they need that type of support and would they be, you know, wanting training and development? So, again, this is just a sample of the many questions that we asked at our workshop.

Public comments. We had -- I think the public
comment period ended on February twenty --

MS. MASTERSOON: We extended it.

MS. SHIRAKH: Oh, that's right.

MS. MASTERSOON: So March 7th.

MS. SHIRAKH: March 7th was the end of the public comment period, and we received 24 individual letters. And when you break that down, about 55 individual comments and quite a few different categories, but this slide shows the top categories that were commented on. You know, again, the geographical distribution, how are we -- how would we distribute those funding; the types of buses that would be replaced; and then how would we rank the buses. So these were some of the comment areas that the public had commented on.

Now, I'd like to transition a bit and just talk a little bit about electric school buses and a potential emphasis on electric school buses. While the legislation doesn't specify the type of bus that should be purchased, we're emphasizing the electric school bus -- school buses in this program -- and you probably see that by the added incentives to infrastructure and workforce development training, electric school buses have many benefits. Lower emissions, which benefits children's health. Reduced noise, you know, quieter
ride for the children. Quieter neighborhoods around the resident -- for the residents living around school sites, lower maintenance cost, lower fuel cost.

Electric school buses are an emerging technology but there are -- let's see. And they have a higher upfront cost than some, you know, mature technologies but there is a lower operating -- annual operating expense and maintenance cost. And electric buses do have the greatest energy savings.

Also, just wanted to show a visual of -- although it's an emerging technology, there are quite a few electric school buses available or will be available soon. And this is just a few of the samples that are currently on the road or, like I said, will be in the near future.

So also -- let's see. The electric school buses come in a variety of sizes and types and ranges. So that is something that we want to consider because districts have various needs, and we want to be able to make sure that there is some flexibility in their choices, but the technology is developing, and we're seeing more different sizes and larger ranges.

Next, I'd just like to touch briefly on the two components I talked about that were in addition to the Prop 39 funding, the infrastructure and workforce
training. Infrastructure is the second component and, as I mentioned before, would be funded through another funding source not Prop 39. But we could offer an incentive to school districts that chose electric buses by providing the infrastructure for the electrical view -- charging.

And this just shows an example of the variety of charging systems that are available. Again, this is an emerging technology, but the market is growing, and there are options.

And finally, workforce development to provide school districts that provide -- that choose an electric bus training for the workforce. Again, that would be funded through the ARFVTP funds, and these would be complementary to the Prop 39 funding.

Proposed schedule. Again, we're still in the early stages of program development, and we're still considering the public comments we received at the workshops. This is a tentative schedule that we shared at our workshops, and it's, it's subject to change, but we are considering releasing a solicitation to schools, May or June. That would be -- that solicitation would be an application to identify those oldest school buses, and identify the school districts that are interested in participating in this program.
Funding becomes available when the budget is signed July 1st. Then we'll know for sure the remaining balance of that Prop 39 funding. We could then move forward with program awards if we need to go to an Emergency Commission business meeting, and then the bus delivery would be most likely to 2019. We'd need to go through a bus solicitation and secure, secure that. But to give you a -- kind of, a overall, very general possible schedule -- how's that work for lots of qualifiers -- just want to share ways to stay connected to the program. We do have a list serve. It's the Prop 39 list serve that we've used for the K through 12 program. Jennifer Masterson is the staff lead for the program, and we have a hotline.

And I think that was it. I'll stay there. I'd be happy to ask -- or answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Great. I'm sure we have many. I think both people -- everyone has questions.

Randall, do you want to start?

COMMISSIONER MARTINEZ: Sure.

Thank you very much for the information and the presentation. I appreciate the list of potential manufacturers, and that caught my attention. Based on what research you have done so far, are any of these manufacturers headquartered in California,
California-based companies?

MS. SHIRAKH: I will have to rely on some staff here.

MS. WILLIAMS: Hi. My name is Sara Williams. My understanding is that none of the bus manufacturers are headquartered in California. Bloomberg is one option that is America -- in the United States of America.

BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: Uh-huh.

MS. WILLIAMS: But the rest of them are not I believe. There are component manufacturers in California, and there are transit bus manufacturers in California but not school bus.

BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: Okay. And the reason I ask that question -- and I appreciate that answer. Thank you -- is that these companies are going to benefit from a fairly lucrative contract. When they're not based in California, they don't pay State taxes on their corporate profits, and that's a shame especially since the taxpayers in California are funding this particular program.

So I would encourage your -- you and staff to think about ways you could either identify or cultivate California based manufacturers if they exist. And if not, maybe come up with solutions and creative ways to
encourage out-of-state contractors to somehow maximize their California footprint.

Second idea is these out-of-state manufacturers probably have little knowledge, if any, of what else the Proposition 39 has accomplished besides enabling them to make some school buses, manufacture school buses. And I would encourage you in your solicitation to identify the manufacturers, to encourage the successful manufacturer to come up with a plan to incorporate other aspects of Prop 39 into their manufacture. Perhaps, recruiting potential employees from the community colleges that actually put together curriculum and graduated students. They could partner with these community colleges and set forth a plan that, that is acceptable to staff. And they could also work with the workforce development folks to potentially identify some of the graduates from our Conservation Corps programs that might be eligible to work on the manufacturing of such, such buses if they're going to be manufactured here in the state locally.

MS. SHIRAKH: Okay. Thank you for your comment.

BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Can just -- Sarah, can you just clarify. Were you saying that there are no
school bus manufactures in California at this time?

MS. WILLIAMS: To the best of my knowledge, at this time, that is correct specifically because we're not looking at diesel school bus manufacturers. We're looking at electric and potentially other alternative fuels.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Okay. Thank you. That was a great question, though, Randall. Thank you. Mark.

I'm holding my own many questions here.

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: So I have got a few, so bear with me. They're going to, sort of, jump around and not all be thematic, but, but they are about buses. But, but -- so the first one is for a criteria that wasn't included that I think would be critical in light of the priority of children's health and safety -- would be that not only in disadvantaged communities but in non-attainment areas from the standpoint of meeting air quality standards, and is that something that can just be added? Or is there a rationale for why that wasn't an original criteria? It seems, sort of, like an obvious one.

MS. SHIRAKH: Well, the criteria that I have mentioned for the disadvantaged community and the free and reduced price meals is specific in the legislation.
So those are, are ones that legislation suggests that we -- and it's, kind of, an "or" thing. So --

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Right.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: And is it an "or" or an "and"? That's actually a question.

MS. SHIRAKH: It -- that's a good question.

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: But for me, the air quality component is really important.

MS. SHIRAKH: Yeah. I hear what you're saying.

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Yeah. And so, so non-attainment. And the other thing is if it's not -- and I hope that's -- I hope you have the flexibility to add that as criteria because it would strengthen this program dramatically -- but what it also opens up is you talked extensively about electric, but if you're in an attainment area, as an example, you might look at renewable gas buses on -- you know, is -- they're cheaper capital costs on -- and, you know, they do have -- they're, they're great on greenhouse gas emissions. But the issue is from a public health perspective, you know, there's still going to be -- even with the latest engines that are out there, there's still going to be, obviously, worse than electric bus, which is zero emissions.
So that part, I feel like we don't really have the information there. Do you have -- so shifting gears a little bit -- on the cost savings of electric buses, you give us maintenance, fuel, but you don't give us the capital cost of the bus itself. So is there a ballpark estimate of an electric bus versus, for example, a natural gas bus with, with near zero emission engine?

MS. SHIRAKH: So I, I might have to have Sarah -- my understanding is the electric bus is, like, three to four hundred but I'm going to let Sarah --

MS. WILLIAMS: I think that I would -- sorry. I think that I would agree with Liz. About 350, it would be a electric bus. And if memory serves -- and I don't have this right in front of me -- a natural gas bus, you're looking at about a hundred and sixty thousand.

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: But is that even with the -- because the new engines aren't going to last two, three years on natural gas.

MS. WILLIAMS: Those probably are going to be a higher cost, but I don't know that I have a number for that.

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Okay. So I think that would be useful, useful to know. And then --

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Can you hold on that one
for one second just because it is related.

Can you talk for a second about the -- you said this briefly, but it's very related to Mark's point. So you're not using a savings investment ratio as we have in the prior program, but you are using a benefits greater than the total cost over time. Can you just talk about what that means; how, how you're look at that, sort of, capital cost savings over time; what's included in that.

MS. SHIRAKH: Okay. What I mentioned was that the requirement in the statute -- the -- which is cost effectiveness, which is that the benefits need to be greater than the cost over time. That is the same requirement of the current program. The current program then developed what we call the savings to investment ratio, which was a formula to determine the cost effectiveness of the energy efficiency project. We're exploring doing a similar, if you want to say, you know, savings to investment ratio for a bus. So -- because that is the requirement of the statute that we showed these buses are cost effective. So I don't have that exact formula. It's still under development, but it is a requirement of the program.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Go ahead, Mark.

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Okay. So, so the last two
are just, sort of, points, which is, you know, if you
are looking at renewable gas buses as a viable option,
the one thing I would encourage you to do is ensure that
the renewable gas is from California, where it's not
right now. And so that would be an opportunity to, sort
of, you know, force that market a little bit to occur,
which has been a big issue, you know, having, having the
gas come from landfills and -- in the south doesn't
really make much sense.

And then the last thing is on -- and the reason
that looks really familiar is I literally just spent --
had an hour on this exact issue with the big blue bus
fleet in the City of Santa Monica. So that's why it's
all really familiar in my head. I, normally, don't know
anything about buses. But the thing that -- the thing
that they're going to end up doing a pilot on is that
there's, sort of, the manufacturers' range versus
reality. And they have been seeing on manufacturers'
range versus reality -- it's, like, 50 percent. So it's
something that you guys should really take a hard look
at. Like, you want to -- you want demonstrated range as
opposed to manufactured range on electric bus. Believe
me, I'd like nothing better than, especially in
non-attainment areas, to go to full electric buses. But
just make sure you're not -- you're not purchasing buses
that say they're going to go a hundred and fifty miles, and then they only go 75. And that's really been a big problem on, on the bus fleets. So --

MS. SHIRAKH: Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: That's a really good point, and I'm, I'm actually already thinking that we may -- what we may do, as a Board, is decide to write a letter to the CEC with some of these recommendations so that we have them in a more formal way.

MS. SHIRAKH: Okay.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Just to let you know what's in my head, and we should all be thinking about that.

Dave, you had a question and then I'm sure Barbara does and then we'll go to the phone.

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Yeah. Actually, that was a good point. I have a plug-in electric Ford Fusion, and it doesn't get quite the milage it says for the plug-in. Of the electric plug-in, the range isn't quite there yet. So anyhow -- so I'm glad you brought that point up.

Charging stations or infrastructure. Okay. Well, if you don't put the charging station in, the electric bus really doesn't do you any good unless you have a really long cord. So I think that's, you know,
critical. But not only that -- okay. So if -- say a school district, or whatever, gets two buses, or whatever, to start out with. I think when you do the infrastructure, when the infrastructure is done, it should be more charging stations than actually needed to begin with because it's going to cost a lot more to just come back every time and add a station than if you put more in possibly needed to begin with because bringing -- I'm in construction, so I know. Bringing back more and more and more adds to the cost. And I don't -- there's some -- probably a rule at how much you can do. But I'd like to see, if we're going to do this or whatever to -- you need to -- or you need to have two buses -- I don't know what the number is. But just in case you add more buses, it's there and maybe even some kind of a solar charging station as well. I don't know if that's out there yet or not. And --

MS. SHIRAKH: Those are great points that we have, have, you know, a lot of discussions on those -- what the infrastructure would look like and how, how to position that for future.

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: And the only other things, actually, that I really had were already brought up. So -- about being built in California or at least the United States and I know that the range is not what
they probably state. So that's pretty much it right now.

MS. SHIRAKH: Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Really quickly, following up on that. When -- on the charging, is it right to assume that many of these districts have some centralized station where the buses hang out? I mean, the thing with school buses is they hang out all day when they're not being used in the morning and in the afternoon. So that must be to -- potentially centralize-able. Right?

MS. SHIRAKH: That's my understanding. Yeah. And I think -- just to clarify, although, it might be obvious to you. You had said, you know, you need to -- if you have an electric bus, you need to charge it somehow. So our vision is that once we have the -- you know, identify the schools that qualify for buses and we have the bus manufacturer solicitation complete, and they're working on it; then we can work on that infrastructure development before those buses are delivered. So, kind of, timing all that so that you don't end up with a bus and nowhere to charge it.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Great.

BARBARA, I'm sure you have questions.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Right. Just a few. So
the first one had to do with what kind of feedback you received from the public regarding your scenario one, scenario two. You know, scenario one with some sort of a geographic, you know, pre-allocation formula and scenario two being based on age of buses without direct regard for geographic, you know, equity.

MS. SHIRAKH: Yeah. I'm -- I think it was regional, correct? Yeah. I think the regional approach, where it's -- the funding is more distributed equally throughout California, we had more comments favoring that approach.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: In favor of that. I will observe without really taking a, a strong view on it that, that wasn't in the statute, right? The geographic --

MS. SHIRAKH: That is --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: -- wasn't a criteria. And what we have here is a very complicated balancing act of age versus disadvantage versus, maybe, you know, area attainment. And also, there's the potential for, for significant dilution of benefits if each graphic bucket is exactly the same. And one of the reasons that's incredibility obvious to me is looking at the scenario two map, where it looks like SQAMB has already done a lot of work potentially incentivize-ing those
fleets to be cleaner, because there's a bigger percentage in California that have, essentially, made that transition. And so maybe fewer buses remain there. Anyway, it's just something to take a look at. I'm not sure that you'll get as much bang for your buck with

that equal distribution geographically.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Just on that point, it'd actually be worth -- and I don't know if this is easy or hard to do. But it would be interesting to look at the overlap between the non-attainment areas and older buses because I'm just looking at -- eyeballing your map. My sense is you have -- actually have a pretty big overlap with the non-attainment areas down in the Inland Empire on that -- on that -- on that older bus map. Not particularly good overlap on the geographic distribution. So just something to think about as an additional -- just a -- it's an overall goal of California and that's an issue.

MS. SHIRAKH: Thank you so much.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: And then I had a question. Let's see if I start it -- let me see if I can find the page. Sorry. The two additional funding sources -- one for infrastructure and one for workforce training development -- would seem, to me, to be -- essential for districts to know whether or not those
resources would be there before they would apply, because if they apply for the funding and those other resources aren't there, they're stuck needing to fund those activities in some other way. How, how is that going to work?

MS. SHIRAKH: We would have that identified in the application for the school districts that this, this would come -- you know, if you choose an electric school bus, it comes with these incentives. So it's actual incentives to make that choice.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Okay. So what is -- and maybe this is something you can talk to now or maybe we have to hear about it later -- is adding the process for the CEC to formalize those allegations and, and what the ability for CEC to do that in advance of knowing who those -- you know, you almost need a programmatic allocation from the CEC in advance of knowing where the Prop 39 funding would go. Otherwise, it's just a promise that doesn't have any teeth.

MS. SHIRAKH: I believe that they -- we -- I'm a little new to the fuel and transportation office.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Right.

MS. SHIRAKH: So excuse me for not being able to answer all your questions.

Thank you.
MR. BARTRIDGE: Let me jump in on that.

So the Alternative and Renewable Fuels and Vehicle Technology Program prepares a funding plan every year. There are already components of it for workforce or, or -- charging infrastructure. They do a lot of charging infrastructure throughout the state. I think at last count, it was about 10,000 or 11,000 they funded around the state. So I would see that as -- for this, as a subset of what they already do as a category by line and then they also do as part of that planned workforce training.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: So my question then is what is the process by which there's going to be an adequate reservation of funding from those two programs to meet the needs of the district who receives the school bus replacement funding?

MR. BARTRIDGE: Right. So --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Did they need to align or else somebody's going to get an award here and there's not going to be enough funding for them, and there's going to be a lot of gnashing of teeth or something?

MS. MASTERSO: So there's already been a set aside for this program.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Thank you.
MS. MASTERTSON: And then, also, we are looking into cost sharing with some of the utilities, because they're coming out with their program for infrastructure as well.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Okay. Just to spread it that much further. Thank you. I did not understand that there had already been a set aside. It seemed a little bit more like wishful thinking. So thank you.

And then my only other concern is looking at the proposed schedule, it's unclear what the application submittal time frame would be in the schedule. So there's going to be a solicitation release. Business meetings in August. If the release is May or June means that the districts are having to submit their applications in July. Is that really going to work? I mean, that's -- that may not be enough timing. I don't know.

MS. SHIRAKH: That's one of the things that we're considering; why I qualified this tentative schedule because I think we need to have two weeks -- two-month window for schools to respond to this application. We want this to be a successful program and we want it to have time and we need to do outreach as well to make sure the schools are aware of this program. July is, kind of, a, a downtime for schools.
BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yeah.

MS. SHIRAKH: They're on vacation. So our window is pretty much May to June. And if that doesn't seem realistic or doable, then I think we'll have to shift it and come back to the schools in August, September. So again, we're conceptually working out the different possibilities and making recommendations.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Okay.

MS. SHIRAKH: But those are very good points that we have to have a large enough window so we'll get response and, you know, schools are on schedule.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yeah. And, and really that those who, maybe, have less robust administrative infrastructure are not disadvantaged in the process.

MS. SHIRAKH: It is a challenge. We have -- what -- 10,000 public school districts. With the Prop 39 K through 12 program, we had the luxury of four years to get the word out, and that was difficult at some times for those small, small school districts.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Great. I'm good.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: I want to see if Heather or Chelina have questions.

MS. ODBERT: This is Chelina. Can you guys hear us?

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yep.
MS. ODBERT: Okay. Most of my questions have already been brought up by the rest of you, but maybe just a clarification as to the scenario one versus scenario two. How is that decision going to ultimately be made?

MS. SHIRAKH: Well, staff will make a recommendation, and that's a policy call from our Commissioner. So that's the process here. So we are still formulating recommendations, and Commissioner Scot is overseeing the transportation. So it will be a policy call.

MS. ODBERT: Okay. Great. I think the other ones were around schedule, and I think they were just asked in the last set of questions. So that's all for me.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Heather? Sorry. Heather, do you have questions?

MS. ROSENBERG: No. They have all been answered.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Great. Some really good points have been brought up. I had a question about the workforce training piece. I think all my other questions were answered, which is great.

So it's great that you're thinking about workforce training. Can you talk a little bit about
what kinds of training you're thinking when you say that.

One of the things we know from the Prop 39 program is that the multicraft training has been really effective because it is multicraft. It's not just training for one specific, small area that may or may not have jobs in existence. It's training for a variety of things, among which efficiency is one.

What kind -- what are you thinking here? Are you thinking on the manufacturing side? Are you thinking drivers? What, what are you -- what's, what's the workforce training theory?

MS. SHIRAKH: My thought was that this is more for workforce -- this is training for the schools so they can maintain these buses and operate these buses safely and maintain the charging systems. So --

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: It's really not new jobs. It's really -- it's really, sort of, upscaling operations people that are already in the system.

MS. SHIRAKH: I would say that's correct.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Okay. That's really helpful to understand because it goes to Randall's point, too, about, about whether you can leverage some of the existing workforce pieces of Prop 39, which may or may not be possible because those were mostly
building-focused and efficiency-focused and necessarily a different set of skills.

I do want to make sure that we're not -- all of us, together, are not overpromising on job creation here because what I'm really hearing is this is not -- I mean, there's not a place in California on the manufacturer's side. The drivers will probably be the same drivers, and we'll probably see custodial staff or existing staff getting additional training to do maintenance. But I'm not hearing a lot of new job creation, so we just need to all be careful about not promising that, because we have been burned by that in the past.

Go ahead, Dave.

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Do you have any idea how many buses are out there right now?


BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Well, because I --

MS. SHIRAKH: I think that's part of that scenario two, where it has the buses identified -- is that the CHP has -- I believe they have some kind of licensing -- or not licensing --

MS. MASTERS: Certification.

MS. SHIRAKH: Certification, that's the right word. Thank you. DMV also has the list. So
we've got both those lists. We tried to align them and found a lot of data that was questionable. At that point, we went to the phones and tried to call school districts to verify what's really there. And we found that the information we had was dated. So it would probably be a big lift for the Energy Commission to actually identify and find and know that number.

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Well, the reason I was getting at it, I did -- real quick -- the math. And $350,000 for a school bus, yeah, you're a little over 200 for 75 million. And how many school districts are there?

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: 11,000, something like that.

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: 11,000. That's a drop in the bucket. Yeah. So that's why I was wondering. It's going -- even if you really make a big dent, it's going to take a while.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: And this goes back to the prioritization question that we have all been focused on is how do you get the most bang for the buck, given the goals in the program, which our oldest buses, disadvantaged districts. And how to really -- we had the same problem at the beginning of this Prop 39 program. As you all remember, there's no inventory of
school buildings either. So we also have been -- had a
hard time targeting funding, and when, ultimately, the
geographic distribution, the Governor's office and
legislature did, which was, you know, good and bad.

So I, I -- I'm just trying to think through --
and we don't have our lawyer here. But I'm trying to
think through logistics. It seems to me that we should
put together some of these recommendations on paper to
Commissioner Scot, it sounds like, is the right
recipient of that. I don't think we can do that, as a
Board, without an additional meeting and voting. So
what we can do, though, is that I and Vice-Chair Gold
can write -- the two of us can write a letter,
especially, without an additional meeting, without an
additional vote to, to the commissioner seeking info.

Is everybody comfortable with that approach?

Great. And then we can put some of these
recommendations on paper including if we have a
recommendation on your scenarios. I think we will --
we'll include that because it sounds like we might. So
does that sound like a good plan for folks? And let's
ty to work -- try to do that quickly.

Are you good with that, Mark?

VICE-CHAIR Gold: Uh-huh.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: We'll try to do that
quickly.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Do we need a vote asking you guys to do that?

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: I don't think so, because I think if it becomes an official action of the Board, then it has to be everyone in the Board. And then we have to have a meeting about it, and it'd have to be out for public comment. So I think what we'll do is I will -- two of us can communicate something and we'll just informally -- I'll reach out to folks. Does that make sense? I'll double-check with our lawyer that that's okay, but that's my sense as to how this can work.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: I'm certainly comfortable. The input I've already given are the questions I already asked.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Thank you. Yeah. We will include all the -- I have written down notes on all the info.

Does that sound -- and we'll get something together as quickly as possible so you can include it in your deliberations on the program. Thank you for giving us your overview.

MS. SHIRAKH: Okay. Well, thank you so much for having us today.
CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Absolutely. We're really happy to learn more about this program. As, as folks know, this is the newest -- for us, it's new, too. So we're in the same boat as you. We also are new to this as part of the -- the Prop 39 program. It's a new -- Commissioner Scot hasn't been involved before. So it's a new commissioner, a new set of statutes, a new set of guidelines, a new set of technologies. So I'm happy that we're able to weigh, weigh in early.

And right now, this is a reminder, this is one-time allocation. So it may or may not -- again, like everything else, it may or may not get re-appropriated and that will partly depend on how successful the program is. So it's in everybody's interest to make that 75 go as far as possible. So that if it's a successful program, it can be -- there's more money that can be appropriated there.

All right.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: You know, actually, on that front --

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: If I may, there's probably some value in collecting the information on the next available chunks of districts and buses in your program so that you could basically say, "Here's where
our first 75 million would go. If we had another 75
million, here's where it would go," and almost, frankly,
pre-ranking them because then those districts go to
their legislators and their legislators say, "Okay.
We'll try and get the funding." And it's all very
symbiotic.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: That's a great point,
and it's also a good reminder that our report to the
legislature next year will include this program, and
that's another place for that kind of recommendation.
So the more we know from the districts of what is
actually working and what their needs are, then the more
that we can be -- use that report to make a case for it.

MS. SHIRAKH: Absolutely.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Great. And reminder --
one more reminder to this Board is that with, as in
everything else, we will be responsible for auditing
this program and for paying attention to what the
savings actually look like and to making sure it's
working. So we -- it is in our interest to be there at
the beginning with recommendations and to pay attention
throughout the year. This will be added to our audit,
not for this current year, but for the following year.
And I'm not going to start that discussion now, but that
is something we need to talk about, because that's going
to be an additional scope. Exactly. We need to figure
that out. So that should be in the back of everyone's
minds.

    Thank you so much, Liz. Thank you, everybody.
    Sara. You guys have been great. Jennifer, great to
    meet you.

    All right. Moving to Item 4. This is a
presentation and discussion of our annual report to the
legislature. I just want to make a couple of remarks on
this before we start, particularly, because we have some
new folks. Obviously, Barbara and Heather, new to the
report process. Mark hasn't gone through a report
process yet either. Right?

    MR. BARTRIDGE: Chair, Chair, can I jump in
for one second, please.

    CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Oh, sure.

    MR. BARTRIDGE: As you all know, Chair
Weisenmiller is an ex officio member of the Board, and
I'd just like to recognize Michael Murza is representing
his office, attending today.

    CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Thanks. Sorry, Michael.
I should have said that earlier. We're just so used to
having you with us. Thank you for being here.

    Thanks, Jim.

    So -- you did go through it last year. In any
case, reminder to everyone a couple of things about this report. One is the Citizens Oversight Board has two major responsibilities. One is our annual report to the legislature due 90 days after the 1st of the year. So that is always on March 30th except in leap years, which we experienced once, where we had to do it faster. And it is -- the other one of our major responsibilities is the audit, and I just want to be clear that the report to legislature is not the audit. So we are -- we have an entire audit process, in which we have to really dig in on whether these numbers are what they should be and whether what the savings are being reported are what they should be.

This report is much more of a programmatic overview and our recommendations based on our unique role of being at the center of all the agencies working on this project, looking at what's working, what our recommendations are, and, and what things are going forward. So I just wanted to be clear on that because some -- in the last couple years, we have gotten into audit-like conversations during this meeting, and I just want to make sure those two things are separate.

One thing that's different this year than usual is that, obviously, there are some program changes coming up. This program does not cover any of the
program changes. We are not reviewing a year in which there were program changes just to be clear, but we do preview the program changes under SB 110 in this report because we're -- though we're reporting on last year, we're reporting to a legislature that is currently considering potential allocations of money to the new program. So I hope that makes sense. We're reporting on what's happened. But the legislature we're reporting to has the opportunity to give -- to allocate or not allocate funds to this program going forward. So it's different in that way, and those were the two big points I wanted to make.

I think what we're going to do is go -- oh, I guess the final point is the one I make every year, which is my annual apology of how last minute this always is. As you know, we get the reports from all the agencies at the, kind of, end of February. We have to have the meeting to review them, approve them, and then write this report and summarize them and then approve this report. It's a very, very fast turnaround, and I just want to thank both Jim and Jack for all of their work over the last month, writing this and pulling pieces together and, and making it easy for the rest of us. So thank you.

With all that said, I think what we're going to
do is go -- we're going to actually put this up on the screen. I know it's a Word document. It's not ideal, but we may be making some edits. We can make a motion at the end of this meeting, where we incorporate the edits that have been made. So it's -- that's how we're going to try to do this. If we have edits, we're going to try to make it in real time using track changes so they're obvious. And then we will decide on how to incorporate them and whether to incorporate them at the end of the meeting.

So any overarching questions about process or about this from the Board before we start?

All right. I'm going to have Jim go through, section by section, explaining the outline, sort of, organization of this report, which is slightly different. It's shorter than previous years. I hope everyone appreciates that, and then we're going to dig into a couple sections.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay. Very good. And yes, it was a fast process. So I apologize for getting the report out to you guys so late, but we're making changes right down to the wire, and we understand there is an opportunity to continue making changes over the next week and still make our legislative deadline. So for those of you that have looked at it, feel free to look
at it more. Send us comments in the next couple days, and, and we'll keep -- continue to integrate those as we move forward plus whatever we do today. So we really did try and take a look at this report over the last several years. We incorporated a lot more data that was provided by the outside agencies. And so here, we just tried to preview some of that data and let those reports speak for themselves. So the -- chapter one, we really tried to do a high level look at, at the program overall and what's, what's occurred and the kind of funding that's happened over the last four years and talking about final project completion reports at K through 12, summary of the community college final completion reports. We identified these 2018 program changes in relation to SB 110 that we talked about last time, and we put some comparison tables there in, in the back. They're probably not perfect, but the idea is this has extended. The program has extended, and depending on future legislative allocations that the Board will have some continuing oversight duty into the years ahead. So that -- that's really chapter one.

Chapter two is where we talk about what the Citizens Oversight Board mandates, history, and audit progress is; what we do; what we're required to do as part of this report. So it's not a super long chapter,
but it does capture the work that we're intending to do or that we're required to do.

Just walking through the first chapter of high level -- go to right page here. Sorry.

These, these are comparison timelines, where they talked about the current program and the future program.

So then here we talked about -- again, here's what we're required to do as part of the Citizens Oversight Board; review the expenditures from the fund, review the annual independent audit. Chair Board talked about that we're not doing that today, but, you know, we have last year's audit, and we have some things to work through still. Publish a complete accounting of all expenditures each year, and then submit an evaluation, changes needed to the program that, that the Board sees fit to do. So here, last year is. Your, your meeting history is included; what we have done so far this year; and again, we, we recognize there's some line edits still needed. We can work through some of those as well.

And then we really tried to, in chapter three, give the highest level summary type information of what's going on in the program based on the program reports and then let those reports speak for themselves. And, and of course, we put those revised reports up for
you last night as well so that you have them. If you have questions, we can go back to those reports as necessary and work our way through it.

And then finally, I think this is an important point of the, the participation by county. We spent some time on this, and pretty much every county except for Alpine is represented, has been touched by Prop 39 dollars. And, and I think that's an important point to make. Some more than others but some counties, a hundred percent. A lot of counties, 70 to 99 percent. A lot of counties over 40 percent. So there's a lot of things, positive things, going on out there as a result of this program, and I think that's an important point. And, and this table came from the, the -- or this graph came from the Prop 39 Energy Commission Report.

And then finally -- and then another one here is on community colleges, where it shows a lot of projects at community colleges. And I understand that a representative of community colleges is on the line to answer any questions you may have in relation to some of those projects; walk through some of the technical assistance grants and where those dollars have gone; and how that's resulted in changes in the program.

And finally -- as we get to it -- here's the job creation side of things you heard about from the
Workforce Development Board last time as well. So there's, there's actually been some, some good stuff going on out there. But we're looking at, you know, direct, indirect induced jobs at 18,500. Those are the -- those are the numbers that have been estimated as, as created through this program. And I think that's an important point to get across.

And then finally, we get to the recommendations.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Great. Let's hold on that for a second. I want to give people a chance. Barbara, I will start with you, because I know you have some questions. But give people a chance to ask questions for the sections that are not the recommendations section. So we're going to get to that in a minute, but questions or comments or edits on the report, overview section, summary sections, anything up until this, this point? And I -- and I should say at the outset, for Barbara, I know sent some really -- some good copy editing and other people have sent some copy edits. I, I just want to assume you will incorporate all copy edits --

MR. BARTRIDGE: We will.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: -- and not get into that here and get into substantive questions.

But, Barbara, I'm going to start with you.
BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: So my first substantive question appears on page 16. It's in Table 3-1. Just wanting to make sure that I understand and that the numbers are, in fact, correct. There's an interesting simultaneous number. So disadvantaged LEAs, a total of 1,374. Looks like it happens to be the same number as the total number of LEAs participating in our program, which is an interesting irony. And so is it accurate or has -- you know, has something been put in the wrong place?

MR. BARTRIDGE: And I'll say, as are the percentages.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yes. Well --

MR. BARTRIDGE: I, I --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: And don't -- they all round to 63 percent.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Exactly.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: But it was just -- are we right?

MR. BARTRIDGE: We have Haile Bucaneg --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Thanks.

MR. BARTRIDGE: -- from the program here to respond to your concerns.

MR. BUCANEG: Good afternoon. Yes, my name is Haile Bucaneg, and we also have Jim here, who put
together the report, Jim Holland. So a lot of Jims around.

But yeah, we did go back and take a look at the numbers. The 1374 was a bit of a coincidence but it isn't that -- like you mentioned, it isn't that one thousand three -- all disadvantaged schools applied at the time. It's just at that date of June 30th, we happened to have the same number of applicants as the same number of disadvantaged LEAs. And since then, our number has gone up. We're about 1700 now. So --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Total applicants.  
MR. BUCANEG: Yes.  
BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: I mean, total participants.  
MR. BUCANEG: Total applicants.  
BOARD MEMBERS LLOYD: So the one thing I would say -- and this, kind of, rises to the level of a line item but not exactly. In that last sentence, before the chart, where we say 63 percent of which participated in the program, since it's not clear what we're talking about there, I would say 63 of both disadvantaged LEAs and remaining LEAs participate in the program. That makes it clear that that 63 percent number, you know, applies to both because otherwise it -- I mean, obviously, once you look to the table,
you, sort of, see that, but I just think that would help make clear that this isn't an accident. This is actually what we intended to say.

MR. BARTRIDGE: And if I could ask, I do have it on track changes. If you just say that again slowly, I'll --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Oh, sure. So replace "which" with "both disadvantaged LEAs and remaining LEAs."

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: It's not showing "all mark up." Sorry. You have to put it on "all mark up" to see it. Can you go up to "simple mark up." Do you see that to the right in track changes? And change it to "all mark up," and then you'll see it.

MR. BARTRIDGE: This is a new version. I haven't worked with the new version.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: I mean, it's the same language that I sent over, but it's -- instead of "which," you will say "both disadvantaged LEAs and remaining LEAs."

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Now track changes are off.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Once you look at the table, that's what you think we meant. But before you look at it, it's not clear.
CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Okay. That's good.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: And then my only other question, and I don't know that it's linked to any changes, is on page 19. Are community colleges --

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Our community college -- it's a question for -- the community college person is on the phone. Go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Okay. So I just did a little bit of math on the 578 projects, of which 123 are completed. And when we look at the estimated annual energy cost savings of 1.4 million for those 123 projects, that's about 13 percent, almost 14 percent, of the total projected annual energy savings from the program. So 1.4 compared to 10.3 million, which was a little earlier in our discussion there. So that's quite a bit lower as a percentage of total savings than the 21 percent of projects done. Should we be comfortable that we're still on track towards getting the total $10.3 million in savings because these first projects were lower cost, therefore lower savings. Or should we be concerned that we're not going to hit that 10 million because the savings is running behind the trend or behind target? End of question.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Thank you.

MS. BARTRIDGE: Are you on the line?
MR. MONTOYA: I, I am on the line. I'm just trying to digest the question here. So --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Do you want me to repeat the math that I did?

MR. MONTOYA: No. Actually, I was working with the -- our consultant, Mat Sullivan, earlier on -- we, we got a tidbit earlier of -- the number and the figures and we're trying to figure out -- I think the savings was considered as a point in time. So the 1.4 of the 123 projects was for year four at that point in time and the -- I believe the 455 projects are still in progress. So they could finish up this year or the following year.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Right.

MR. MONTOYA: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: No. I, I get --

MR. MONTOYA: But --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: -- that that 1.4 million is going to be a smaller percentage.

MR. MONTOYA: Uh-huh.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: I mean, is going to be a portion of the target 10.3.

MR. MONTOYA: Right.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: You know, the number of projects is 21 percent of the total 578 projects. The
estimated annual savings from those hundred and 23
projects is only about 14 percent of that $10 million
savings. So that means that those projects haven't
generated 21 percent of savings. Does that mean that
they're just smaller dollar projects? I mean, that's, I
think, a question. What percentage of, of the total
dollars have been spent on those 123 projects? That may
tell us that, oh, you know, only 10 percent of the
money's been spent. So we're actually ahead -- ahead of
it on a proportional basis. It was --

MR. MONTOYA: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: -- red flag.

MR. SULLIVAN: Would you like me to chime
in?

MR. MONTOYA: Yeah, could you, Mat?

MR. SULLIVAN: Sure. So this is Mat
Sullivan with Anderson and McCormick. We're the
consultant that's working with the chancellor's office
on this.

So yeah, I mean, you're exactly right. It's,
it's -- you know, you can't just look at numbers of
projects and, you know, forecast savings. So there's,
you know, a variety of different types of projects that
we're doing and a variety of sizes of projects. So
it's -- you know, the savings are all over the place.
We can -- you know, we can do that analysis if you'd like us to and dig a little deeper into, you know, the savings of the closeout projects versus the savings of the in-progress projects. And some of those in-progress projects are probably closed out by now. This was as of earlier -- or late last year actually. So we probably had more current data on those projects but just, just generally speaking -- and we could get this information for you, too, if you'd like. Generally speaking, our, our original project savings estimate was before the projects were started compared to when they were complete are, are pretty close. We haven't found a situation where --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Okay.

MR. SULLIVAN: -- we overestimated savings significantly. So --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: So this feels -- if I'm to paraphrase, this feels like a normal, sort of, in-progress incremental savings, and until we're closer to, you know, 50, 60, 70 percent of projects done, we shouldn't be too concerned about the trend, and, and we'll get a report next year.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: And I just did the math on the, the 17.5 million that was sent is 11 percent of the year four funding that was available just to be --
BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Oh. We --

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yeah. So the year -- is a hundred and sixty-one point six million --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Oh, right. And --

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: And 17.5 is about 11 percent of that. So that -- if that helps --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Oh, yeah.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: It's lower.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Okay. Great. I actually didn't realize we had that number.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: We do. It's on the prior page. I just found it, too.

So that -- it's a good point. But did -- Barbara, do you think it needs additional clarification, or are you okay?

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: It was more of just a big question as to are we on track. I don't know that there's anything that we would say differently other than a statement that, you know, this is just an -- a point in time but I think that's almost obvious. You guys just have -- just, sort of, reinforced for me that we're most likely on track.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Great. Thank you for those points. We did make one edit.

Okay. Other questions about report up to the
recommendations section? Any, any points of clarification? Any concerns?

   Chelina and Heather, I want to give you a chance to weigh in.

   BOARD MEMBER ODBERT: This is Chelina. I'm okay for now.

   BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Me, too.

   CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: I had a question for Dave actually, because I wrote this, and I want to just confirm that it works. On page 23 on the job creation page, these were my -- I, I wrote in the definite -- the e.g.s, definition of direct, indirect in these jobs, because I feel like people don't know what that is unless they're in the workforce world. Do you think those work, or do you think those should be written differently?

   BOARD MEMBER DIAS: I'm fine with it. I -- could have put sheet metal instead of electricians.

   CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yeah. That's a bias. I think -- no. I --

   BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Yeah. No. I remember reading -- and no. That's fine with me.

   CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Okay. So you think it generally conveys the correct --

   BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Yeah.
CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Mark, you --

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: I just thought it was helpful.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Okay. Great. Yeah. I have spent so much of my life explaining those three categories to people. I figured we should just put it -- put it in the report.

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: No. I think that's really right on.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: So let's talk about the findings and recommendations if no more questions on the prior part of the report.

Jim, was there anything else that you had in the prior --

MR. BARTRIDGE: No. Just to say that, again, if you -- if you have any other line edits or things like that, we're going to be going through it. Feel free to send it to Jack or myself or both of us, and we'll make sure it's incorporated.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Copy edits by when, though?

MR. BARTRIDGE: Probably no later than Tuesday if that's possible maybe Wednesday.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Okay. So will you send out something after this meeting just reminding people?
MR. BARTRIDGE: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Okay. Findings and recommendations. This is the section that is the most in our voice as a Board. So you all have seen versions of it that I have been sending, but this is the final version. And I just want to talk through this for a second.

So this section is always based on our conversations and meetings and people reaching out to me individually or to the staff individually. We make the point at the beginning of this section as we always do that this Board is the one place where all the agencies, kind of, come together. And that has the, kind of, most broad view of the overall workings of the program especially because we also have the public comment board. And so our findings or recommendations are based on that. Basically, the findings section is intended to be a generally supportive set of comments about the outcomes of the program; the particularly increased geographic participation and the increased participation among disadvantaged schools, which were two big pieces of the year. We called out the job training pieces and we called out -- we call out the Energy Commission. We call out the job -- and the job training pieces here because in some ways, that's been the most -- there's --
that's, sort of -- that program has really out performed expectations and that we just generally say this is a good program.

We can add more in here if people want. So we can stop on the findings for a second, and then we can get to the recommendations. Any thoughts?

And thank you for those of you who have already sent me some edits of the sections that have been incorporated.

On the phone, Heather or Chelina, any feelings on the findings section?

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: No. We're all right.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Great. In the room?

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Good.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Everyone good with this section? Okay.

Moving to recommendations, let's go through these one by one. I, actually, have an edit to the first recommendation. So -- which I wrote, so I take full responsibility. The first recommendation, I, essentially, recommend the continuing funding of this program, which would have to be through SB 110, because there's the new vehicle, the new regulation through which the program will be funded. I -- the final
sentence here says, "in particular," and we put in numbers. So we can talk about this. But we said, "In particular, we recommend the legislature appropriate at least 175 million per year for a competitive grant for LEAs as detailed in SB 110." This needs to be changed to reflect the fact that SB 110 provides funding to both LEAs and to the community colleges, which it does not say right now. So I guess I'm recommending a change to something like, "appropriate at least 175 million per year," to -- just give me a second to think. To -- you know, under the "under the, the program guidelines laid out on the SB 110" or just something that says that we'll basically be putting it under 110. Does that make sense to people? So --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: You're not calling out LEAs --

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: We're not calling out LEAs or competitive grant program because actually, the community college program is not competitive grant program. So it's -- and either are parts -- it's just both of those things are too specific. So --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: So just consistent with --

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Consistent. Perfect. So "at least 175 million per year under terms consistent
with SB 110." People happy with that?

You got that, Jim?

And just as a reminder to folks, SB 110 does have an allocation of percentages to both LEAs and to community colleges. And I think it's -- I have a little cheat sheet here from Jim. I think it's 88 percent to LEAs and 12 percent to community colleges. So you guys know what we're saying, which would be about 154 million or something like that.

Yes, Dave.

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Where it says, "at least."

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: "We recommend that the legislature appropriate the minimum" instead of "at least."

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: A minimum of?

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Of 175 million.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Can you get that, Jack, "a minimum of." We can copy edit all this stuff up there.

Okay. All right. On the first recommendations, that was my one change. Any other changes? Great.

The second recommendation is -- and actually, the next one -- well, all of them, the next four -- just, I
want to remind folks are not part of 110. That's why we
had to make them separate. SB 110 does not fund the
ECAA-ED program. They do not fund the workforce stuff.
It does not fund either of these two things that we ask
for all the time but never get. But we're going to try
again -- the inventory or the manual and best practices.
So that's why they're called out not as part of that
first 175. Is that clear to everybody?

So the second recommendation is, essentially, a
recommendation to support ECAA-ED. This is a
recommendation we made, also last year, just as a
reminder for new folks. ECAA-ED was funded in the first
year of the Prop 39 program but not after that. But it
has consistently been -- you know, it's a revolving
fund. People put money back into it. There's a zero
percent default rate. It is one of the more fiscally
responsible pieces of this program, so we called it out
once again as a program and, essentially, made this
point that it's revolving and that schools don't
default.

So the second paragraph here, just so you know
why it's in here, SB 110 -- SB 110 essentially -- well,
actually this is a question for Jim because this was
your point. I just made a point that ECCA-ED is not in
SB 110. But here, we're, we're using language that
implies that it does. This second -- this second paragraph would be separate from 110, right?

MR. BARTRIDGE: So --

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: So right now SB 110 does not provide for any funding for ECCA-ED; is that correct?

MR. BASTIDA: It does.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Just for the remainder of the funds but not for new funds, correct?

MR. BARTRIDGE: Correct. So, so the estimate -- 110 called for 75 million for the school bus program, up to a hundred million for ECCA, of which there was only 39 a week or two ago, and we expect that that number is going to continue to decline up until June 30th.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: So -- I'm sorry. So I probably misspoke. So essentially -- this is always confusing, but there's, there's two sections of 110. There's the section that's about remaining funds from the first five years of this program, which is school buses ECCA-ED. There's then the section that's about everything going forward, which is competitive grants with no ECCA-ED called out, right? Is that correct?

MR. BARTRIDGE: Yes. I believe that's correct, yes.
CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: So we're essentially saying we want a minimum of -- maybe we change it to a minimum again. But we're saying we want a minimum of funding for ECCA-ED, and we're also saying in the second paragraph, we don't want that to be competitive grant funding because ECCA-ED doesn't work that way actually. It's not spent competitively in the way that 110 lays out. The Bright Schools Program is spent for schools that need technical assistance. It's not a competitive grant program.

So I don't know how to make this clearer or if it is clear. But I would -- we would love some help on this recommendation. Essentially, what we're trying to do here is get some, some support; is make a case for ECCA-ED and make a case for us to a higher level of support.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: I have a suggestion. If we simply say, In addition, will -- SB 110 calls for future programs to be run on a competitive basis, then continue with everything else you have there.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Did you get that?

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: "To run on a" or "to be allocated on a competitive basis."

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Oh, you lost it. There you go.
BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: So with that said, is -- how is it that the Bright Schools Program gets funded if schools that have already been approved for something else and then they're just getting this as additional supplemental funding?

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: It's through ECCA-ED, so it's basically funds from ECCA-ED that get -- right? Isn't this right, people in the room?

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: I think I understood it last night, but that was at midnight. So --

MR. BUCANEG: Basically, what happens is, basically, the funds that get associated with the ECCA-ED program, a portion of those funds are allowed to be used for our Bright Schools program. So that's the percentage of the overall amount of funds that go to ECCA-ED that get held to the side for our Bright Schools Program. So it's a separate application for ECCA-ED and a separate application for our Bright Schools Program.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: But that separate application is only given to those who have already made it through the ECCA-ED program?

MR. BUCANEG: No. They can apply either or -- because they -- even if they applied for Bright Schools, doesn't mean they applied for ECCA-ED or vice versa. They can do it separately. We do encourage
everyone that comes in for Bright Schools project to -- through Bright Schools for identifying energy savings measures. We advise them to go through our loan programs so they can fund the projects, but sometimes they fund it themselves.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: So are you saying that you want the Bright Schools Program to be first come, first served? I mean, that if somebody comes and there's funding, they get -- they get allocated.

MR. BUCANEH: Right now the program is a first come --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yes. Okay.

MR. BUCANEH: -- first served basis. So --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: All right. So that's already.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yeah. And SB 110 has priority order for the competitive program, and if you start applying that, it will just -- it would be disaster. So does that make sense, the way it's written?

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yeah, but I think it, it begs the question, what would be the basis for the allocation, and I think you just want to say something to the effect of maintain the status quo -- first come, first served -- for those meeting the eligibility
requirements or something.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: So maybe we change this sentence from a negative. So instead of, "The Citizens Oversight Board does not believe the technical assistance," maybe we should change it to a positive statement. "Believes that technical assistance and energy funds funded by the Bright Schools Program should continue to be allocated on the current -- " I don't know.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yeah. I don't know how one would describe it other than, "first come, first served." So if there's a different term of -- allocated until funds are no longer available. You know, I mean, it's -- on an eligibility basis rather than a competitive basis.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yeah. Should -- so go to "should continue to be."

MR. BARTRIDGE: On a first come --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: If that's the way --

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Is that -- do you think that's an appropriate way to describe it?

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Eligibility basis. So you still have to meet eligibility criteria.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Can we just say, "on an eligibility basis"? Does that make sense? Is that term
Okay? So "on an eligibility basis." Yeah. Coma, "as they're intended."

Okay. All right. Good. People good with this as --

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Where did that hundred million come from because it's per year.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yes. We -- where did the hundred million come from? Remind me.

MR. BARTRIDGE: The hundred million, what we had initially thought was that the --

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Oh, I know where it came from.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Let me go back.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yeah. No. It was what SB 110 originally allocated for ECCA-ED after the 75 school buses.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Exactly. It said, "up to."

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: So they, basically, said, "Of the remaining funds, 75 million -- up to 75 --" or no. 75 million, for sure, go to school buses, and then up to a hundred million to ECCA-ED?

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: But that was a one-time allocation.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: That was a one-time allocation.
VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Well, that's right.

That's why I was saying the "per year," makes it sound like it's in perpetuity.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Well, nothing's in perpetuity because everything's an annual appropriation at this point, right? I mean, unless they write new legislation I guess. We can ask Felicia. I mean, it is a loan --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: We could just say, "a hundred million," and end it there.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Just change it. Take out "per year."

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yeah.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Since it's revolving.

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Yeah.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Okay. Because that's what it was supposed to get any way.

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: I was like, "Wow. In ten years, you get a million dollars."

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: It's only getting --

just to remind folks, because the remaining funds -- the good news is that a lot of LEAs have applied for funds. The remaining funds are less than what we thought.

Right now I think it's only around 39 million that's going to go to ECCA-ED after the school buses because
school buses get priority. So -- and it may be less.

MR. BARTRIDGE: And it's likely going to be less because what we heard was that they had a rush on programs and people submitting application. So by the time they go through the final numbers -- we won't know the final number until June 30th I think.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: So let's just stick with the hundred million. People are -- thank you. You all good with that?

MR. BARTRIDGE: And I'm taking out the "per year."

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: "Per year," yep.

Okay. Got it.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Yeah.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Thanks, guys.

All right. Number three. Now, there's no number in here. This is Director Works of the pre-apprenticeship program. I just want to remind folks that the pre-apprenticeship program is -- this is the program that people from other states call us about consistently. It is unbelievable what results they're getting. I mean -- and we see them, and we have double-checked them. Their placement rates are unbelievable, and I think that's because they made it a multicraft program not a targeted energy efficiency
training program, which was just very innovative, and a lot of states are looking at, at copying it. So that program has been an unfunded mandate from day one. They, essentially, were told to do it with no money from, from the legislature. And they redirected funds, and they have had amazing results. So we've -- I think we have all been really impressed with it. We want to support it. We did not put a dollar amount in here. We can talk about whether we want to put a dollar amount in here. I'm not sure what it would be actually. They ran that program with about $3 million per year and it's one thing to be -- it was in the report. One thing that's interesting about that is that the California Conversation Corps ran with about 5.7 million per year. So more with less placement, which I think is interesting. So do we want to put a number in here. Do we want to try to have this thing -- I mean, I feel like we should try to fund it, but I don't know what the number should be.

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Well, it sounds like you, kind of, do. I mean, you know, you're saying that it's a successful program and ran at 3 million and -- so, you know, it's at least three whether you want to up it or not, but there should be a number in there for sure.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: How do people feel?
BOARD MEMBER DIAS: I agree.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Go ahead, Chelina.

BOARD MEMBER ODBERT: I don't have a suggestion in terms of a number, but I'm just questioning is there anything else that you guys think we can put in the recommendation that would raise the level -- kind of urgency or opportunity that this program is showing us. Even if it's something as simple as referring them in this presentation to a particular portion of the report that --

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Uh-huh.

BOARD MEMBER ODBERT: Because I think it will help make this statement really clear. It -- there's other really -- that might make someone want to --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: More persuasive.

BOARD MEMBER ODBERT: Yeah.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: We could put in the placement data, which we'd have to go back. I mean, that would just be putting a pin on that and would have to be okay with us doing that. But we could -- if we want to put in the placement data to be clear on how many people this is, that could be good.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: And it could come right after the statement about model for other states. Just
insert some of that additional fact buttressing there, and then based on all of that, you know, "we believe it should be funded going forward." If, if --

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Uh-huh.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: If we make a statement that we think reasonable starting point for the administrative funding is $5 million but obviously defer to the legislative -- you know, the budget and legislative process to fine tune it, at least we're putting something out there that has -- you now, or maybe it's $4 million because we're rounding up from three and a half or whatever that number is.

BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: In that scenario, who would receive the money? Would it be the Energy Commission, and then it's granted to these entities?

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: No. It would be the reverse donor board specifically. Yeah. They are who -- this was never money that came from the CEC. This was always money that they converted from other programs, essentially, to meet the goals of Prop 39. So it would have to be -- I mean, like, some of these sections, it would be -- it would need -- this would need to be, kind of, an amendment from the legislature or a new bill from the legislature. So -- or just a new allocation to the --
BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Clarification question.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: It implies that that work will continue regardless of what else is happening to say we're asking for that administrative support. So under what circumstance would this unfunded mandate end versus which of the program recommendations that we're making would cause us to continue to need the workforce development program. How --

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Well, it's ending anyway at the end of the five years of the original Prop 39 program because the directive from the legislature from that first program was to essentially train -- with the workforce development program -- to train people for these jobs. That's how they decided to do it. That mandate no longer exists. It's not in SB 110. So there is no longer any requirements for them to keep doing that training. They will probably end it because it's an unfunded program. So what are the conditions. I guess the conditions are; if we no longer did any energy efficiency in schools, if there's never any more money allocated after the remaining funds were spent to any of these programs at all, then, theoretically, we wouldn't need workers.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: So we probably need to
make that connect-the-dots observation that if --

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Well --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: -- the legislature continues the Energy Efficiency Program, we're assuming that additional workforce training is going to continue to be needed on an ongoing basis, and as long as these other programs are funded, they should be funded and should run the training program.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: I'm actually going to take back what I just said because, because this is a multicraft program. It's actually applicable to every single program that the State runs that's on clean energy or efficiency.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Okay.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: So there's actually -- it's hard to think of a situation in which we wouldn't need that especially given that we have AB 32 and all this funding going into these --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Right.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: -- projects. This is probably the most effective program for all of those.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Okay. So maybe we need to --

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: So --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: -- and that gets back
to buttressing the argument for continuing this
program --

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON:  Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD:  -- a little bit more
because it's not linked just to the Prop 39 program.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON:  Yep.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD:  But we have been in a
unique position to be able to watch the effectiveness of
the program.  Okay.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON:  That's a good point.  So
we will work with approval on the original motion here.
We'll work on language to strengthen this recommendation
and make both the points about additional positive
benefits from the program as it exists and also to make
the point that this training is applicable across all
the states so that clean energy and climate goals will
also -- if people are comfortable with us adding a five
million a year number to this, we will do that.  Are
people comfortable with that number?  Yeah?

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD:  Yeah. They're either
going to take that advice or not.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON:  Well, that's generally
true. Right. In this whole thing. All we can do is
try. That is -- that's the thing about money. Exactly.
It is -- it's unusual, I will just say, to see a really
effective drought training program. It's really hard to do. So that's partly why it's an interesting example because it's -- most of them don't work. So --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: If I could make an observation, I just went to a board meeting of the California Clean Energy Fund last Friday at the San Leandro Energy Efficiency through a Net Zero Energy Training Center that they have done with others, and it's pretty amazing. And they definitely take the multicraft, you know, example to heart. Even within the electricians, they're really looking at, you know, the entirety of what might be needed not just for installation of solar or not just for installation of the energy efficiency, and it's pretty amazing.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: I completely agree. I recommend people go to that facility if you haven't. It's amazing.

All right.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Just a point of clarification.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Sure. Go ahead.

MR. BARTRIDGE: On the five million funding, is that per year or is --

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yep

MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay. Thank you.

All right. Number four. This is a recommendation we have had before, but it has a little bit of color. We normally recommend this. One of the things that's been true since the beginning of this entire program is there's never been a State inventory of school facilities ever, which meant that it's always been extraordinarily hard to target these funds. And we have recommended for the past two years, I think, that there be an inventory. This year, we added a sentence about the fact that the Energy Commission is collecting utility data from every one of the schools. The LEAs that have done a project through Prop 39, we have 12 to 18 months of utility data. We also have all of the California Conservation Corps audit data, which we've got a presentation on when they were here. So all of that -- those data are not going anywhere and being used for anything at this moment unless there's some decision to do that. So that's what this recommendation is. Again, it doesn't have a dollar amount connected to it. I don't have any idea what that would cost. We may want to recommend -- make the recommended addition more advisory that, that there be a -- you know, multi-agency discussion about using the data. I don't know how we
want to do it. But right now it's essentially just a recommendation on how the information be leveraged. Do we want to make it stronger? Do people have other comments about this recommendation?

Yes, Mark.

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Yeah. So this is a topic that's, sort of, near and dear to me. So we have a researcher at UCLA who runs this -- who runs the, the center on sustainable communities. And they have created something called the Energy Atlas. And in the Energy Atlas, it literally has parcel scale energies data on -- as well as building age and a number of other different factors on -- and that's -- right now it's for all of LA County. I think they're expanding it right now to all of southern California on -- user areas. So that's -- you know, compilation-wise, that's pretty much half the state on. And so there's a fair amount of this plus what you're saying from -- now people submitting data separately. That could be there. The fact that this has just been done in a way without using the best available data, to me, is stunning, but it is what it is. But it seems like since the program's evolving, you know, from the standpoint of it's not operating same way it did in the first five years obviously with the legislation from last year on, it just makes sense that
this is an opportunity to make sure it's a more targeted program so that the dollars that are used, you know, are targeting on, you know, schools and disadvantaged communities on -- that are the most energy efficiency -- inefficient on -- and so we get the most bang for the buck with what will clearly be a much more limited pool of dollars. And so it seems like there's a much stronger rationale in which to utilize this approach when before it was obviously a bigger dollar amount on -- and so on -- that's, that's what I'd like to see this do, but I don't think it really does.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Can I ask a question of Mark?

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Do you think what we need to do is just make an encouraging statement that these agencies search out others who are undertaking, sort of, big data projects that could leverage this because we don't know what would -- at this point, probably what is the most efficient? But, you know, you have just given us one example. Do, do we want to include that example?

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Um, I, I -- you know, I, I didn't really say that to pretty much say, "Hey, you know, let's have it go to my university on," you know.
CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: I mean, we could just add, after public school facilities, just in addition, you know, "relevant data is available at universities and utilities across the state."

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: "Seek out some partnerships that would leverage this data with, with other," you know, "research institutions, government agencies, et cetera."

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: But I think -- I think the stronger thing is to add the point that, you know, we really want to target continuing resources towards those schools in disadvantaged communities that had the greatest need, which would be those with the most inefficient, older structures based on the data.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: I have -- I have a question on that, but first, it sounds like Heather or Chelina wants to weigh in here. So go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: I was just agreeing.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Chelina. I'm sorry?

BOARD MEMBER ODBERT: Nothing from me.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Here's a question to what you just said Mark because I think that's absolutely right. The question is, under SB 110, can --
the way SB 110 is written, the competitive grant program only is by geography and then it's disadvantage. It's not disadvantage from a facility standpoint. It's from what they often use, which is free and reduced lunch.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: There's a lot of alignment there.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: There, there is alignment but they're also -- they're not looking at prioritizing the facility need, right. So I'm just -- I'm really asking the question is can you -- can we ask for priority here when it's not part of 110? Do you know what I mean?

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: I, I don't see how that's any different than asking for money that we don't know is there. I mean, we're basically saying this is our best professional judgement, and we'd like to do it in this way, and so I don't really see the difference.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: So I don't -- we should not try wordsmith-ing this right here, but what we're essentially getting at is we want to add, essentially, to make clear that we would -- we believe the funding going forward should be targeting for those schools in disadvantaged communities with the greatest facility need, essentially, from an energy standpoint.

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Yeah.
CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: That is something that requires data and we, we are recommending that -- who are we recommending do this actually is a good question. What entity would you, kind of -- I mean, I feel like it should be the California Department of Education because they are the people with the databases by facility right now. They're the only people who have databases by -- they, they determine free and reduced lunch status. They're the only people who have databases of all the schools. So it feels like it should be them, but that may not be a smart recommendation. I don't know.

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: I mean, I think -- I think what Barbara was saying was it, it could be in, you know, collaboration with, you know, the UC and CSU system or academic institution.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Right.

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Because the reality is they're going to have some data and, and academics are going to have different data --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: And utilities --

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Well, I just meant -- I just meant which coordinating agency.

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. I misunderstood.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: No problem.
MR. BARTRIDGE: Should it be a function of the Energy Commission in Collaboration with Department of Education and CCC working with others? I don't know that, you know, they can potentially workshop it. We could work with Commissioner McAllister and think through some of the things that he's approaching on the energy efficiency side and try and marry something together.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Right.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: It, it sounds like we might get more leverage if the CEC were an active participant because of the --

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Uh-huh.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: -- higher level of motivation in energy efficiency, where CEC has a lot of their responsibilities.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yep.

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: And I would also note that CEC knows very well about the Energy Atlas effort as well.

MR. BARTRIDGE: And we have a disadvantaged community advisory group as well.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Right.

MR. BARTRIDGE: So there's a lot of synergy.

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Yeah.
CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: And the POC as well.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Right, because they have data.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Right. So, so, so, A, there's the language on, on the need to better target. But B, it sounds like what we're -- actual recommendation is --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Collaborative.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Is a collaborative effort, yeah.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: -- be undertaken probably led by CEC.

BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: Collaborative effort with a goal of what to recommend.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Okay. I think that makes sense. I have notes here, Jim. So essentially, again, making that case about better targeting; making the case that we need this collaborative effort; and making the case that that would include reaching out to, to universities and utilities and any other entity that has, you know, done data collection on these, these issues. I know that Berkeley Center for Cities and Schools has done some, too, but there's a bunch of different places, none of which right now have a -- have
a coordinated -- a coordinated system. I do want to
include the Department of Education just because I think they need to be part of this. They're -- they really are the people who do the most outreach to schools and maintain a list and a database. So --

All right. Are folks comfortable with that -- those additions? We will work through them, but generally, those additions to this recommendation? We'll do a motion on all this. It's going to be a complicated motion. So --

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: I'm almost done.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Oh, Mark's almost leaving us. He's leaving us in nine minutes. Can we make it through.

MR. BARTRIDGE: And there's no funding associated with that one.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Uh-huh.

MR. BARTRIDGE: It's just, "Go figure it out. Make something of it."

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: I don't think we have any idea what it would cost or what that would look like. You know, and I just want to -- we do make this recommendation every year. It has, so far, not worked, but we can keep trying. The final one is a recommendation that's actually just copied and pasted from last year. So it's just our, our recommendation
that we learned a lot in the first five years of the program. We should write it down. Somebody should write it down and, and make -- and we, we actually say, "a third party organization" to basically look at all this and write down what's worked and what hasn't worked because other, other states are interested and other, other parts of this state, California, are interested. So it's that again. We did not recommend -- we just said, "allocate some funding." We didn't actually recommend an amount. We can. We need to take out -- I should change this. We need to take out "possibly out of unspent program funds," because those have been allocated through SB 110. So now they have. So take out that parenthetical. Do we want to put a number in here? Do you see where I'm talking about, Jim? I don't have any clue what the number would be either. It's like a grant to somebody to basically evaluate the program and figure out what's worked and what hasn't worked. I don't know that we want to put a number in, but we could. It's not that much. It's, it's, it's like a hundred thousand dollars or something.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Right.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Do we want to put that in? Do we want to set some funding, or do we want to put in a number?
VICE-CHAIR GOLD: I just don't think a hundred is the right number.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Just give us a number, Mark, and we can discuss it.

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: I would have given you a number on the last one, too, but it doesn't matter. I don't know. "Not to exceed 250."

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Okay. You guys good with that? How about allocate -- take out "some."

"Allocate funding."

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: And then put, "e.g." not, not actually a cap but something like, "examples."

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Uh-huh.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: To -- maybe not like a maximum but we're, sort of, saying ballpark. Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: So e.g. 250,000.

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: That's fine.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Does that work for everybody?

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Yeah. I just think a hundred -- you guys have so much data and so many examples, a hundred grand -- a hundred K won't do it.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Okay. Okay. Otherwise, people generally happy with this one?

All right. Look at that. Are there
recommendations -- oh, Chelina and Heather, I'm sorry.
Your moment to speak.

You're good. Okay. Are there things we have left out that people feel a burning need to include?

Randall.

BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: Just a thought as I look at the appendices, as we list them, considering this after four years, standalone document, we might consider adding the original legislation that created this.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: That's a good idea.

That's very smart.

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: You may as well add the 110, too.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Add 110, also. Yeah, we should add 110 also. Great point. There's actually two pieces of original legislation, right? There's the Cork Bill and the -- I can't even remember. The De Leon Bill and the Cork Bill; is that right? 73 and then the other one, right? And then there's -- and now there's 110. Thank you. It would be good for all of us to go back and read them, too, because sometimes, we forget.

Anything else, from Board members? I know we're about to lose Board Member Gold, so I want to do a motion on this. This is going to be a motion --
essentially, this is going to be a motion to accept the report with all copy edits recommended by staff or Board members and the specific amendments that were made during the course of this meeting either to the document or through discussion.

Do we have a motion?

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: So move.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Oh, Dave. I'm going to go with Dave.

BOARD MEMBER ODBERT: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Oh, I'm going to go with Chelina seconding because Barbara's already gotten a second one. So, you know, everyone gets a chance.

All right. Let's do a rollcall on this, because it's important.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay. We're going to -- we're going to start with our outside parties today.

So Heather Rosenberg.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Sorry. What was that?

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Vote on the motion.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Vote on the motion.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Yes. Sorry.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Chelina Odbert.

BOARD MEMBER ODBERT: Yes.
MR. BARTRIDGE: Randall Martinez.

BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: Yes.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Barbara Lloyd.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yes.

MR. BARTRIDGE: David Dias.

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Yes.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Mark Gold.

VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Yes.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Chair Gordon.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yes.

Yay. All right. Thank you, everybody. That was relatively painless. I, I appreciate that.

We now have -- I, I don't know that we have any public on the phone or in the room, but we have the opportunity for public comment on any of the items on the agenda before we close.

Is there anyone waiting to make a comment?

Any of the CEC staff feel like making a comment?

UNIDENTIFIED MAN ON PHONE: I think we're good.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Great.

MR. BARTRIDGE: One, one more reminder before you close, and I, I don't know yet, but form 700s due by April 2nd, 2018. If you haven't submitted already, please send them to Jack, and we'll get them
processed and submitted.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Thank you for the reminder. I, too, need to do my form 700. And one more reminder, the next -- I will be reaching out to several of you individually to talk about the audit. And we may put together a -- not a committee -- but we may have some conversations, with no more than two Board members at any time, about the audit as we're getting there.

Thank you, Mark.

Because, again, we are in -- we are auditing right now. We're going to get the draft audit in May.

Am I correct about that, Jack?

MR. BASTIDA: July -- June.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Oh, June. Okay. So we will have -- our next meeting will be a review of the draft audit. And we will have to start thinking through some decisions about the next set of audits because we're -- the audit's going to start becoming more complicated soon. So let's -- I want to put a pin on that, Barbara. I will certainly reach out to you as our official financial experience person on the Board. Help with audit process and that is really important. It is one of our main functions. We also have some outstanding points from the last audit that we need to follow up on. So this is going to be -- now that this
is over, we're going to have a bunch of audit conversations coming up. So be prepared.

Other than that, thank you to everybody so much for all your participation, for coming up, and for helping with this last-minute push on this report. If it makes anyone feel better, I wrote the whole recommendation section on my birthday, which was Monday. So that's what I did.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Happy birthday.

CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Thank you. It's all about dedication to the State from all of us.

All right. Thanks, everybody. Meeting's closed.

(Whereupon the proceeding concluded at 2:58 p.m.)
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