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MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay. We’re ready to get started.
Board Member Gold is online, so let's go ahead.

Welcome everyone to the second meeting of the
Citizen's Oversight Board. The first meeting of this
Citizen's Oversight Board typically occurs in February of
each year and is followed quickly by a second meeting in
March. In between we take the annual reports and
information received from our reporting agencies to develop
a draft of the board's annual proposition 39 Clean Energy
Jobs Act report to the Legislature which is due at the end
of this week, March 29th, end of next week. Excuse me.

So we're here today, March 21st, to discuss,
receive input and seek approve from the board on the Draft
Annual Report and recommendations we published on Monday,
March 11th. After the meeting we'll finalize the report
and submit it to the Legislature at the end of next week.

The other main item on today's agenda is an
update on the Board's interagency contract for audit
services with the State Controller's Office. Our original
contract has expired, so we're seeking your input and
guidance as we begin developing a new contract for audit
services. To be clear, this item is not to approve a new
contract at this time. With that, let me turn it over to
Chair Alvord for opening comments.

CHAIR ALVORD: Thank you very much, Jim.

Good afternoon. I'm Adrienne Alvord. I'm the Western States Director for the Union of Concerned Scientists. And I was appointed to the Citizens Oversight Board by Betty Yee in June of 2018.

I was elected Chair at the last meeting when Kate Gordon was appointed by Governor Newsom to run the Office of Planning and Research. And we're hoping to see her today. I'd like to recognize that we're also joined today by the Chair of the Energy Commission, David Hochschild, who's an Ex-Officio Member of the Citizens Oversight Board, and Energy Commissioner Andrew McAllister. Thank you for coming.

And as you know the California voters approved Prop 39, the Clean Energy Jobs Act, in 2012 to create jobs, save energy and reduce costs and greenhouse gas emissions by investing in California's schools and community colleges. The investments were also intended to provide job training and workforce development in order to promote the creation of new private sector jobs to improve energy efficiency of commercial and residential buildings throughout California, and to help us meet our climate and energy goals.

The Citizens Oversight Board, or COB, was created
as an independent body with nine members appointed by the Attorney General, the State Controller and the State Treasurer to audit, review expenditures, and maintain transparency and accountability for the Clean Energy Job Creation Fund. We currently have six Board members and I wish to recognize all of them for their continued service.

The funding for Prop 39 programs ended on June 30th, 2018. The roughly 117 million in remaining funds were directed to new competitive programs, the School Bus Replacement Program and the ECCA-Ed Competitive Loan Program. I look forward to the continued development of these new programs and the results in the years ahead. And as Jim noted, today we'll be discussing our Draft Annual Report and Recommendations to the Legislature.

I want to emphasize a point the Board has noted in previous reports, that we continue to be impressed by the job training benefits and the energy and financial savings realized by the school districts as a result of the Clean Energy Jobs Act. This program creates real value for the State of California and contributes to meeting the state's larger education, energy, climate and economic development goals.

So with that I'll turn to Chair Hochschild and the other Members of the Board and Commissioner McAllister to see if you'd like to make any opening comments.
CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Well thank you very much, Chair Alvord, and members of the Commission. I'm just very grateful to my colleague, Commissioner McAllister, for his work and that of his staff and team.

I think this is a landmark program that has produced really great results we should all be incredibly proud of. I was actually involved in the campaign for this initiative back before the Commission and went to some events and voted for it. And then to see it now, I think $1.75 billion invested, about $100 million a year in savings for schools, which is going back into the classroom. That's a bold vision and I hope we can build on it and expand it, because it's still much needed. And so I just want to thank everyone for your involvement in helping do the fine tuning to make the program as successful as it has been.

And I'll turn it over to Commissioner McAllister.

COMMISSIONER McALLISTER: Thanks, Chair Hochschild.

So this has been a huge effort, I mean I totally agree with everything the Chair just said and its leadership. When we'd go around to other states and other groups and talk to other state energy offices and public utility commissions and elected officials all over the country and all over the world, when we say well we
citizens approved, you know, the voters approved this. And we've been implementing it and it's in the -- yes, that's a "b," it's not an "m" right. And so their jaws just drop. And that's California leadership.

And the fact that we have implemented responsibly, that the audits have shown that we've done it, that there have been no signs of any sort of untoward activity or anything, right? There's been just squeaky clean program administration and that's called good government. And actually I think that example, just that basic example of good government, is a powerful piece of the message from Prop 39.

And the second thing I'll say, and final thing I'll say is, it's the Energy Commission's brand now I think is a really positive one in terms of program design, development and implementation. I'd say ten years ago, not everyone would have looked at state government and said, "Hey, wow. There's a real skillset in there that gets money out quickly and effectively and transparently and technically competently," and all the things that we've done in this program. But that program design and implementation is a real skillset. It is a skillset that has to be learned and built and maintained.

And I think the Energy Commission is now seen as an agency that has that skillset and that the Legislature
and others can rely on to implement large scale public policy initiatives where financing and grant funding is available in part of that mix. And so I think we should be really proud of that.

And our staff who has systematically learned what they need to learn and been incredibly rigorous and consistent and raised flags when they needed to and coordinated up and down with the Commissioners and this marketplace to figure out what's the right thing to do. And so now that we have that institutional ability, it's going to continue to serve the state really well as we proceed towards our bold climate action goals.

So I think we all should be proud of this program as really a leading light of this sort of public policy initiative.

CHAIR ALVORD: Thank you very much, Commissioner McAllister and Chair Hochschild. I think your comments about the leadership that this program has shown are well taken. And right on cue it's a pleasure to be able to introduce as well the former Chair of the COB, Kate Gordon, who's now the Director of the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research. And I think it's fair to say that Kate, without your incredible leadership and the ability to really push this program forward and the work that you've done to ensure that it maintains excellence over the past
several years, is really a large part of what's made this such a great program. And I'm pleased that the Newsom Administration will be so well served by having your talents to call upon.

And with that I'd love to know if you have any comments you'd like to make.

MS. GORDON: Thank you. Yeah, I still remember how to do this with these microphones. Thanks, Adrienne. And I should say I'm thrilled to be succeeded in this role by Adrienne, who is a long-time leader in this space in California. And I think really the right person to take this issue forward, especially if there's more and more of a legislative conversation around the future of the program. It was very bittersweet for me to have to step down from the role of Chairing this Commission, which I felt like was a labor of love for five years.

This program, from theory to inception, has been just really -- at this intersection that's so often ignored of energy, education, health and really equity. And I think because it's been at that intersection, it doesn't always find a home among any of those places. And so we were really, really fortunate that CEC took on the role of administering -- doing the guidelines and administering the program, because I think it's found a home at CEC.
And it really has shown incredible results, not only in terms of the things that it was set up to do, which were energy savings and renewable energy, but also some of the workforce outcomes have been amazing. This has been -- the pre-apprenticeship program associated with Prop 39 I think is a model for other states on how to tie workforce outcomes and an actual career ladder to creating a market for these types of jobs. And people's lives have been changed.

I mean there's -- I have as many people know, had a Google alert on Prop 39 and the Clean Energy Jobs Act and got to read all the stories. It is actually a little bit challenging, because the other Prop 39 came up all the time, which is the Charter Schools Prop 39, which is also about schools.

But you get these great stories like the school that was able to save a band teacher, because they had energy savings that allowed them to put money back into their operational budget right, which is like a real thing. I mean, the schools we've heard about at Twin Rivers that got HVAC systems for the first time. You know, schools that are creating these amazing student-learning opportunities around energy efficiency and renewables, so it's just been really exciting. I think I just really want to do what I can to keep it going and to keep the focus on
it and just let me know what we can do from the Governor's Office side. And I'm here to support you all, so thank you. It was such a pleasure serving with all of you guys. Thank you.

And also Jim and Jack who just are the brains and heart of this whole thing, so thank you.

CHAIR ALVORD: Thank you so much, Kate. Would any other members like to make any opening remarks? That includes you Mark Gold, wherever you are.

VICE CHAIR GOLD: Yeah. Thank you. I just wanted to state that I'm sorry I'm not there to be up there with you, Director Gordon or with you Commissioner Hochschild and McAllister. And I couldn't agree with you more, when I first was put on this a couple of years ago, for me much more of a water person and a biodiversity person, and I've learned a great deal working on this program.

And I did want to share one thing, which may come up later as well but that I think is pretty cool. Is that in my own region, Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District, has basically used this to catalyze a complete sustainability change in the school district. I bring that up because I was unable to achieve that while my kids were actually in the school district, of which I had three. But because you guys brought the resources
there to move them forward on LED replacement, they now are putting -- they'll have solar installations on every single school as well as full LED implementation by next year.

And they're finally adopting a sustainable school district program. For the very first time this incredibly comprehensive and full and there's just no doubt in my mind having been so close to them over the years that really Prop 39 was the absolute catalyst to make that happen in Santa Monica.

So really even that multiplier effect is something that I'm really interested in us figuring out moving forward.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay.
CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Just one final comment before we leave. Just as Commissioner McAllister suggested, I think one muscle we've developed well at the Commission in the last year is giving out money. We gave out over half a billion dollars altogether last year and I feel good about the pace that money is coming out, and the diligence we're applying.

I think one thing we're still not as good at as we need to be is telling success stories. And I think this is a huge success story. We should think creatively about creating the right occasion to mark the progress. And maybe it's an Earth Day event at a school. Maybe it's some
other milestone when we hit some number of savings or something, but I think that's something -- this is worthy of generating an event to drive media attention to this and to tell the story collectively and showcase. Because it's also not just the amount of money that's going out, but the diversity and geography because it's literally every county in the state, Jim, am I right on that?

MR. BARTRIDGE: Yes.

CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: I mean it's very, very few programs actually can say that and so I would love to hear your Committee's suggestions and ideas on that and see how we can work together to support.

CHAIR ALVORD: I'm really pleased to hear you say that, because I actually made similar points to Kate and to Jim about these great stories. Who knows about it? Do the parents and the teachers know about it? This is really important. And I'm sorry that the CEC is not the only entity in state government that is not as good as it could be about telling success stories. But so maybe the CEC could be the model.

Okay, with that I'll turn it back over to Jim for the roll call.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Very good. Thank you. I'll start with folks in the room, so Chair Alvord?

CHAIR ALVORD: Present.
MR. BARTRIDGE: And then Barbara Lloyd?
BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Present.
MR. BARTRIDGE: Randall Martinez?
BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: I'm here.
MR. BARTRIDGE: And let me reach out there to Mark Gold?
VICE CHAIR GOLD: Here.
MR. BARTRIDGE: Heather Rosenberg?
BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Can you hear me?
MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay. And in this case since we have an Ex Officio Member with us can we use you, Chair Hochschild, for our --
CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Absolutely. I'm here.
MR. BARTRIDGE: So with that, Chair, we have five and we have our quorum.
CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Very good. Thank you very much.

So Item Two approval of the minutes from February 19th. Is there a motion to approve the minutes?
VICE CHAIR GOLD: So moved.
BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: I'll second.
CHAIR ALVORD: Great, discussions? Edits, comments?

Okay, hearing and seeing none.

MR. BARTRIDGE:
Chair Alvord?

CHAIR ALVORD: Aye.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Mark Gold?

VICE CHAIR GOLD: Aye.

MR. BARTRIDGE: David Dias?

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: (Absent.)

MR. BARTRIDGE: Barbara Lloyd?

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Aye.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Randall Martinez?

BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: Aye.

MR. BARTRIDGE: The minutes are approved.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. This passes unanimously.

And that takes us to Item Three, which is the Interagency Contract for the State Controller's Office. And that is, as you mentioned earlier, is an item where there's feedback requested, but no action.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Correct.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Thank you.

MR. BARTRIDGE: With that, I'll turn it over to Jack.

MR. BASTIDA: Hello, everybody. My name is Jack Bastida. I am COB staff and also I was the Contract Manager for the current contract between the Citizens Oversight Board and the State Controller's Office to provide audit services for the Board. So we just wanted to
take a few minutes with all the new members that we have for COB to let you know why we have a contract, what the current contract is about, and also some direction that the Board will be making over the summer in regards to a new contract.

So first off, why did we enter into a contract with the State Controller's Office? It goes back to the Public Resource Code that talks about what the Board is all about basically, Public Resource Code Section 26210.

You can see the have four main reasons this Board exists. One is to review the Clean Energy Job Creation Fund expenditures. Number two is commission a review and annual independent audit of the Job Creation fund and a selection of projects completed to assess the effectiveness of the expenditures. Number three is to publish a complete accounting of the expenditures and post it on a publicly available website. And number four, that we'll be talking about later, is to submit an annual evaluation to the Legislature identifying changes needed to Clean Energy Job Acts Program. So it's basically our yearly report.

So the current audit contact we have, it actually ends this summer. So we entered into -- originally entered into a three year interagency contract between the Citizens Oversight Board and the State Controller's Office. It started on June 30th, 2016 and it goes until June 30th of
this year, 2019.

So we have allocated $300,000 per year toward the contract services. We do a financial audit and a program audit. We've been doing the financial audit every other year. So we did it in the first year and we're doing it this year to save some money towards the program audit. Because it was our understanding, and the State Controller's Office let us know that not much changes in the financials every year to have to do it every single year, so we saved that for every other year. But we've always done the program audit every year, with a selection of projects to review.

So I wanted to go over what the current contract is about, just basically. The real substance of the contract is put in Exhibit A of our contract and I put it into your folders to look at. It basically goes through what service and products we as the Citizens Oversight Board expect to get out of the State Controller's Office, what they're going to provide to us.

They're pretty much all the sections that cover overall agreement management as well. The financial audit of the Job Creation Fund and the program audit of the Job Creation Fund go through all the tasks that are involved and what we are looking with those tasks. Each task is further divided into objectives that they meet in order to
make sure we meet those objectives. And we look at how they're going to meet those objectives and the deliverables that they need to provide to us. So it goes through quarterly reports that we get from them, it goes through the final report that's due in summer. And so we know what we're getting from them.

There's a schedule of deliverables as well, with dates that they need to provide the plans and reports. So we keep them honest. And they actually due -- this year, they're above -- they're going to be doing the reports and they're kind of actually already done with most of the work, so they're ahead of schedule this year.

If you look at Exhibit B of the contract that I've provided in your folders, you'll see that this does kind of includes the invoicing and rate structure of the contract. And actually we update it every year, because it has to be amended every year to take into effect all the new staff classification rates that happen every year in state government. So every time Auditor One gets a raise we have to make sure that that's included in the contract and it's all good to go.

All right, so where are we with this contract so far? So we are in the final year of the three-year contract that ends this summer. We'll get two reports from the State Controller's Office in July. We'll get a
financial audit, so they've met with CDE, California Department of Education, the CEC, the Community College Chancellor's Office, the California Workforce Development Board and the California Conservation Corps. They've met with all these and they're obtaining basically audit accounting records on the fund to draft a full accounting of all the appropriations and expenditures that are part of the Job Creation Fund.

And for the program audit this year, the State Controller's Office has visited 20 school sites, 16 LEAs in four community college districts. For the K through 12 Program they've -- it represents about 126 projects that they've audited at these 16 LEAs. This totals about 473 projects at 73 LEAs completed for that fiscal year, so we're about auditing about a fourth of all the projects this year.

For the Community College Program we are looking at 23 projects at four community college districts. This is a total of 121 projects at 37 college districts completed for that fiscal year. So again, it's not as much, but we're trying to get about 20 to 25 percent of all the projects that have completed the reports to be looked at by the auditor.

So in the first two years of the program audit fundings from State Controller's Office, the audit has
shown that LEAs have sole source, so that's kind of their big finding and some have incurred costs prior to the program eligibility period. So depending on the appeals process with each individual finding some of these funds have been recovered, because of the audit findings. So there has been reasons why the audit was put in place and the findings that have shown sometimes maybe shouldn't have been spent how they were.

And we have a complete accounting of all the LEAs and CCDs that have -- where they are in that process. So we can show that to you as well.

So what are the next steps today, basically? We're looking to create a new contract for next year. So hopefully today we'll get some general direction from the Chair and Board Members on what you want to -- how you want to begin the creation of a new contract. So the CEC's Contract, Grant and Loans Office is going to help us. Since I'm not a contract expert they're going to help us a little bit to create the contract. But it's up to us to look at what our scope of work is going to be and what we want included in that contract.

The two big pieces we need to flesh out today is if you want to stay with the State Controller's Office for our contract or try an independent auditing service. I would recommend staying with the State Controller's Office,
because we're able to do an interagency contract with them and it's a lot easier to implement an interagency contract. We don't have to out to bid for contracts so I would recommend that, but it's kind of up to you guys.

Also, we want to discuss if the Board wants a multiyear contract or a single-year contract. Last time of course we did a three-year contract; 300,000 per year, which was 900,000 total. So I would recommend this time maybe a single-year contract, because of how much this program is in flux in the future. And we might be having to audit the Bus Program, looking at Liz over there -- no -- in the future. So we might need to be a little bit more flexible in not getting ourselves into a corner with a multiyear contract if we wanted to audit those bus programs in any way.

And also with the funding in flux with the Legislature, we don't know exactly how long we're going to be auditing stuff and everything. So I would recommend just doing a one year. We have to go back anyways each year to update the Section B with the staff classifications. So it wouldn't be the end of the world to redo another contract in a year.

So after this the next steps for us is to meet with SCO staff, see what worked and maybe what lessons there are to be learned. And we can go through that. We
would keep you guys informed of all those discussions. And then we would begin to draft the Scope A and B and the other documents required. And we would work with CEC Contracts Office to implement the contract. And ask the Chair to sign the contracts, so that's your once we have it done.

I think that's -- later on we would need to present the contract to the Board for vote approval and then the contract can be implemented. I don't think it needs to go through a Business Meeting here at CEC like normal contracts for CEC. But I would have to check in on that. Last time we didn't, so unless they've changed the rules.

Do you guys have any questions on anything or discussion?

CHAIR ALVORD: Not surprisingly, it looks like Barbara has the first question.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: So I actually have a couple. What's our funding source right now; is there residual Prop 39 money that's being used or coming out the CEC operational?

MR. BASTIDA: No, it's a BCP that CEC put into effect. But it's -- we don't have to do it every year. It just keeps coming.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: It's in your base?
MR. BASTIDA: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Okay. Thank you. Do we have any sense as to what the cost would be of beginning to add the bus program audit instead of an either or situation?

MR. BASTIDA: We haven't really looked at it, really, that closely yet. So a lot of the cost is just -- the only costs we incur to SCO is basically their hours that they've worked. So we have to pay for the auditor's hours and transportation. That's the two big costs and transportation isn't even that much money, really, in the grand scheme of things. So we would have to pay some transportation costs for them to visit the facility that the bus was in. Now they won't be auditing the infrastructure, because that's not Clean Energy Jobs Act money. That's AFRVTP, right? That's how you say it? Close enough? (Laughter.)

So we won't have to -- they'll just have to basically make sure all the paperwork for -- it'll be a little bit easier actually, because it's a bidding process for the buses. So they'll just be able to look at those bidding process paperwork, make sure everything was -- it really matters how we write the contracts. How deep you want to get into it. But --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Is there an opportunity for
that to be folded into the discussions in this year's
contract or do we need to wait for the following year in
order for there to be enough completed purchasing?

MR. BASTIDA:  My understanding is they haven't
purchased any buses yet.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD:  That's kind of what I was
thinking.  Okay.  I mean, they haven't finished the
procurement process for the vendors yet, right?

MR. BASTIDA:  Right.  So it would be next year
probably.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD:  Have we received any
feedback from the schools who've been the subject of the
audit so far, as to how the Controller's Office was to work
with?

MR. BASTIDA:  We haven't received any of those --
we haven't received any complaints or anything.

MR. BARTRIDGE:  I don't think we've received any
complaints, per se, but there is -- I mean with each they
have their responses the school district provides back to
the State Controller's Office at the back of each audit --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD:  Of course.

MR. BARTRIDGE:  -- to walk through the issues and
so far I haven't heard anything negative, per se.

MR. BASTIDA:  I will say that the State
Controller's Office has been relatively flexible with the
schools to make sure that they can -- that they are
adhering to the guidelines that we've put in the contract
and they aren't like sticking them on everything or
anything.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Right. No, I understand.
And even in the discussions that we've had, they've looked
to advise them on how they can cure deficiencies in order
to have a better outcome.

I guess the other thing I'd like to say, in
addition to the benefit of an easier contracting process,
which is really convenient, I think there's also -- they
are very cost effective for a number of reasons. Number
one, the familiarity with the program and number two, they
have very competitive rates compared to the private sector.

And if we do not have complaints and we feel that
they're operating at a very high level of professionalism,
which I have every reason to believe they are, I would feel
very comfortable going forward and putting at least another
year into the program. And if we want to take stock, even
after the budget process for this year as to whether or not
we would need to have a multiyear program depending on
whether or not there's ongoing funding, I think that would
be fine. And I'm willing to work with staff as sort of an
ad hoc committee member to help look at the scope.

MR. BASTIDA: Yeah, we'll be relying on you as
well.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: (Indiscernible)

MR. BASTIDA: The other thing to say is they won't be looking at making profit as well, so we don't have to include that certain percentage or anything in the contract.

CHAIR ALVORD: Just for clarification, Barbara, are you suggesting that we revisit the length of the contract post-budget?

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: I think that we're going to have to, at some point in time, look at what happens after the end of this year. And we don't want to wait until the last minute, so if we do get good news that the program has another three years' worth of funding, then we might want to think about it, yeah.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: And I have one methodology clarification, but I think we can work it into the audit. I do want to note that I'd like to know whether an individual district in the sampling is getting hit more than once or whether each district that is sampled is in fact a new district. It's not that's something I've thought to ask before, but it kind of sparked my --

MR. BASTIDA: Yeah, they usually provide us with a list of their recommended schools that they're going to
look at. And they actually, in the contract it says they have to wait to start doing the contract until we agree on those schools. So it's kind of up to us to decide that. But we could also write into the contract some other mechanism for making sure it's random or --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Well, random won't result in people not getting hit every single year.

MR. BASTIDA: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yeah, I'm not sure what the right methodology is.

MR. BASTIDA: I know they try to make sure it's kind of disbursed geographically, you know, as much as possible. And also that you're not just looking at big schools and little schools, so I know they make sure all the tiers are met.

Any other questions?

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: I didn't have any.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Randall or?

BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: I do have questions. And thank you for the information, Jack, and it's good to see you again. And many of my questions were answered, so just a couple of follow up clarifications. I understand why you're suggesting at this point maybe a one year contract versus three.

MR. BASTIDA: Yeah.
BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: To me that makes a lot of sense, but I would be curious to know if there were any cost savings associated with a multiyear or a one year. And perhaps that's something you could look at.

MR. BASTIDA: I don't know of any real cost savings. I think usually the -- I mean I'm sure the State Controller's Office would rather have a three-year contract just so they can put staff in place and make sure that they have the staff available, but they're pretty flexible. They have a pretty flexible number of audits that go on in the State Controller's Office, so they're able to move staff where it's needed. So I don't think that's a really big deal. But for us, for using the $300,000, I don't know if there's any savings really.

BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: Okay. And I understand why you'd like to stay with the State Controller's Office and not go out to bid, use a private firm.

MR. BASTIDA: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: I also assume that the State Controller's Office has a bench of private consultants that they might use when they need. I would be curious if they have ever indicated whether they have used private consultants from their own contracting bench on this contract or would anticipate to do so. And if so, I'd like to know that.
MR. BASTIDA: There's usually a subcontracting portion of the contract that they would have to put in there if they were going to use like a one of those, but I can definitely ask them when we meet.

BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: And where I'm going with that is if they do intend to use an outside firm that we stipulate it be a California-based operation.

MR. BASTIDA: Yes. Yes, I can definitely have that included in the contract, if they're looking at having a subcontractor work on it. But usually it's been all their staff, state employees that have worked on it in the past.

BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: Thank you. That's all I have.

MR. BASTIDA: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Hello? Hello?

MR. BASTIDA: Hello.

CHAIR ALVORD: Is that Heather?

MR. BASTIDA: Is that Heather?

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Yes. I've been here the whole time, but having all kinds of audio problems.

CHAIR ALVORD: Oh, no.

MR. BASTIDA: Oh, no.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: I'm sorry. I just wanted you to know that I'm here and I think everything is
great. And I really appreciate all the comments, so far but I don't have a further comment. I just wanted to not be all alone.

MR. BASTIDA: Oh, okay.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Thank you.

MR. BASTIDA: Yeah, I saw your audio like popping up and down, so I was like trying to unmute you. But I didn't know what was going on, so I'm glad you're with us.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Good (indiscernible) but I'm here and glad you can hear me now. Thanks.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Thanks, Heather.

Mark, Heather said she doesn't have any remarks to this point. Do you have anything?

VICE CHAIR GOLD: Nope, nothing on this one.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. I just have a little bit of a cleanup. I agree with the comments that Barbara and Randall made. I also am wondering about the timing of the contract. When do you expect this to be done?

MR. BASTIDA: Well, so our contract currently goes until June 30th, 2019. So we would want to get it implemented soon afterwards, the new contract, so they can start working for the next year. And that date kind of makes sense also because of the financial year of the different -- of the state. So --

CHAIR ALVORD: Yeah, I was wondering, because I -
- well, I don't know that we'd have any financial certainty
by the end of it, by the time the budget is signed. But it
kind of gets to your point, Barbara, about if there's -- if
we can revisit the length question. But I think that it
probably is close but no cigar and we should probably just
keep going.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Do we have a scheduled
meeting?

CHAIR ALVORD: I don't think we have a scheduled
meeting at this point during the summer. Do we?

MR. BARTRIDGE: We don't. We usually have one in
July. We'll get back to you with that, but at the next
meeting we would bring the State Controllers to report on
the audit in that one. And then we'd probably do some
updates on the programs at that point.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay.

MR. BARTRIDGE: So we'll be checking schedules
and working with you.

CHAIR ALVORD: Great. I'm curious, I know this
is primarily a financial exercise, but do the State
Controller's, either their contractors or do they have
internally people who look at these kinds of projects,
specifically?

MR. BASTIDA: Yeah, I think all of them kind of -
- they -- from what I understand they draft a lot of
different auditing reports. And they have audited a lot of
different schools for various reasons. And I think it's
kind of their --

CHAIR ALVORD: So their specialty.

MR. BASTIDA: -- it's what they do, yeah.

CHAIR ALVORD: Yeah. Okay. And this would be
specifically for construction, hopefully, some energy
efficiency?

MR. BASTIDA: Yeah, so like they usually just
visit the school, they look at the paperwork, make sure
that their contracts are all with whoever's building the
project is in compliance with how the Public Resource Code
kind of says and lays out.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay.

MR. BASTIDA: Make sure they're not sole-sourcing
and things like that. And so they do actually visit the
site. They look at -- they make sure that the air
conditioner or the solar panels of whatever measures were
taken are in place, but they're not energy experts at all.
They don't make sure it's hooked up or anything.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. And final question, how
much staff time is usually involved in this?

MR. BASTIDA: I would have to look but on average
in a month of work time it's probably at least 120 hours.

CHAIR ALVORD: That's -- oh, you're talking about
the audits themselves? I'm sorry, I wasn't clear. I mean the staff time just to put the contract together.

MR. BASTIDA: Oh, not very long. Since we have the contract already done from last time, it shouldn't take too long to update it. And my office is like literally right across the way from the Contract, Grants and Loans people and Admin, so I can get them working pretty fast.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. That's general, but I guess that's fair enough. So I think for all the reasons you mentioned, Barbara, in terms of the Controller's Office the cost effectiveness, competitive rates, no complaints, high level of professionalism, that I too would be the most comfortable continuing on and for the single year, but making sure any contractors that are hired are California based, I think that's a great suggestion.

So with that, I think unless anybody else far away has a comment, I think you've gotten enough feedback.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Mark or Heather, did you have any comments you'd like to share on --

VICE CHAIR GOLD: No, nothing. I just agree with pretty much where this is going.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Yes.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Great, and Heather?

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Yes, the same. Thank you.
MR. BARTRIDGE: Good. Thank you.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay.

MR. BASTIDA: Great. That gives us some good direction.

Thank you.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. And now we're at the big event.

And before we get started, I want to thank you, Jim and Jack, very much for all of the hard work you've done on putting this report together. And your being extremely conscientious about consulting with us and making sure that you're doing things in a way that the Board thinks is proper and right. And I know it was a lot of hours in a very short period, so thank you very much for your efforts. I guess from this point on, any errors are ours.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Well, we've got a week, so thank you for that. We tried. And I apologize about getting into the room late. It's sort of frantic this afternoon, but we're up and moving. And they're trying to do something about the air conditioner as well. So --

(Off mic colloquy re: air conditioner and set up.)

MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay. So we'll move on to the presentation of the actual report. And we did have some
reports out in the hall. We have some of the other agency reports as well that we feed from. Again, we really kind of crunch between the time that other staff provide us with information and trying to put that together and just to recognize and thank all the other staff involved. We hit them with a lot of emails. We hit them with a lot of phone calls. And they get right back to us pretty quickly. So when you talk about professionalism at the State Controller's Office, I'd like to say that there's a lot of professionalism in this building. And special thanks to Jim Holland for his immediate review that caused us to put another version out a day or two later in redline strikeout, because we -- again, it's a quick process. We do what we can. So anyway --

CHAIR ALVORD: Thank you, all.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay. So we'll walk through the report real quick in a second. Again, we talked about the objectives of the Clean Energy Act, Clean Energy Jobs Act, putting Californians to work and provide workforce training, create energy efficiency jobs, save energy, reduce energy costs and greenhouse gas emissions, and by investing in energy efficiency and improvements and onsite generation at schools and community colleges. This is really important.

We heard the Chair say this and Commissioner
McAllister. And I did like the suggestion about raising the awareness of this program, because it's a fantastic program and doing some really good things out there. And I'm happy to be associated with it, so thank you.

We went through the mandates as well. You can see here we're at the last one, submit an evaluation to the Legislature. That's due by the end of next week. I won't go through any of these. I know Jack did as well, but we'll pull everything together that we hear from you today. And with feedback we'll make the changes to the report over the next week, reassemble it all. What you saw didn't have appendices in it. Those appendices will include the other reports. And I'll show you we've had some great help from staff here at the Energy Commission on pulling some data sources together for -- and the projects in districts, which I'll give you a sneak peek at. I think I sent it around to you. So all of that will be assembled in the final report that goes over to the Legislature.

Okay. So it's due 90 days from the first of the year, the end of March. In it we talk about Board activity in the previous year, findings and recommendations based on annual reports from the Energy Commission, the Community Colleges, Workforce Investment Board, and the Conservation Corps. Plus findings on quantifying total employment from the Workforce Investment Board and we heard about that at
the last meeting, which was pretty impressive results.

In Chapter 1 there are three main areas of focus.

We talk about the objectives of the Clean Energy Jobs Act. We do an overview of various programs, funding amounts and program timelines. As well as we talk a little bit about the program changes after 2018.

So regarding those program changes, and Chair you touched on this, it was a five-year program. They then took the remaining dollars from the fund and moved that off to start the School Bus Program and fund the ECAA-Ed Program Competitive. There was $114 million. The School Bus Program was fully funded at 75 million. ECAA-Ed called for 100 million, but was only funded at 39.5 and then there was nothing left for a K through 12 Competitive Program. So we talk about that in Chapter 1 and walk through some of the details there, as well as staff's work to develop those programs as they're occurring now.

Chapter 2 talks about the mandates of the Board, our meeting history in 2018 and so far in 2019, and the audit. And again, we'll have another meeting. We've had the meetings in February and March. We'll have another meeting July or August, depending on folks schedule and availability. We'll get the report out and submit it and then we'll start working with you on dates and working on audit things and start to line things out.
This year in the report regarding the audits we went a little more into detail. I wanted to make sure that folks reading these reports understand the importance of the audit work overall and there's follow-on processes to recover Prop 39 dollars that may have been used incorrectly. So we talk about that. There's some information on CDE there and the audit appeals process and what they do and how funds have been recovered. So we cover part of that in the report. It's a little bit longer and thank you, Barbara, for your help with that section. I do have your other edits we'll be making this week.

Okay. So Chapter 3 again we summarize from the work of the reporting agencies. I won't talk about each of these areas. We all know what these programs are. I think the important thing is that through the end of 2018 more than 19,812 total jobs have been created from the Prop 39 Program. It includes direct jobs, indirect jobs and induced jobs, so that's a great benefit. And we capture some of that in the report.

And then here again on Chapter 3, I was a slide behind, and now let me just refer to the actual recommendations and the report and just bring that up so we can look at it.

(Pause to bring up report and recommendations.)

Okay. And so I'm going to go right to the
recommendations so that we can have a discussion on those. I've spent a lot of time looking at this page-by-page, so I don't know exactly where everything is. It's been a crazy couple of weeks.

Here's a look, since I'm passing, of participation by counties. And you can see last year we had one county at 0 percent participation, but this year actually we have all of the counties participating and we have several at 100 percent.

So Chair Hochschild had asked if we had a map. We do have this map from staff. I think he wanted to dig in a little bit more and we can talk with staff on that and maybe identify by county. But that's just to see that in passing.

And here's, I'll just show you, so the version that's posted you'll see things like this 174 to 292. Again, this is thanks to Jim Holland. That was actually a leftover from last year's and as we're updating things it's a pretty hectic process.

Okay, so on to our recommendations. These are similar to the recommendations from last year. And I've spoken with all of the Board Members on these recommendations and I think we have substantial agreement on where we're at.

And so our first recommendation, provide annual
appropriations to the Clean Energy Jobs Fund to allow for continued energy savings, emission reductions and jobs at California's public schools.

We believe there's a lot of demonstrated success to this program. And so we recommend as a Board that the Legislature appropriate a minimum of $175 million a year for continued funding.

So any comments from Board Members on Recommendation 1 or concerns with that, that you'd like to identify?

VICE CHAIR GOLD: I have a question. This is Mark.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Go ahead, Mark.

VICE CHAIR GOLD: How did you arrive at the 175?

MR. BARTRIDGE: So when we looked at the program overall, a number at around 300 million was sort of a low mark for the yearly dollars that came to the Energy Commission. So when you look at the 175 and then you look at our next recommendation, which is 100 million to ECAA, not only does that 100 million to ECAA match what SB 110 called out for ECAA but together the 100 and the 175 is around what the appropriations were for a one year funding at the Energy Commission. We do have that called out in one of the tables. I could go back if you'd like me to, to look at the overall funding per each year, but that's where
we came to the 175.

VICE CHAIR GOLD: No, I recall. So it's just loosely based on sort of the least you got in a given year, which was actually I think a lot more than that. But not from the standpoint of any sort of operational goal or anything like that?

MR. BARTRIDGE: No. Last year I think we had a similar recommendation of 175 million. And I think Chair Alvord was comfortable with it, so we aimed at that. Again with the ECAA the same thing, that was $100 million last year as well. We didn't find success across the street last year from a number of factors and looking for opportunities for this with I think it's AB 1028. So that has proposed the 300 million, so we'll see where that goes. But as with the Legislature and that process I couldn't see necessarily going forward and asking for 500 million. That's a big request.

But this is sort of "let's keep things moving and let's raise the awareness of the program" and keep the Legislature thinking about it and sort of recognize the successes and see where they want to go.

VICE CHAIR GOLD: Right, so all I guess I'm saying is that just to make it -- and you have all the data to extrapolate this -- is just to make it clear that at this level, one would expect a certain amount of energy
savings and a certain number of projects at the K through 12 and community college level. So that they get some idea of what they're buying for their 175, based on your last five years of data? Just it's very impressive stuff, so that's why I would just make sure that you do tie it to something performance oriented. It just makes it more compelling.

The other thing is I was wondering on the 100 million for the ECAA, which I know you're about to get to, is that a onetime thing or is that -- I'm used to revolving loan. You don't necessarily give it 100 million every year, because it's a revolving loan program.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Right, so the first one says a minimum of 175 million per year. This one says 100 million. And that is a revolving fund, so we were looking for a one time appropriation. With a revolving fund it keeps going and paying itself back and keeps funding other projects.

And I think it's worthwhile. I don't recall, off the top of my head, what the ECAA funding was for the program, but when -- 110 said 100 million through a competitive process. It's pretty compelling at the 100 million level, especially with the revolving fund side of things. It's just going to go on in perpetuity and keep making these kinds of improvements, so I think that's
worthwhile and again just a one-time 100 million through a revolving fund.

VICE CHAIR GOLD: I agree, but what it means is your $300 million cap per year allocation gets a little more confusing after year one. That's all. So anyways that's it. I'll hush for now. I know you've got a lot more to get through.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIR ALVORD: Just a point of clarification, Mark. Are you talking about requesting the staff to include in the recommendations some data about the energy savings and other outcomes, job creation outcomes for example, in the recommendation itself?

VICE CHAIR GOLD: Well, I think you need something to substantiate why 175. And I think you have data that substantiate 250 or 300, so whatever number you pick. And so I'm just saying I would have that as a sentence or two that's part of that, yes.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. And what I heard was that basically the record shows that the CEC has been able to productively use at least that level of funding in addition to that, which is why this particular amount was chosen. Correct?

MR. BARTRIDGE: Correct.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay.
VICE CHAIR GOLD: Yeah, double and triple that amount. Yeah.

MR. BARTRIDGE: So and we can work with CEC staff as well to help us sort out what that sentence looks like and bring -- I'll work with the rest of you next week through some emails and we'll try and get some language, work with staff on some language that sort of trues this up and puts some validity behind the number, towards the energy savings.

VICE CHAIR GOLD: Okay. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: I had one question, but it is about the next bullet. It's about the ECAA-Ed. Are you ready to take a question on that?

MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay. Any other Board Members have anything to say on Recommendation 1 of the 175 million?

(No audible response.)

MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay. Let's go ahead and move to the ECAA-Ed. So that one is support the revolving loan program at a level of at least $100 million. Again, that's a onetime appropriation of $100 million into a revolving fund. Go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: So I think the question goes back the existing revolving fund structure and what funds are coming back at what pace and what level to be revolver
in addition to the new funds. I think that it absolutely begs the question as to why you need more if you've already got a revolving structure set up, so just a little clarification on that.

That doesn't mean I don't support providing more funding into the program, because there is a lag in what comes back if you've got a seven-year payback period or something. I just think a little more information to demonstrate how the program works and under what timeframe that 100 million would be expected to cycle as well.

MR. BARTRIDGE: And let me just turn to any Commission staff in the room. I know we had some discussions about some extra dollars that paid back that got added to. And I can certainly go back, but does anybody have an impression off the top of their head about the payback period and time and returning dollars?

MS. ERSOY: Hi, there. I'm Elise Ersoy. I manage the office that does ECAA and Prop 39 and Bright Schools. Off the top of my head though, I'd want to confirm this with Deborah Godfrey who really supervises the program. It's about I want to say 17 million per year we get in repayments. And that is from -- we had 58 million allocated through Prop 39. So --

MR. BARTRIDGE: And that's the 58 million that's original with the Prop 39?
MS. ERSOY: Yeah. I really don't want to be quoted on that off the top of my head, but we can certainly get you those numbers.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay.

MS. ERSOY: And just a point of clarification here, as you said earlier, SB 110 funded ECAA-Ed at 39.6 million. So are you asking -- I think it could just be more clear in the language if you're asking for an additional new 100 million, or you're asking for the difference between 39.5 and 100. We'd be happy to take another 100.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Yes. I think the Board's recommendation was for the full 100 million, going forward.

MS. ERSOY: Meaning to fund it, so we're already at 40?

MR. BARTRIDGE: Right.

MS. ERSOY: So to fund it 60 million more, so the ask is really for 60 million more?

MR. BARTRIDGE: No, no, an additional 100 million. (Laughter.) And that's the way I understood it from the Board.

MS. ERSOY: The gift that keeps on giving. All right.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Any other comments on Recommendation 2? No? Mark or Heather?
VICE CHAIR GOLD: No.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Nope.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay. Thank you.

Okay. Recommendation 3 we have, provide direct support to the Workforce Development Board's Pre-apprenticeship Program. This year we heard from them that they trained with $13.2 million, 1,400 disadvantaged folks and put them into their pre-apprenticeship programs, actually put them into jobs. I think that was a successful result.

I don't have a number in this recommendation. We heard from Sarah White at the last meeting that they had received $25 million under SB 1 to do some work. They were hoping to receive some additional dollars from GGRF this year based on some early meetings with the Governor's Office. We didn't put a number in this. We've yet to put a number in this recommendation. It's a similar recommendation that we include each year. We think it's a valuable program, but I don't have the expertise to suggest what might be needed here.

CHAIR ALVORD: I just want to expand on this a little bit, because Jim and I talked about this at length. And in my experience when you put a number in, it becomes for some people the floor and for some people the ceiling. And often becomes the ceiling. And I don't know that we
want to -- with the information that we have available and what we know, I'm not sure we have the expertise to determine this.

I do think it feels like there is pretty strong support for this, both within the administration and certainly in the legislation that's proposed. So I think -- I'm most comfortable just saying that this has been a successful program and that we want to see it continue to be supported. But I'm open minded about whether if people feel that a number is important, it's not a huge thing. I just want to make sure that we don't put something on a piece of paper that can be used to basically artificially limit what could be available.

VICE CHAIR GOLD: Well, I think -- this is Mark, can I talk?

MR. BARTRIDGE: Sure, go ahead.

VICE CHAIR GOLD: Okay. Yeah, I was just wondering just sort of based on the same logic is, as we've seen previously, is that I think saying that at $3 million, we've seen over the years that that has been as you say a clear winner here. I think means that we should imply that that is the floor and that there's a tremendous opportunity for expansion here. But I'd hate to see it come back less than 3 million in light of how well it's done. And so that's why I think maybe wording it to say that we've
demonstrated over the years that $3 million is demonstrated tremendous success. And there's a real opportunity to expand this program even more than that level and leave it open-ended that way.

CHAIR ALVORD: Did they use the word "pilot" for any of this? I mean I think that actually says a lot if it's up 3 million for a pilot that's been very successful. And I agree with Mark's comments about maybe strengthening the language around it. But clarifying that this was not a full-fledged program, but they were trying it out to see if it had wings and it does.

VICE CHAIR GOLD: Right. Okay. Thank you.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Yeah, and they definitely used the work pilot. I have some of their pamphlets left over. They're out front that call it a pilot. Any other Board Members like to make a comment on it?

BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: This is Randall. I agree with the comments made so far and understand the logic as well. I too also want to emphasize that we show our strong support for the Legislature to support workforce development. You mentioned some pathways forward that they've already initiated. And you cited some specific examples. I think you said $25 million was one?

MR. BARTRIDGE: Through SB 1, yes.

BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: Perhaps we could
strengthen by specifically offering our support to SB 1, for example.

CHAIR ALVORD: Or would that be support for the Governor's budget?

BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: Or both, yeah.

CHAIR ALVORD: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yeah, I was going to add that we definitely want to say that our recommendation is to expand the program. I mean that has to be there. And from whatever funding sources, you know we don't have to be specific I think about the funding sources.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay, any other comments on Recommendation 3? Okay, moving on.

Recommendation 4 is an inventory. This is an inventory of the K through 12 facilities. This is a similar recommendation from last year. This year we added -- we requested that the Legislature put $5 million into an inventory to make it worthwhile to understand what's out there, what's been done, what's the condition of schools. And really look at a lot of data. CDE has data. The Energy Commission, Prop 39 staff has data. The Conservation Corp, last year we heard about the data that they had as well. And so pulling together some of that data into a comprehensive inventory that can tell us where we go from here and best focus our dollars was the idea behind this
recommendation.

And to put some teeth into it to say the $5 million is not a lot of money in the context of the work that's been done in this program. But going forward this kind of inventory, depending on the where the Legislature goes and future of Prop 39 or energy efficiency programs for schools, having information for schools and state agencies and everybody else trying to achieve these goals, having some information in one place, in an inventory, could really help that effort, I think.

So that's behind this recommendation and with a dollar number to it. So, comments on Recommendation 4? Barbara?

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Let's check the phone first.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Mark or Heather?

VICE CHAIR GOLD: It's not surprising I have a comment on this one. I think this is probably the one I've been bringing up since the beginning.

So first of all I'm thrilled to see the 5 million put in there. All I would also say is on the -- to support an inventory of school facilities that leverages -- oh, you just scrolled down the other way -- that leverages information collected through Proposition 39. I would also say and through other available -- maybe publically available resources. And the reason why I say this is
because in doing the inventory you could get everything
from building age data at the county level, on to depending
on what's in the relationship with any of the utilities.
You can get some partial scale energy usage data on either
a school basis or on a building-by-building basis. And so
it'll just augment the data that you've obviously collected
through the whole Prop 39 process.

And I think to do an inventory, and the thing
that I think is missing at the end of this that's most
critical, is really an assessment of where the potential
greatest need is. And if that's always been a problem in
this program, but that makes since when you're at $500
million a year in funding. Now prioritizing it, using this
sort of assessment, I think is absolutely critical. And in
particular, you know, targeting those disadvantaged
communities would probably be a top priority. And in those
areas where -- I remember that map you had where I can't
remember if it was the color gray, those LEAs in the gray
areas were clearly -- the percentages aren't as high as the
rest of the state.

That's a lot to unpack. But I'm just bringing it
up, because I think it sort of leads to a larger discussion
on -- you know an inventory is one thing, but making sure
that we actually get the data and use it to make further
recommendations on prioritization I think is pretty
MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay. Thank you. I'll work on some language and probably work a little bit with staff as well. And then circulate something back through Board Members this week and we'll kind of work through it that way. Okay?

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: I had a follow-up question.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Please.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: The $5 million number seems substantial. And I think the task is substantial, even with leveraging other databases. But do you have any particular precedent that you use to come up with that number?

MR. BARTRIDGE: I had talked with Heather a bit who has done work in some areas similar and sort of studies. Heather, are you on the line? And she thought that was --

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Oh yes, I am.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Go ahead, if you --

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Sorry, can you repeat the question again?

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: This is Barbara. I just really inquired as to whether or not the $5 million figure was informed by any look at precedent, studies, or on what basis it might have been determined? I'm not saying it's
the wrong number. But if it's just like putting your
finger up in the air, I guess we might want to say at least
or something, because I don't know if that's enough for 58
counties and 3,000 school districts or whatever our numbers
are.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Yes. I certainly don't think --
no, go ahead, Heather.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: No, I agree. I mean I
don't have a benchmark for that number, necessarily.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Yeah.

MR. BARTRIDGE: So I did talk briefly to the
School Energy Coalition and they sent some reports, some
background things that I took a look at. And they were
trying to calculate based on square footages and square
footages of all the schools out there. And this could be a
much larger number. I'd have to go back and take a look at
one of the reports they shared with me, but I think and
that was an independent report. Off the top of my head, I
don't recall what it was, but I have a printed copy at my
desk I've looked at a couple of times.

But I think there was a number in there as high
as $60 million. And so, when we start talking about
requests to the Legislature for funding we hadn't had a
number in this before. And so working the Legislature a
little bit, if you go with a huge number it's a non-starter in many cases. So we wanted to add a number this year and sort of be reasonable and be incremental. And if they take a look at it, if we do something with an inventory or they do something with an inventory and decide additional funding is needed down the road or we find that we have some information but it's touched on 20 percent or something like that, can we extrapolate from there? I don't know.

But we wanted to have something, but we certainly couldn't have the world.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: I'll respond after Heather.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: So and what I was understanding -- so this number to be is this is not necessarily for interventions, but really to look across all of the different schools and what the different needs are at some level of detail, but not necessarily detailed site inspections in every school and come up with an inventory.

And that to me, looking at it as a consultant, that budget would let you do a pretty decent inventory and potentially needs assessment at a high level, looking at the age of the school, the location, the things that have been done, the size, the number of buildings, those kinds of things. You could make some reasonable assumptions and
create some granularity in terms of what's been done, what's needed, where are the questions marks?

So I was looking at that as a sort of consultancy. You can do a pretty good list from that perspective.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: So I agree that you can get a good start and you can frame the issue. I think if we were to use -- substitute initiate for support, to initiate an inventory school facility. So you're basically saying this is a down payment of the inventory. When you look at the kind of information that you could be asking, based on the laundry list that we described, and you compare that to what the University of California has been doing with one of their programs, and they don't have as many campuses, they don't have as many buildings, it has been a five-year process, minimally that started from a risk management standpoint, not an energy efficiency standpoint. But still it didn't cost $5 million. So --

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: But did it --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: I don't off the top of my head right now -- much, much, more. And it wasn't a one year effort. I mean, it's been at least five years. I mean I've been working with the university for four years and it was already well underway when I came. So I think that we have to frame this as a kick start, a scoping --
BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Yeah, I mean just --

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Sorry. Just in terms of my assumptions, I mean what I would actually like to see rather than just a one-time inventory actually would be a database of the schools where these things could really tracked. And that then you could use that for the basis of our deeper risk assessment and potentially a resilience strategy for across all schools. That's a database that could have, in other words, multiple uses.

But I do think that you could look across the schools and at a very course level. From an energy perspective you can tell a lot about the age of the building and what retrofits have already been done on any sort of higher level information you can get. Even though you may not even know how many buildings the school has, all of those other questions, you can get -- you can build hopefully the beginning of a database that then would have to be managed and could be used to answer all sorts of other questions down the road.

But this would not be energy modeling of any of those schools. This would not -- I'm just sort of speaking -- because of now I'm back with a consulting hat on what would it take, what could you do for that amount? And we wouldn't do a detailed risk assessment for every school.
You wouldn't do an energy model for any of those schools. But you could say these schools have really gone deep. These schools are really old. These schools are in disadvantaged communities areas. And start to track where their buildings are, what's been done and what needs to be done and an inventory. And that was really the word I was responding to there was "inventory." That hopefully would live in a database.

And I do think there are consultants who could turn that around for you on the order of $5 million.

CHAIR ALVORD: And I totally agree with your point that there's much, much, much more work to be done from that, that then builds out and answer some of these harder questions. And I do think that framing this as an initial scoping or beginning process of an inventory is spot on.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: And I'll have one final comment. And that is along with Randall's comment earlier, let's make sure that in that $5 million procurement we voice an intent that California-based small businesses be included at least to the state's minimum requirement that this kind of contract not be accepted from normal state small business participation rules, DVBE, etcetera. I mean, maybe that goes without saying, but I think we can say it.
CHAIR ALVORD: Agreed.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Board Members then for Number 4 at the start in the bold this is inventory of K through 12 facilities. With your agreement, I'd change that to "initiate an inventory of K through 12 facilities" and then we can work on some additional language. Is that acceptable?

CHAIR ALVORD: I heard the word scoping, which might actually be appropriate. Initiate scoping of an inventory. And Heather your recommendation a database was very interesting because I like the idea of just being something that has sort of longevity and robustness. But I'm also concerned about what that would mean in terms of additional cost. And I don't really know how to answer that other than punt to the Legislature or whoever makes the decisions. But I do think --

VICE CHAIR GOLD: This is Mark. I just want to add one thing. So I have a colleague here named Stephanie Pincetl who has done an Energy Atlas for all of Los Angeles County and has parcel scale energy data on literally for every single building in Los Angeles County, on a yearly basis for the last five years or so. And it was a big issue in getting the data PUC, etcetera. We don't need to get into that. But the point I'm saying is she did that for far less than this, way more parcels overall than this.
To me, there's no point in just doing an inventory unless there's a database and a commitment to actually use the data to more wisely come up with energy efficiency recommendations and even set priorities. And I think that language needs to be in there. And I'm fine with saying the 5 million is to initiate the process and adopt the framework and begin using the database. I don't know whether you can do the whole database for 5 million or not. I assume it would take a lot of time to figure that out.

But there's really not a point, I don't think, of doing this unless that data is actually there and could be analyzed to make recommendations.

CHAIR ALVORD: Yeah, I think it's really critical that the point of the inventory is not stagnant. The point is to enable better long term operations and decision making.

VICE CHAIR GOLD: Yeah. Totally agree.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: And I think that we work with a lot of these schools and so many of their systems are kind of in a different century and it feels kind of stuck there. But there's no reason to not start moving all of this towards a manageable set of data that can be dealt with in a much smarter way. And it feels to me -- I mean I'm not a database developer. This is not my scope of
expertise per se, in terms of how you would do this kind of inventory. But I think you can get reasonably far down the road with the budget that's outlined here.

VICE CHAIR GOLD: I do too. And that's why I was giving the example for all of LA County. And if anybody wants to look at that, you can just look online for UCLA Energy Atlas. And I think you'll see what I'm talking about.

CHAIR ALVORD: Well I really enjoyed -- I've gotten a lot out of this discussion because I felt very strongly about this as well, including a noticeable amount of money to get us going. And it's for a lot of reasons it's come to my attention over the years that we have extremely poor data overall on the schools in this state.

And the fact is that if we're going to achieve our greenhouse gas emission goals, we've got to do a much better job, as you guys know, on building energy efficiency. And I'm not sure if people understand just what an undertaking that is in terms of just knowing what the building stock is out there. So this again could be a place where the program could really model some excellent ways of doing business, proving to go beyond the purview.

And so I like the idea of supporting, given what's been said, that this would be initiating -- how would we say this -- I don't want to wordsmith it here.
But I like including the word "database" and the fact that this is just getting started. Obviously including California-based businesses and that was another thing I wanted to say --

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: The DBE requirement, I think, is good.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: It's I'm sorry, Disabled Veteran Business Enterprises is DVBE?

CHAIR ALVORD: DVBE.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: DBE is a federal requirement that doesn't exist in normal state contracting without federal dollars.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Okay. But with whatever the right language is, I think for smaller and disadvantaged businesses, if there is a possibility to target this fund, the task.

CHAIR ALVORD: So the last thing I wanted to address is Mark's comment about the assessment of need. And I think that -- I agree that that's extremely important in terms of knowing how we want to prioritize. I'm just a little wary of how people set criteria at times, because who's more important? A disadvantaged community in Los Angeles where there are relatively large amounts of resources around or perhaps a community in rural California where perhaps you're serving fewer people but there's just
no options.

And having through the wars on the EnviroScreen and various other tools I just think we -- I don't think we need to put any guidance in it, but when it comes to actual -- if this ever gets operationalized, I think we might want to have a discussion on the best way to go forward.

VICE CHAIR GOLD: Yeah. I would agree with that, but the one thing I would just add is I mean right, because it could be the approach for assessment might be different by region, by county, whatever the case may be. But the way that we've seen when there's limited resources, I'm just a little bit worried that a lot of times it doesn't go to those school districts that are much more prepared and well-suited to apply for these funds. And it's just something we've just seen time and time again. And that's -- you know by using the metrics-based approach as well as looking at some of those other sorts of things, I think that'd be helpful. But I agree. It's going to be a much longer discussion but I look forward to us having.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Yeah. I actually want to piggy back on something you said earlier, Mark. And that was to inform future decision making. The inventory and the assessment, if an assessment comes out of it isn't actually going to be the thing that sets the priorities, because that's a policy matter. But the data -- having
that data available will inform future decision making. And I think if we put it in those terms, we're not over reaching what this project would accomplish.

CHAIR ALVORD: Totally agree, Heather.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay. We'll work on some language and take input on some language as well and we'll circulate and work with you next week through that.

Elise Ersoy wanted to make a comment as well.

MS. ERSOY: Just as the discussion was going on, I want to make you aware of there's a Title 20 data Collection Rulemaking that has been underway at the Energy Commission. I used to be in the Energy Assessment Division and so they will be collecting IMD interval meter data for every meter in the state.

So if we were to have -- so we've been in conversation a lot about building crosswalks between databases, etcetera. And if there were a proper inventory of schools, so long as we have the meter number associated with that building, we should be able to -- or a contractor should. But we'd love to -- and maybe it's not my staff, maybe it's the assessment staff look at -- make those connections as to how much energy they're using per square foot, the energy use intensity. And then we also are getting some feeders (phonetic) data, which is the database of energy efficiency measures that have been installed.
And again, so long as we have those meter data and a school has taken advantage of some incentive program somewhere along the way, we'd be able to sort of see that as well. And then we can marry that with census data. So I think 5 million, if we were to do it I think that there are agencies -- I'm not trying to advocate for us getting $5 million -- I'm just trying to say that I think for $5 million you would be able to make those crosswalks.

But getting that inventory of what the stock actually -- building stock actually is, is the bigger list. So that's all

MR. BARTRIDGE: It seems like we're at the beginning stages of this, but I think we're on the right path and we'll make some amendments to this recommendation and work with you on those the week ahead. And thank you, Elise.

Recommendation Number 5, if there's no other comments on 4 we'll move on. Okay.

Okay. So this is a recommendation we've also made in the past, funding in capacity for a manual on best practices. We know there's a lot of work going on out there. We suggest in here a small amount of funding. This is almost similar word for word from our recommendation last year. A small amount, 250,000 for a third party to review a cross section of completed projects and provide a
handbook manual to schools across California that helps
them identify, or we identify the best opportunities for
energy efficiency and self-generation projects. And the
key issues that they should consider, as they think about
moving forward with energy efficiency projects.

So that's the recommendation and we end with, we
believe that such a guide would increase the reach of this
program by creating an informational legacy. And I think
this ties into the last one where we talked about a
database as well.

So one's a database of information, an inventory,
beginning that process and that's really for all of us and
to inform future work. But this is also to benefit the
schools. I think we heard a lot about energy managers
going to work in the schools and coming up to speed and the
schools trying to figure things out. We heard in our
December meeting that they're all dealing with different
ranges of schools and age of buildings and things like
this. This type of best management practices manual would
hopefully give them a leg up in approaching improvements in
the future.

So do we have any comments on Recommendation 5?

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yeah. I have one. Arising
out of our discussion about the programmatic audits where a
number of schools have had difficulty satisfying existing
procurement requirements, whether it be sole source or putting specified target energy savings and contracts and the like, it seems that there may be some benefit in having procurement best practices, or procurement practices generally included in the issues to consider. So financing capacity, procurement practices, distinct from technical knowhow, just something as small as that to kind of highlight the fact that it seems people need some help and we'd like to get that noncompliance rate down.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBerg: Can I jump in. This is Heather. I think that's a really good suggestion, because I think the barriers for a lot of school districts is not that they don't know what to do. That may be true, but also how to access funds could be a portion of this. And I do think you could probably incorporate some of those financial best practices and budgeting guidance and guidance on application. Having written a lot of best practices guidance books like this over the years, on different topics, I think the budget listed here is reasonable even if you were to include a section on economic and accounting and budgeting best practices as well.

CHAIR ALVORD: This is Adrienne. I think we talked about this a little bit, Jim. And I wondered if there was a way to provide the school districts without
getting into big trouble as a kind of a list of licensed contractors who are actually licensed to do the kind of energy efficiency work, since the CEC oversees the licensing. That would be helpful. Now I know there might be some heartburn around that, but it's not an unlimited universe and I think that a lot of times the schools just don't know where to go.

I don't know if I want to include that in the recommendations, but just as a practical suggestion it's kind of hard sometimes for people who are not specialists to know who to talk to. Randall will see that suggestion, I know.

MR. BARTRIDGE: So is that something we would or -- in some of the audit information we've heard back is that in many cases there's only a certain amount of contractors in their area. You know when you're talking 58 counties and a lot of land mass and a lot of school districts, I think putting together that kind of list of -- that could be a pretty heavy lift.

Now I don't know staff if we maintain anything at the Energy Commission on contractors, certified to do that we could refer to or?

MR. MICHELLE: Dave Michelle, (phonetic) Prop 39 Program Staff. One method is to do an RFQ, so and then publish that. That's one method. But endorsing any
contractor would probably violate our policy. But you can also look at contractor license board or associations or some of these contractors. Those are some of the things that are general enough that we're not indorsing any individual entity.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: I would suggest that we add a word. Where I said procurement practices and resources, because that's a broad brush where even developing some practices that include who you reach out to, to find qualified providers as opposed to looking in the phone book. I mean, nobody looks in the phone book anymore, but you know what I'm saying.

CHAIR ALVORD: I like that idea.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Yeah. I mean if you were going to include in this section recommendations on how to, not just what project to do, but how to do it. How to manage the different basics of managing a project of this scale, which could include the accounting piece, it could include how to identify funds, how to select a contractor, some places to look for contractors. That could be very -- that could fit nicely into a chapter of a resource like this.

BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: This is Randall. At this point, we're simply requesting the funding, correct? So if we get the funding then perhaps a follow-up discussion on
the scoping associated with (indiscernible: audio drop.)

MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay. Well, we'll certainly take
that feedback on all of the recommendations back and work
along those lines and then seek your approval this week.
With the understanding that we won't have another Board
Meeting before this is due to the Legislature, I'd ask for
you to consider approval of the report with these
recommendations and edits that we will bring to you over
the week before we submit a final to the Legislature next
Friday. And so let me turn it over to you.

CHAIR ALVORD: Thank you, Jim. Thank you for
your help on this.

I think that, from my standpoint, I'm pretty
comfortable approving the overall, because it looks like we
didn't want to change anything material. I think what we
wanted to do is add clarification, provide background on
say why programs have been successful and basically ensure
that certain things were included. It was a lot of
wordsmithing and I think there was some substance in that
wordsmithing, but I don't think it changed the fundamental
recommendations at their core. So I would be comfortable
recommending a vote.

Of course, it looks like everybody has something
to say, so Randall and then Barbara and then on the phone.

BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: Sure. This is Randall.
I was appointed to Prop 39 in 2014, I believe, and then reappointed in 2018. And over that time I've seen, we've seen, some really tremendous results: improvements to school districts that benefit the students, improvements to the school districts that save money. I was also impressed with what we heard at our last meeting from the Workforce Development Board about the types of jobs that we have created over this time; jobs in clean energy and jobs in energy efficiency across the state, nearly 20,000 jobs that did not exist five years ago. And all of these are just tremendous accomplishments that I for one am very proud of.

So when you are ready, I am happy to express my support for the Board Recommendation to go before the Legislature and am happy to make that motion.

CHAIR ALVORD: Thank you, Randall.

Barbara?

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yeah. I'll second the motion and like Chair Alvord I have trust in the staff's ability to incorporate what are contextual comments. So I'm good with that.

CHAIR ALVORD: Thank you.

Mark and Heather?

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: I think we have a motion and a second?

CHAIR ALVORD: Yes, I think we do have a motion
and a second to accept the draft report with changes that will be submitted to Board Members by staff before it's submitted to the Legislature. Is that correct?

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Sounds good.
CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. So that's been moved and seconded.

MR. BARTRIDGE: And Heather or Mark, did you have any additional comments or shall we move forward with a vote?

VICE CHAIR GOLD: Sorry, no.
BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Uh-uh.
VICE CHAIR GOLD: So please move forward.
MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay.
CHAIR ALVORD: Okay.
MR. BARTRIDGE: So we have a motion by Board Member Martinez and a second by Barbara Lloyd. And we'll move to the vote.

Chair Alvord?
CHAIR ALVORD: Aye.
MR. BARTRIDGE: Barbara Lloyd?
BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Aye.
MR. BARTRIDGE: Randall Martinez?
BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: Aye.
MR. BARTRIDGE: Mark Gold?
VICE CHAIR GOLD: Aye.
MR. BARTRIDGE: And Heather Rosenberg?

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Aye.

MR. BARTRIDGE: So we'll move forward with those changes.

Dave Dias, I don't know if you're on the line or not. Board Member Dias had a state license board meeting. He was going to try and join by phone, but it was in San Diego, so I'll communicate with him as well the changes.

CHAIR ALVORD: Thank you.

MR. BARTRIDGE: And one other thing I'd like to bring to your attention real quick, just so you know. One of the things that we had done, again with the help of staff and David Velasquez here in the room was tremendously helpful and we're including these as part of the appendices.

And so what we did was we went through the funding, based on CEC's data and developed for each legislative district the amount of -- so we did it statewide, this is K through 12. And this shows of the dollars spent those projects, the number of sites, 541 number of sites completed projects but still in progress, 6,000 still moving forward. And so you can see the $1.5 billion in spending. We also have by zip code the disadvantaged community that we pointed out. And that's the CalEnviroScreen here, so this is the statewide
investment. And only a fraction of the projects have been completed to date, so this is the statewide.

And then let me just show you how this looks for the Senate Districts. And we go through and we do each Senate District and talk about the annual dollar savings, 15-year savings, both electric and dollars associated with it, and the grand total. And if there's a disadvantaged community in that district what portion of projects and spending also occurs there. So I really want to call out David for his help on this. We spent a good month and a half working through developing this kind of data.

And I felt like it was very important to have going forward with the report next year or later this year. The only thing we had last year to take around was the recommendations and show members. But this really gives folks an idea of what's happening in their districts. What kind of jobs are -- I didn't have the jobs numbers necessarily associated with it, because it's more difficult to sort of suss out. But they know that this kind of activity is occurring in the schools in their district and both completed and in progress. And I think the big thing, the big story here, is not only the savings and the total savings over 15 years but the projects that have been completed versus those that are in progress. And this is based on the end of last year, 2018 data. So the closure
of the program.

And so we're including these as appendices in the report with your approval.

CHAIR ALVORD: This is really great. And I think it kind of anticipates Chair Hochschild's remark that we should do a better job of really letting people know the good work that gets done in the CEC. So be sure to let him know and sorry I didn't think to mention that earlier, because I know you'd shown me a model of it.

MR. BARTRIDGE: We'll definitely get a report across his desk as well for review.

And we did the same thing, it's a little bit different, we didn't have the same amount of data for the community colleges. So all we could do was show there that within each district these are the community colleges that received funding from this program. And that's the kind of dollars. And then here we have the Prop 39 funding, the utilities incentives and additional funding.

So but for the Prop 39 funding you can see here in Senate District 1 the overwhelming majority was from Prop 39. There were some utility incentives and some district funds as well, but these projects wouldn't have happened if it weren't for Prop 39. So again this is the kind of stuff that we wanted to make clear to folks when they pick up the report to understand the value of this
program, and understand that the Oversight Board with its audit authority adds value to making sure that these things are real.

And with that, Chair, I'll turn it back over to you and then we can ask for public comments.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Thank you so much. This is a really interesting and valuable discussion and I think that report will be stronger for it, so thank you everyone.

And with that and some --

VICE CHAIR GOLD: Wait, I had --

CHAIR ALVORD: Oh, Mark.

VICE CHAIR GOLD: I had a question.

CHAIR ALVORD: Go ahead.

VICE CHAIR GOLD: Yeah. Well, I'm just wondering is it possible? Maybe I'm missing it, but I didn't receive that, are we going to get that in the next week with the final? Is that when we're actually seeing the Assembly and Senate data?

MR. BARTRIDGE: I -- yes. I can send it to you. I think I sent the -- and Mark, I may have missed you, but I think I sent this out in .pdfs about a week or two back or links to them.

CHAIR ALVORD: Yeah.

MR. BARTRIDGE: So but I do have them and it will be included in the report and you're more than welcome. I
can send you another copy.

VICE CHAIR GOLD: Okay. I'm just wondering did anything -- this is always what happens is when you do this sort of analysis, did anything pop to you from the standpoint of wow there was one Assembly District or a couple of Senate Districts that just didn't sort of get their fair share. Did anything sort of pop to you in that way or did it give you in fact your ideal story, which shows that you have equity across the board in all 120 districts? I mean, usually something like that will pop when you get a chance to look at it.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Well, and I'll say that as we put this stuff together I think this is -- this one shows that a good chunk -- this is the statewide, at least for the K through 12.

VICE CHAIR GOLD: Yeah.

MR. BARTRIDGE: And shows that a good chunk of the dollars in this program went into disadvantaged communities, so we were really happy to see that that -- I mean the Legislature has moved in that direction over the last several years. And I think we all find a benefit and a need for that kind of continued investments to just see how that shook out in this program. And again, this is the CalEnviroScreen. This isn't the free and reduced meals priced lunches. This is a different filter. And so to see
that the dollars actually focused into areas, I think that was worthwhile.

Beyond that, Mark, I'll be honest it was sort of a fast crunch to just assemble the data and verify the data. And Prop 39 staff had the data. Again, David was fantastic, spent a lot of time meeting with Jack and I. And then we'd say, "Well, no that's not right, wait. Is that really the right question?" And then there were -- so there was a lot of work to just assemble this. It is based on the data sets that CEC has on the reporting of the program. And so as far as in-depth analysis, we're a pretty small shop just Jack and I, and we didn't quite get that far.

VICE CHAIR GOLD: Okay, understood. Thank you.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay. Uh-huh.

CHAIR ALVORD: Thanks, Mark. And are there any other comments or questions?

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yeah. I just suggest that you add one sentence into Chapter 1 indicating what is contained in Appendix J, so that people actually have reason to go there. It would go at the end of the second full paragraph of Chapter 1, I think.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Anyone else? Comments?

Well a heartfelt thanks again to Jack and to Jim and to all the staff who've helped with this wonderful
program. And with that, I think we're ready for public comment.

MR. WEISKOPF: Hi. I'm Dave Weiskopf from NextGen California. I want to offer my since gratitude and heartfelt thanks to everyone who's been working on this program. I know at this point five years in, and we've sort of come to the completion of one phase, but as I think the graphs here just were showing, show us we're really just at the beginning of seeing the benefits that will continue to accrue for years and years to come to schools, I guess in every county. So congratulations and thank you. We're looking forward to seeing how this continues to grow and benefit Californians.

A couple of very brief comments besides those general, we are very supportive of the contents of this report, and the recommendations that are being offered and the minor amendments that were discussed today.

I think it may be helpful also to -- also in Recommendation 4, to the extent that it is possible it would be nice to know either here or maybe somewhere else in the data collection to what extent schools, especially those participating in the Prop 39 programs, are able to function as cooling centers. Or other shelter-in-place zones in the event of extreme heat days, extreme poor-weather days or excuse me poor-air quality days or other
natural disasters. The centrality of schools to community-wide resilience is I think going to be increasingly important and be something that would be great to know more about. And whether this program is helping to increase that resiliency, and if it can be leveraged to go further down that road.

I guess I would also like to endorse a comment made by, I believe one of the Board Members under Number 3. We agree with the recommendation to continue the Workforce Program. I think it makes sense maybe not to specify what the appropriate funding source for that continued program would be.

And then finally, in the Best Practices Guide, under Section 5, I think it may be helpful also to refer back to the pre-apprenticeship program and the benefits of that program in creating a trained and skilled workforce in the equipment and techniques that are helpful for improving the comfort, efficiency and decarbonization of these school buildings. And how those network effects might spread to the rest of the local buildings stock to the availability of homeowners to hire contractors who are trained in these ways.

And with that I thank you for your work and strongly support the finalization of this report with those recommendations.
CHAIR ALVORD: Thank you, David. Appreciate it.

MR. WEISKOPF: Thank you.

CHAIR ALVORD: Any other public comment or staff comment?

MS. ERSOY: Me again, Elise Ersoy, Manager of the Local Assistance and Financing Office. Tomorrow is my last day as the Manager, so I wanted to just really thank you guys for all the hard work you do and really particularly thank staff. This program wouldn't be what it is without the amazing staff that we have here. So thank you very much to everybody, especially Jim Holland and David Velasquez, who are absolutely instrumental in pulling this together.

And then I just wanted to note a few things that I've noticed as Manager over the last two-and-a-half years. And one is that I think sometimes the disadvantaged communities' gets confused with the High FRPM, high free and reduced price lunch. And just want to note in that all of the enabling legislation it doesn't talk about disadvantaged communities, it talks about free and reduced priced lunch. So just when communicating to the Legislature, just be cognizant of that, because they may be interested in the other.

You can have a disadvantaged community, because of environmental justice and air pollution etcetera that's
highly affluent. So if the intent is to get dollars to low-income schools FRPM is a better metric, so there's that.

And then also, I think we've talked about this, but we are doing a lessons learned survey, because we spent $1.5 billion and I'd like to learn something from that and how moving forward we might be able to do an even better job and spend dollars more cost efficiently. So that should be coming out sometime around the beginning of the new fiscal year. And we're interviewing LEAs. We're surveying LEAs, consultants, staff, and certainly the COB will be interviewed as well.

So with that I'd just like to thank staff and thank you Jim and Jack. And Bill Fanner will be the Acting Manager while I'm gone, so direct all of your questions to him, all right? (Laughter.) Thanks very much.

CHAIR ALVORD: If I may ask is this are you going to a different part of state government or are you --

MS. ERSOY: I'm taking maternity leave --

CHAIR ALVORD: Oh, my goodness.

MS. ERSOY: -- first. And then I'll still be with the Commission, but I'll be in a research position over in the Energy Research and Development Division.

CHAIR ALVORD: Well, thank you've done. And good luck in your future public service and with your growing
family.

    MS. ERSOY: Thank you very much.

CHAIR ALVORD: Are there any other comments?

Okay.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Any comments on the phone?

VICE CHAIR GOLD: No.

BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: Motion to adjourn.

CHAIR ALVORD: Motion to adjourn? Seconded?

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Seconded.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Do we need to make a roll

call, or can we do it by acclamation?

    MR. BARTRIDGE: You can do it by acclamation.

CHAIR ALVORD: All in favor?

    (Ayes.)

CHAIR ALVORD: All right, any opposed? Okay.

Thank you very much everyone.

    (Adjourned at 3:03 p.m.)
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