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CHAIR ALVORD: Thank you.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay, great. Well, welcome everyone to the first Proposition 39 Citizens Oversight Board Meeting for 2020. I'm Jim Bartridge for the staff, joined by Jack Bastida.

We'll start with a few opening housekeeping comments. So for those of you not familiar with the building, the restrooms are located around the corner to your right or off to your left under the stairs. There's not a snack bar on the second floor, some vending machines. And lastly, in the event of an emergency and the building has been evacuated we'll go to the park across the street, follow us employees there. And then we'll meet at Roosevelt Park and then afterwards, after any emergency is cleared, we return back to the building. So that's that; I am going to go ahead and offer some additional comments for the start of our Board meeting.

The Citizens Oversight Board typically meets three to four times each year, the first meeting is in February when we elect the Chair and the Vice-Chair to oversee the Board's work throughout the year. We also receive the annual reports from the agencies that report to us including the Energy Commission, the Community College
Chancellor's Office and the Workforce Development Board.

Going forward, we'll take information we receive today from the reporting agencies to develop our annual report, which we submit to the Legislature at the end of March. Our second meeting is held in March where we'll review the draft report, receive input and then submit it to the Legislature. In July we'll have another meeting to focus on the results of the audits performed for us by the State Controller's Office and our audit work for the State Controller's Office includes a program audit every year and a financial audit of the Clean Energy Job Creation Fund every other year.

So with that, let me turn it over to Chair Alvord for opening comments.

CHAIR ALVORD: Thank you, Jim. Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Adrienne Alvord and I'm the Western States Director at the Union of Concerned Scientists. I was appointed to this position or to this Board in June of 2018, and I was elected Chair last year.

Are we joined by any representatives today of the Commission?

MR. BARTRIDGE: We are not.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. As you all know, California voters approved Proposition 39, the California Clean Energy Jobs Act in 2012 to create jobs, save energy, and reduce
energy costs and greenhouse gas emissions by investing in California schools and community colleges. These investments were also intended to provide job training and workforce development in order to promote the creation of the new private sector jobs to improve the energy efficiency of commercial and residential buildings throughout California to help meet our climate and greenhouse gas reduction goals.

Program funding, from a change to the corporate income tax code and revenues were allocated to the Clean Energy Jobs Creation Fund for five years, from July 1st, 2013 through June 30th, 2019. And there were no new appropriations for Prop 39 programs after fiscal year 2017-2018.

The Citizens Oversight Board was created as a nine-member, independent body to audit, review expenditures and maintain transparency and accountability of the Clean Energy Job Creation Fund. Board members are appointed by the Attorney General, the State Controller and the State Treasurer. The Board currently has six Board Members and I'd like to thank all of you for service.

And finally, an update, please enjoy me in congratulating Dave Dias for his recent reappointment by Betty Yee. We very much appreciate it, Dave. Thank you.

(Applause.)
Would anyone, other members of the Board like to make any opening comments before we begin?

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: I just want to let you know I'm here, this is Heather.

(Applause.)

CHAIR ALVORD: Excellent. Thank you, Heather.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Sorry, I had a little technical difficulty, but I'm here now.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay, so with that I would entertain a motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting.

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: I'll move to approve the minutes from July 24th.

CHAIR ALVORD: Any discussion of the minutes? Any corrections? Any second?

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: I'll second.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. All in favor?

(Ayes.)

CHAIR ALVORD: Any opposed?

Okay. And now I will come to the embarrassing part of --

MR. BARTRIDGE: Well, let me just say that Commissioner McAllister's Advisor, Fritz Foo, has joined as well.

(Off mic colloquy.)
CHAIR ALVORD: Welcome, thank you for coming.

MR. BARTRIDGE: And why don't we start with roll call and make sure we're all here.

MR. BARTRIDGE: So Chair Alvord?

CHAIR ALVORD: Here.

MR. BARTRIDGE: And Dave Dias?

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Here.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Randall Martinez?

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Here.

MR. BARTRIDGE: And Darrell Park?

BOARD MEMBER PARK: Here.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Heather Rosenberg?

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Here.

MR. BARTRIDGE: And Barbara Lloyd is unfortunately sick and can't join us today.

So with that we have a quorum and we can proceed. And we've approved the minutes, so the next item is vote on a Chair for the year. And we've had some discussions with Chair Alvord and she's agreed to stay on for another year.

CHAIR ALVORD: Against my better judgement, here I am. (Laughter.) This is a great offer and I shouldn't make light and I'm honored to serve as Chair if that's (indiscernible) take.

MR. BARTRIDGE: So do we have a motion?
BOARD MEMBER DIAS: I Motion.

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: So moved.

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Second.

MR. BARTRIDGE: And then we'll do a vote.

CHAIR ALVORD: All in favor?

(Ayes.)

CHAIR ALVORD: Any opposed?

MR. BARTRIDGE: It's unanimous, thank you.

And then the next up is the vote on our Vice Chair. I've spoken with Randall and he's agreed to consider serving again as our Vice Chair this year.

CHAIR ALVORD: Great, thank you.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Do we have a motion?

CHAIR ALVORD: I'll move it. I moved.

BOARD MEMBER PARK: Second.

MR. BARTRIDGE: And then --

CHAIR ALVORD: All in favor?

(Ayes.)

CHAIR ALVORD: Any opposed?

Okay. It's unanimous. Thank you, Randall.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Very good.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. And with that I guess we got to Item 5, the Annual Report presentation.

MR. HOLLAND: Good afternoon Commissioners and guests. I'm Jim Holland with the Local Assistance and
Financing Office. And I’m here this afternoon to provide you with an overview of the updates contained in this year's Energy Commission Proposition 39 progress report. This is the fifth Energy Commission progress report to the Citizens Oversight Board. We do expect to have, I believe, two more beyond this one in the future.

This report contains information on the Prop 39 K-12 Program, the Energy Conservation Assistance Act Education Subaccount, or ECCA-Ed, the Bright Schools Program and the School Bus Replacement Program. Again, the report includes four program components: the Prop 39 K-12 Program, which are grants; the Energy Conservation Assistance Act Education Subaccount, for loans; the Bright Schools Program for technical assistance and the School Bus Replacement Program.

The reporting period included in this report is December 19th of 2013 through June 30th, 2019. The numbers you see in this chart have not changed from last year. The total allocation for the Prop 39 K-12 Program was 1,748,000 and 56,000,000 for the ECCA-Ed program.

This chart, as well as well has not changed from last year. This chart does pertain primarily to the Prop 39 K-12 Program. The chart indicates that the highest percentage of participants were charter schools at 54 percent, followed by public school districts at 43 percent,
the county offices of education at 3 percent and then the
state special schools, which contain three schools at under
1 percent for a total of 2,189 LEAs.

This chart indicates the breakdown of monetary
allocations by LEA type, again has not changed from last
year and this definitely pertains only to the Prop 39 K-12
Grant Program. The public school districts received the
biggest allocation at $1,425 million, or 82 percent of the
total allocations. Charter schools came in second with
$304 million at 17 percent. The county offices of
education came in at 17.9 million for 1 percent. And the
state special schools came in at 611,537 for under 1
percent of the total allocations.

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Excuse me?

MR. HOLLAND: Sure.

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Just a point of
clarification, can you go back to the pie chart?

MR. HOLLAND: Yes.

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: The public school districts
received 1.4 billion?

MR. HOLLAND: Yes, more like .425. I’m sorry if
I misspoke.

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Thank you.

MR. HOLLAND: Sometimes I don't get any of the
numbers a little confused. Did you need any other
VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Just that. Thank you.

MR. HOLLAND: So, the task of reviewing and approving amendments to EEPs have replaced the reviewing and approving of initial EEPs. In the first five years when we were actually handing out allocations our main goal was approving EEPs. So since no new allocations have been awarded over the last year, our main goal has been reviewing and approving changes to the EEPs that had already been submitted. And this shows the process in fairly good detail. I think the important points here is that we've had 221 amendments approved in this last fiscal year of 2018 and 2019. And 825 EEPs have had an amendment done at least one time during the life of the Prop 39 program. This represents approximately 40 percent of the total number of EEPs submitted.

This chart indicates that although no new allocations were received, the $1,704 million is the same as the prior fiscal year. The amount spent has risen from 808 to 1,077 million. And that's a $269 million increase over last year.

What this chart shows particularly is the participation rate. And the Tier 4 schools, which are the largest ones with over 2,000 students, a 99 percent participation rate occurred in that category.
This indicates the total numbers of EEPs as well as the total number of sites; 2,121 EEPs approved and 7,189 sites within those approved EEPs were affected (phonetic) by the program.

So these are the most common measures that were included in EEPs: lighting systems, heating and air conditioning and circulation, HVAC retrofits, controls such as thermostats, pumps and motors, plug loads, insulation and photovoltaic systems.

Again, the breakdown of measures that have been included in EEPs: the vast majorities have been lighting at 41 percent followed by HVAC and lighting controls, or I’m sorry, followed by HVAC and then self-generation PV and HVAC and lighting controls and other measures.

What this shows is the increase over last year where we had 292 completed EEPs versus year of 522. What this shows is those projects that have been completed and have had 12 to 15 months since project completion, so we were able to receive 12 months of benchmarking data. So the final project completion reports basically give us a snapshot of what occurred, actually occurred, through the EEP and gives us a measure of the electricity savings. And the actual dollar amount spent, so 230 more since last year were received.

In looking ahead, amendments are still being
processed. Almost half the approved EEPs have undergone an
amendment at least one time. Annual reporting will resume
July of this year. Close to 1,000 annual reports will be
generated at the time. Final project completion reports
are ongoing. Based on overall numbers at this time 1,599
final project completion reports will need to be filed by
September 30, 2021, which is the absolute last deadline by
which final reports need to be filed.

ECAA-Ed Funding, this is the loan program
primarily, showing that this again has not changed since
last year. The funding for the loan program was
50,491,524. And the Bright Schools Technical Assistance
Program was $5,508,476 for a total of $56 million.

This is a breakdown of the loan project status,
loans that have completed and have final project completion
reports submitted, total $43.1 million. Completed loan
projects where project completion reports have not been
submitted are at $4.8 million. And loans that are still
under construction are 4.4 million for a total of 52.3
million.

So the ECAA-Ed Competitive Loan Program basically
kicked off after the timeframe for this report, so just a
brief outline of what's going on with that program. The
first Program Opportunity Notice was released February 2019
for $36 million. The first ECAA-Ed competitive loans
approved December of 2019; seven loans were approved totaling $6.7 million. The second PON is scheduled for release February 2020 for $38 million. And a full report on ECAA-Ed Competitive Loan Program will be briefed in the March 2020 Citizens Oversight Board meeting.

Next, the Bright Schools Program for Technical Assistance. The Bright Schools Program includes energy audits, third-party proposal review and professional engineering support services. Currently their allocation was $5.6 million. $91,524 of the technical assistance monies were rolled over to the ECAA-Ed Loan Program. And 3,331,199 had been spent for technical assistance, leaving a balance of 2,177,277.

The accomplishments of the Bright Schools Program are they've done 195 technical assistance grants. And the important point I think to note here is that 80 of the energy audits done by the Bright Schools Program have gone directly into the submittal of EEPs. So backing up the required documentation to submit an EEP under the Prop 39 Grant Program, so there was some great crossover between those two programs.

And then finally, the School Bus Replacement Program. The School Bus Replacement Program received $75 million in funding. Eligible applicants included school districts, county offices of education and joint powers of
authority. Priority was given to the oldest school buses, school buses operating in disadvantaged communities or schools that have a majority of students eligible for free or reduced price meals in the prior year. Any replaced school bus must be scrapped.

So the School Bus Replacement Program funded by SB 110 received 75 million. The charging infrastructure portion of the program received 14 million through the Clean Transportation Program. And the Workforce Training Program received $1 million also through the Clean Transportation Program.

This highlights the accomplishments of the program. As you can see out of the $75 million allocated for the buses, 74,913,844 was actually spent. So they darn near reached the total award. And the same goes for the total infrastructure award. Out of the $14 million received they were able to allocate 13,980,000. So they've really done a great job over the last year.

And that's it for my presentation. Do you have any questions?

CHAIR ALVORD: Any questions from the Board?

Heather? I have a question about (indiscernible) --

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Sorry, I was on -- but no.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Thanks.
I have a question about the completions. There are 522 final completion reports that were done and there was a slide back there that talked about the ones that are due. It's like 1,000 in the coming year?

MR. HOLLAND: Yes. That's based on --

MS. ROSENBERG: The next one, the one after that. I'm sorry, I kind of lost track. Anyway, if you could speak to what we have yet to do in terms of completions that would be great.

MR. HOLLAND: Okay, so final accomplished -- final project completion reports are submitted between 12 and 15 months after a project is totally complete in an EEP. So they are given 12 to 15 months to collect utility bills, so they can show the benchmarking post-efficiency measure installation. And we compare that to the energy consumption of the sites that occurred prior to the measure installation. So we can see what savings were gained overall between pre and post-efficiency measure installation.

And what I think the slide that you're talking about -- let's see -- I'm not sure which one it was, but how many are left?

CHAIR ALVORD: Basically and in what time period.

MR. HOLLAND: We have EEPs in the system that are going to be due those final project completion reports.
And those final project completion reports have got to be submitted by September 30, 2021. That's the deadline by which all EEPs must have a final project completion report submitted or CDE (phonetic) could possibly ask for return of funds.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. It's the annual reports and then the final report.

MR. HOLLAND: Annual reports, right. We'll still get a lot of annual reports coming this July. And hopefully part of those annual reports will have a final, a completion date. The completion date that they enter into the annual report will in turn trigger a final project completion report 12 months later. So there's that three-month window during which they have to submit their final project completion report.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Thank you.

MR. PFANNER: I'm going to just jump in for a second, Bill Pfanner. I'm a Project Manager (indecipherable).

THE REPORTER: Could you scoot up to the mic?

(Off-mic colloquy re: mic.)

MR. PFANNER: I just wanted to note all work on Prop 39 must be completed by June 30th of 2020. We've had a series of e-blasts going out, but we've noted our third one will be March 1st, making all the applicants aware that
work needs to be done by June 30, 2020. And then that will
trigger an annual report and a final report also. So if
you look at how applications came in to Prop 39, they
started slow and then when we had final date -- and that's
we're seeing now, the same type of thing. But just keep in
mind we're completed June 30th, 2020.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay, so it sounds like our work
is going to end with a bang.

MR. PFANNER: Yes.

CHAIR ALVORD: So, just be prepared.

Okay, any other thoughts or questions, Darrell?

BOARD MEMBER PARK: I'm interested in where I can
get usage data for the bus program. The data that will be
collected or that is being collected is incredibly useful,
not just for this program, but for lots of other things.

MR. HOLLAND: Right. I would have to ask one of
our bus program people to address that, because I don't
have the details for that.

BOARD MEMBER PARK: Okay.

MR. HOLLAND: If anyone here might be able to
answer that or we can get back to you with that.

(Overlapping colloquy.)

MR. HOLLAND: I can give it to Mr. Bartridge or
Jack.

MS. WILLIAMS: Hi, my name's Sarah Williams. I'm
with the School Bus Unit. We are just now getting our
first deliveries in. So we had the first ones in December,
so obviously we don't have usage data yet. But they will
be submitting final reports and they are collecting data,
so I'm sure in a future report we can give you detailed
information about where that data is now.

BOARD MEMBER PARK: Great, thank you so much.
CHAIR ALVORD: Okay.
VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: One more question.
CHAIR ALVORD: One more question from Randall.
MR. HOLLAND: Sure.
VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Yes, I am curious as to
when these reports will be able to show energy usage data
overall. Now I would imagine it's after September when the
final reports are submitted.

MR. HOLLAND: Yes. After they're submitted to us
up to the September 30, 2021 deadline while we're
processing them we're recording all that data. David
Velazquez, as you know probably from last year's
presentation, is the numbers guy. And he's keeping all
this in a database. And we've got a pretty comprehensive
database actually already online that shows a lot of that
data. But after the September 30, 2021 date all that data
will be compiled and I assume available to the public.

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: I'd certainly be interested
in a before and after of the program.

MR. HOLLAND: Yes, absolutely. Right. That's our main goal is just to hopefully prove how much energy we saved through this program.

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Precisely.

MR. FOO: Excuse me, if I could ask a quick question? On the second to the last slide, with the School Bus Replacement Program, I was just curious, because I look at the funding amounts are the same, but in the Central Valley there were, almost in some cases double the number of awardees. And I'm curious, is the allocation different or was there something like per awardee was the funding amount significantly different? I was just curious if you have any insight as to --

MR. HOLLAND: Yeah, again I can't give specifics on the bus program, but if someone from the bus program would like to address that, it would be good.

MR. ORTIZ: I'm Thomas with the school bus program. So the way that we kind of structured the awards was we gave 72 percent for the age of the bus, 20 percent for if they were eligible for free or reduced priced meals and then 10 percent if they served a disadvantaged community. And then each district was eligible for up to 10 buses per award. There were more applicants in the central region than there were in the other regions, which
is why that one looks more competitive. And so in some of the others we had multiple recipients receiving the full award of 10 buses whereas with Central, because it was more competitive some of the districts, they had old buses they were only getting five or six awards (indecipherable).

CHAIR ALVORD: A follow-up question for that. I looked at that and I thought well LA Unified is so huge if that's a single awardee then that might account for that. But you're saying maximum of 10, was there any provision for size of district?

MR. ORTIZ: We didn't make a provision for that. We wanted to make sure that, especially in the case of LA Unified, since they have 1,300 buses in their fleet we didn't want them to take up the whole region.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Thank you. Any other thoughts? Okay. Should we move to accept the report?

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: So moved.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Second?

BOARD MEMBER PARK: You beat me to it. Okay.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay.

MR. BARTRIDGE: All in favor?

(Ayes.)

CHAIR ALVORD: Any opposed? Okay.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay, next up Community Colleges
presents. Hoang, do you want to present from here or?

MR. NGUYEN: I can go there.

Good afternoon Chair, fellow Members of the Board. My name is Hoang Nguyen, Director of Facilities for the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. I’m here to present the summary for the Proposition 39 Clean Energy Jobs Act.

Topics we're going to cover today is are pulled out of our program and we'll go deep into that, our Board of Governor's Energy and Sustainability Awards that we just had in January, go over the summary for '18-'19 and '19-'20 and for Workforce and Economic Development and their summary as well and I'll be presenting on their behalf.

Here’s a summary from the Years 1 through 5 of the allocations that was allocated to us for the various (indecipherable). As you see, roughly 13 percent what allocated to the Workforce and Economics Development Unit in our Department. The remaining amount has gone to our office, or my unit, with a percentage of that going towards the consultant to oversee the administration for these projects.

Overall, we received for actual projects roughly $185 million to at least 72 districts through the system of a total amount 219 million throughout these five years.

No notables out of Year 6 for the 2018-'19 fiscal
year. We had 68 districts that were able to close out a project, roughly 289 total projects. Tentative project costs, that was $104 million, generating in 38 kilowatt hour savings, 6,600 in kilowatt savings and almost 600,000 in therm savings. In terms of energy cost savings, that was almost $6 million through the lifetime of the project.

In terms of job years we had finder 550 generated and 15 trainee job years. That's roughly 1.1 million in direct job hours. Apprenticeship, we had 32,000 in apprentice job hours.

For the IOUs, they paid roughly $4.5 million in incentives for the fiscal year, for these projects to close out. And that almost equates to about 7,000 homes powered through the energy savings.

In terms of Year 7, we gave them past July up to about September, October, to close out these projects. So this -- when I refer to Year 7, I just mean of like a few months after July closeout.

So that was 31 districts that closed out during this time period, 114 projects total, roughly $40 million. That generated -- I think I missed -- 14.3 million (indiscernible) savings on that one, 4,600 kilowatt savings and 259,000 therms. So for the lifetime of these projects it was $2.2 million in energy cost savings.

So that generated about 225 direct job hours, 6
trainee job hours and that's roughly 467,000 in direct job hours total. So the IOUs paid about $815,000 dollars for these projects to close out. And they got some additional, got the money back.

So in terms of homes power, it's roughly about 2,600 homes for these projects, for these energy cost savings.

Here is a breakdown of all the projects themselves. Lighting still remains king. They are the low-hanging fruit, so the districts really go after these parking lots for the safety of the campuses, parking garages, did the work on the facilities themselves. And there's still more there, from what I've been told that they've missed some buildings. So definitely they could use more funding to help fix or replace these lights, the efficient lights in the facilities. So that's 541 for the full seven years.

HVAC remains second at 197. Controls, lighting and HVAC control is 120 from the '19. And the others fall in place just in double digits for a total of 932 projects for these seven years. So lighting is at almost 560 percent.

CHAIR ALVORD: Clarification, MBCx and RCx are?

MR. NGUYEN: Monitoring-Based Commissioning and Retro-Based Commissioning, so they're basically just
monitoring projects.

CHAIR ALVORD: Modernizing?

MR. NGUYEN: Monitoring.

CHAIR ALVORD: Monitoring, okay.

MR. NGUYEN: Yeah. Right, so that goes for the summary for those projects.

So we have partnership with the IOUs. So we call it the CCC/IOU Energy Efficiency Partnership. For that partnership we give out energy and sustainability awards, so last year's winners are based upon the Proposition 39 dollars that they were able to capture.

North Orange County Community College District, they did a chilled water thermal energy storage. That category was for the large districts. They won an award for that.

Chaffey, they won an award for photovoltaic installation and they're a medium district. For a small district we have Victor Valley College for a multi-year exterior lighting retrofit on their campus.

For a retrofit project, we have Saddleback College. They're from South Orange Community College District for interior lighting and retrofit. And then the commissioning project we have Foothill-DeAnza College for monitoring data commissioning for their S-Quad facility.

For renewable energy, we have San Bernardino
College for a solar photovoltaic system on their district office.

And for Access in Energy and Sustainability, we have a faculty/student initiative. This is where faculty or the students come together and try to develop a program or some kind of efforts to make the campus aware of sustainability or energy efficiency or things of that like. So this year it went to Orange Coast College, to Julia Clevenger and Mike Carey for a Student Initiated Sustainability Plan. And what that plan was, they went out to do a sustainability plan for their district. But in realizing the cost with the consultant it was above and beyond their needs, so they partnered up with their students and faculty to generate their own. So that was able to capture the cost savings of them doing it in-house. So they won an award for that.

For Excellence in Energy and Sustainability-Sustainability Champion we have Farrah Farzaneh from -- she's the Director of Facilities Planning and Construction at San Bernardino. Her efforts involved working with the IOUs to have the first D&E facility for the community college system. She presents and helps out the system quite a bit trying to get out there with the climate change and sustainability efforts in regards to what the state's trying to do. So she's trying to get that message out
there.

In summary for programs the districts have recovered (phonetic) the total funding that was shown earlier. We closed out all the projects in '19-'20 and a little bit in '20-'21. However, we still have $5.8 million in project savings, so I'll talk about that in a little bit.

In terms of energy reduction across the system, about 6.1 percent in energy reduction based on the information received from the districts. That means 43 districts reported that they had reduced their energy in terms of comparison with their square footage I should say. And 17 districts have increased their energy usage, but also that could mean that their square footage has gone up. So that could have been the reason behind that. Twelve districts did not report their energy usage. They could be like our department where we're short-staffed.

In regards to the $5.8 million that were in project savings, we've extended it out to the end of this calendar year. In working with the Department of Finance and our General Counsel we were able to help stretch the program out although our program ended in '19-'20. If we were to capture that money back and bring back into our department, the Department of Finance wouldn't be able to sweep that funding. So we allowed the districts to be able
to keep that money that they saved from the projects and hold onto it. And they would resubmit new projects to help capture the remaining funds at their districts. So they could continue on until the end of this fiscal year to finish that program off.

Currently we have 23 districts with those projects savings. Seventeen districts are participating with that extension. I'm trying to get one more district to jump onboard, but he's said there's contracting issues. The other districts that are participating, they have low dollar amounts like $18 or like $1,000 or in the hundreds. So they're not going to like continue the efforts for like a $20 drain like that.

With this extension, we didn't budget that for the administration costs since we're so short staffed. That administration cost is going to be footed by the districts themselves.

So right now we have 5.2 million of the 5.8 moving forwards towards new projects for energy savings and 150,000 right now roughly from six nonparticipating districts.

Future challenges for our department and for districts in general, we adopted a new Climate Change and Sustainability Policy in May of 2019. So we have challenges and goals to meet in 2025 and in 2030. So with
that (indiscernible) lack of funding, so that's one of the challenges that we're facing right now to get this system onboard to meet the state's goals of AB 32, SB 100. So there is a lack of funding for future projects right now to meet these really stringent goals that are coming down the line.

Also with that there is a lack of staff on campuses that are experts in sustainability. Not every district has the ability to hire an energy manager or someone that's learned in sustainability or climate change. As someone just said yesterday yeah, but we created a Climate Change and Sustainability Steering Committee in our Department and we have a group of energy managers that will participate on that to create these guidelines. So we have a system involved to try to figure out a pathway for our system moving forward to try to capture all the requirements that the state is pushing on all those future goals.

Moving on to Workforce and Economic Development, these funds were directed to educational areas to align with SB 350 and SB 100. They provide a supplement of funding to 96 colleges in which students have earned almost 9,000 in degrees and certificates.

If you look at the chart here you'll see how they compare with each other. For an AA degree, there were
roughly 1,600 students that earned that. For a certificate under 18 units, there are roughly almost 2,400 students. For under 30, around 2,100 students earned that type of certificate. And over 30, almost 2,000 students (indecipherable) in that.

In other or not credit awards, there were roughly 800 or 900 students that received some -- did that. Broken out by types of certificates, water and waste water technology almost 1,200 students; civil and construction management, 160; manufacturing and industrial tech, almost 3,000; drafting tech, not as popular with 16; construction draft at 1,300 students; environmental control, 1,200 students. Industrial systems tech, almost 360 students got a certificate in that. Electro-mechanical was 41; electronics and electrics technology, almost 1,200 and architecture at 550.

So far this is the money that when used, was also for faculty and professional development. So they have an eight track collaborative (phonetic) that engages faculty and the industry. So that's now -- that collaborative has now spread throughout the Central Valley, Bay Area north and far north. And they also have an automation collaborative that was launched in Orange County and into the Central Valley. So they're developing programs just like (indecipherable) somewhere and in now this kind of
spread it around to the different colleges and campuses.

They've been working with the California Independent System Operator connecting faculty with the industry just to get them new ideas how to move forward with technology, so that way they could better instruct their students and so with collaboration with the Energy Commission. They also had the Southern California Virtual and Augmented Reality Seminar, which engages faculty (indiscernible) I guess through virtual reality and to enhance the student learning process.

Regional impact, as you can see is being broken out now by areas here in the different campuses cross referenced with the categories from before.

All in all the summary of the education outcomes are aligned with the California mandates and increase the workforce capacity for California through these efforts. These programs that were updated through the professional development with these (indecipherable) faculty would be able to connect with the industry and other relevant players in energy. So that way they can build up their repertoire. And leveraging the funds to existing programs to expand and replicate into other regions.

There was an energy collaborative that was created through this nexus and so that became a successful program as well.
And with that here is my contact and the contact for the Workforce and Economic Development, if you have any questions on their program.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Thank you very much for your presentation.

Any questions?

BOARD MEMBER PARK: No.

CHAIR ALVORD: Heather?

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: No.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay, as usual I have questions. I think I mentioned the community colleges now have like energy and climate policy.

MR. NGUYEN: Correct.

CHAIR ALVORD: Can you briefly describe is it goals based? Is it facilities based? What are the (indiscernible)?

MR. NGUYEN: (Overlapping) It is goals based, so we have greenhouse gas reduction in there, procurement --

CHAIR ALVORD: Is it like a state type goal of like --

MR. NGUYEN: It is based off AB 32 --

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay.

MR. NGUYEN: -- as a foundation. The purpose of the steering committee is to see if our goals are enough. And then we keep getting new goals as well, so we're trying
to make sure that although we have a policy that's not
going to be the end-all be-all. We'll continue to develop
that and move beyond that if need be to be better stewards
of the world, of California first foremost and then the
rest of the world.

CHAIR ALVORD: And even though post-dated the
program here, it sounds like this program has been helpful
to some degree.

MR. NGUYEN: Correct. But we did have a
sustainability policy beforehand. We just upgraded it or
updated it to meet the current standards and put more goals
in there as well.

CHAIR ALVORD: So you mention that funding always
is an issue.

MR. NGUYEN: Correct.

CHAIR ALVORD: What kind of funding are you
eligible for in addition to this program?

MR. NGUYEN: We have a CAPA LA program (phonetic)
where we offer districts who can -- for new projects that
you could be entitled to 5 -- by 2 to 3 percent for new
projects and modernized projects, modernization projects,
with these facilities. If they could meet the energy
standards by 10 or 15 percent, we will give then 2 to 3
percent incentives for that. So that way they can move
forward and add more energy types of mechanics into that
facility. So that way they are more kind of future proofed-ish. So that's the only type of funding that we would have at the moment.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. And finally a small question. You mentioned there's 61 districts that are participating. How many are there total, I can't remember?

MR. NGUYEN: We have 72 total although we have actually 73, we have an online college although yeah, we have 61 participating. That's because wherever they are funded they can only close out after fiscal year, so that's what gets reported.

CHAIR ALVORD: So that's the discrepancy.

MR. NGUYEN: That's the discrepancy, so they're all participating. Only 61 closed that year and the following six months it was only 38 or so closed out within that cycle.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay, very good. Thanks.

MR. FOO: If we (indecipherable). Do you also need to have a follow-up, so we can see others who have received the certificate, whether they were void or sort of how quickly were they able to maybe get a job? I know that's a little hard maybe to have those (indecipherable) numbers.

MR. NGUYEN: This isn't -- that last day was in my unit, I'd have to follow up with that. Though we do
have a funding formula where we do have to track students in regards to if they get a job within their region that comes into play on how districts are funded. So I mean we do try to track that, but I don't have those numbers off the top of my head because that's in a different division.

MR. FOO: Okay. If you can follow-up on that.

Thanks.

MR. NGUYEN: Okay. Thanks, will do.

CHAIR ALVORD: Is there anything else?

BOARD MEMBER PARK: Can I ask you about a couple of individual community college districts; is that in your purview or?

MR. NGUYEN: I'll try to remember.

MR. PARK: Okay. There seems to be amazing energy savings, but there's some especially in my neck of the woods where the numbers went in the other direction, if you have any sort of specific or general information.

MR. NGUYEN: Which colleges are you referring to?

MR. PARK: So Antelope Valley seems to go in the wrong direction by 0.7 percent.

MR. NGUYEN: In terms of the energy usage?

MR. PARK: Yeah, it's over the baseline.

MR. NGUYEN: That could be that they're growing. I don't recall off of the top of my head. I mean this is self-reported.
MR. PARK: Okay.

MR. NGUYEN: So I could contact Antelope Valley and see what's going on with their energy usage and why this might be.

MR. PARK: Okay. I mean, they were very good in terms of reporting their BTUs for the square foot and not everybody did that. So thank you.

MR. NGUYEN: Okay, very good.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay, thank you very much.

MR. NGUYEN: Thank you.

MR. BARTRIDGE: And just on that last point, Darrell, I know that in the Prop 39 program -- I don't know if this is similar to the community colleges as well, but when they added new and better HVAC they ended up in many cases using it more if they hadn't been using it as much, so efficiency wise.

And let me just ask, do we have any public comments on the community colleges report and the Prop 39 report? I'd ask or we can make them wait until the end, I don't see a show of hands out there so okay. So let's move forward on a vote to make this. Do we have a motion to accept the community college report?

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: So moved.

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Second.

MR. BARTRIDGE: And then?
CHAIR ALVORD: All in favor?

MR. BARTRIDGE: All in favor.

(Ayes.)

CHAIR ALVORD: Any opposed?

MR. BARTRIDGE: Heather?

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Aye.

CHAIR ALVORD: Thanks, Heather. Okay.

Okay. And then ready for our final report?

MR. BARTRIDGE: Got it. Okay, so next up is Shrayas Jatkar with the Workforce Development Board. Let's just go ahead and enable it for this session.

CHAIR ALVORD: I don't know. That's very unpromising there, Shrayas. (Laughter.)

MR. BARTRIDGE: So Shrayas, if it doesn't run we have the link copied on a Word file that we can click on.

MR. JATKAR: Okay. All right, thank you.

Well, good afternoon everyone. My name is Shrayas Jatkar with the California Workforce Development Board. And on behalf of the State Workforce Board, our Prop 39 grantees and the thousands of program participants and graduates, first I want to say thank you for the commitment to invest Prop 39 funds in workforce development and in construction sector pre-apprenticeships specifically.

And I want to actually start by speaking from the
heart. This program has changed lives by giving people the chance to acquire basic construction skills and knowledge and secure placement in quality jobs or further education. Individuals coming out of prison who have little more than a conviction record now have an industry recognized credential, disconnected youth who felt lost and alone now have their own tools, and more importantly have a sense of purpose and security. Women and people of color who were told that they don't belong in construction are now exemplary building trades union members and are helping to recruit more people who look like them into the industry.

And before getting into the pre-apprenticeship program, I want to start with a quick recap of the jobs associated with Prop 39 implementation. And the highlights are more or less the same as we reported last year, because as you know there were no new investments in the K through 12 school projects since June of 2018.

So through the end of June 2018, over 8,700 direct jobs were created from the investment from about $1.5 billion. These investment figures or this investment figure is based (indiscernible) in 2016 dollars to have a consistency across the reporting years. And it's based on the approved expenditure plans.

This resulted in the creation of an additional 3,800 indirect jobs in industries that provide various
inputs for these retrofit projects in building materials, supplies, clean energy equipment. In addition the spending of wages and business income from these investments created an additional 7,300 induced jobs, mostly in the retail and the services sectors.

Again, these are figures based on modeling of the $1.5 billion of investment in K through 12 clean energy projects from 2014 through the end of the 2017-'18 fiscal year. I also want to say that this is not the total picture. We are looking only at the K through 12 school program. And of course that is the biggest share of Prop 39 investments, but it's not the only investments.

Also, I would say it's not complete yet. The expenditure plans are of course approved, but construction work is ongoing in many cases. And I'll just end this slide with just sort of a note of caution that when we say jobs created here, that is not the same as the number of individual workers hired and certainly not the same as the number of new workers employed on these projects, still impressive results nonetheless.

Implementation of K through 12 projects helped to "create" good-paying energy efficiency and clean energy jobs in California, one of the stated goals of Prop 39. By and large, legal requirements made this accomplishment possible. What I mean by that is that Prop 39 K through 12
projects are public works projects and as such prevailing wages must be paid to all the workers employed on these projects.

Consequently, the jobs are generally well paid. They include health and retirement benefits. And as you can see, from the table on the right, wages range from $48.22 for journey level electricians to just over $36.00 an hour for laborers. Also, the type of building energy retrofit work largely involved workers from trades or crafts, with relatively high earnings. Specifically the data we've reviewed shows the importance of highly-skilled specialty trades, electricians, plumbers, pipe fitters, sheet metal workers that work on major energy consuming systems in the buildings, lighting and HVAC.

And the data also showed the prominence of trades that work on the building envelope, carpenters, glazers, roofers. And given our focus on pre-apprenticeship it's worth noting that the payroll data we reviewed shows that Prop 39 provides clear career track training for construction works through the state registered apprenticeship system.

About 18 percent of the hours worked on these projects were performed by apprentices, which we think is a healthy ratio of apprentices to journey level workers and comparable to other public works projects. And apprentices
as you see here earn a little over or just under, excuse me, $25 per hour on average.

The Final Jobs Report that we submitted last February is the best resource for more detailed data on jobs, including some information about the data limitations. Going forward the School Bus Replacement Program, if you're interested in a jobs report to be associated with the School Bus Replacement Program, just a note that of course that's different inputs and outputs to run the modeling.

And also given our experience trying to do this with the K through 12 projects, there's a need for substantial resources to make sure that we're addressing the data limitations that we faced for the K through 12 projects.

So turning now to the training side I want to just begin with some brief context. Construction is the most prominent industry or one of the most prominent industries in the energy sector in terms of the number of hours worked. Therefore what we say is having a skilled clean energy workforce is synonymous with having a skilled construction workforce.

And the best career pathway in construction in the trades in particular is apprenticeship, because it is both a good quality job and rigorous training. And hence
the moniker some people may have heard of "earn while you learn."

I'll just highlight very briefly what makes apprenticeship, what are the advantages of apprenticeship. As you can see from the first circle here around placement with apprenticeship there's a solid line between training and employment, unlike in the non-apprenticeship pathways. And as you can see at the end there's a clearly defined and transparent pathway for career advancement over time as workers gain more experience and skills.

All that being said, getting into an apprenticeship program is challenging. There's a high bar to entry. The system is hard to navigate. It's especially true for people unfamiliar with the industry and for people with barriers to employment. And that's why we need to invest in pre-apprenticeship and high road multi-craft construction pre-apprenticeship to be more specific.

So this is a barebones sketch of the kind of high road multi-craft pre-apprenticeship that we invest in. As you can see it's much more than a curriculum in training. Every step is important. It begins with targeted outreach, recruitment and screening to reach priority populations. Training, using the Multi-Craft Core Curriculum or MC3 and assessment along the way, so that we know pre-apprentices are acquiring the basic competencies. That they can earn
an MC3 certificate that enables them to compete for an apprenticeship slot in any of the nearly two dozen trades of crafts.

There are supportive service along the way so that people can complete training, so that they're eligible and prepared for apprenticeship and they gain the lifelong employability skills in this industry, and for any career.

Lastly, placement services to ensure that the investment in training results in a good job or post-secondary education. And so with that, we'll review the results of our Prop 39 Pre-Apprenticeship Program from the last several years.

From 2014 through 2018, we invested over $13 million of Prop 39 funds to build 12 construction pre-apprenticeship training partnerships across California. These pilot projects a coherent system of energy efficiency focused job training and placement programs serving disadvantaged Californians. And this was the foundation of our High Road Construction Careers Initiative.

So on the left as you can see enrollments, we enrolled over 2,700 individuals, which means they received some level of training and supportive services. And of course, as noted here community-based organizations were instrumental in making sure that we reached the target populations and addressed diversity and equity.
Some numbers that are in the final training report that was submitted last week and I'll just go over it quickly. Of these 2,700 individuals over half were low income; about 27 percent are youth, 18 to 24 year olds; 17 percent women; 16 percent formerly incarcerated or justice involved; 6 percent homeless and 3 percent veterans. And while 3 percent is a low figure I would note that there are other programs, particularly Helmets to Hardhats, that serve that population very well and have done so for a long time. And so while our program may not have been the best fit there are other opportunities that they have available to them.

In terms of on the right, you see training completion numbers, 2,100 individuals completed the training and earned the Multi-Craft Core Curriculum Certificate. This is a 78 percent graduation rate, which we think is notable considering the challenges in the construction industry with program -- well participant retention and completion.

How we achieved this success is important as well. And we really chalked this up to making sure that we're that getting and providing more than training, really supportive services that play a key role in making sure that as noted earlier people can complete the training. That looks like stipends and counseling. That they're
prepared for apprenticeship requirements, that looks like remedial math and reading courses, addiction treatment in some cases. And the third sort of benefit or purpose of supportive services to make sure people gain employability skills for the long haul, that looks like financial literacy, trauma-informed care, anger management, things of that nature.

So when thinking about workforce development, we often say that it's important to keep in mind that training gets you training. Training doesn't guarantee you a job. It doesn't even connect you to employment necessarily. And that's true in this case as well. Completing pre-apprenticeship does not guarantee someone an apprenticeship slot. And as a result we make sure that planning for placement was an essential element of the Prop 39 funded programs.

And the key to success is always partnership, in this case with the Local Building and Construction Trades Council and apprenticeship coordinators. And over time, several of the Prop 39 funded training partnerships develop ways to give their graduates a leg up when they apply for apprenticeship. This looked like guaranteeing an interview for some programs. It looked like waiving certain entrance exams in other cases. What really made that possible is the quality of the pre-apprenticeship program and therefore
building a level of trust and familiarity with the
apprenticeship program coordinators.

   And while apprenticeship was the ideal outcome
for many pre-apprentices, training partnerships facilitated
and tracked other meaningful placement outcomes including
the ones you see here. We track construction or energy
efficiency sector employment; that was about 23 percent.
Well, let me just step back and say that just over 40
percent were placed in state registered apprenticeship in
the building and construction trades, 23 percent in
construction or energy efficiency sector employment, 26
percent in other employment. This often looked like
retail. In some cases we saw reporting that showed people
working in the solar industry.

   We probably should have changed our definition to
construction or clean energy sector employment, but
nonetheless this was a significant share. And lastly 10
percent went on to post-secondary education.

   VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: I have a question for you
on that slide. So if I understand correctly 78 percent of
those that enrolled in the pre-apprentice program
graduated. And you had 100 percent placement outcomes for
all those 78 percent?

   MR. JATKAR: We had 79 percent placement rates,
so 1,660 placements.
VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Represented in this chart here?

MR. JATKAR: Yes. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Got it. Thank you.

MR. JATKAR: Yes. Good question.

And actually that's a good segue way to the sort of last note on this slide, which is that we do expect placements to increase over time as the programs that we funded will continue working with those populations with other moneys or where those participants may be served by other workforce development programs. And also the placements may shift over time as some folks probably know well.

Apprenticeship is not sort of like any kind of training program where it's just sort of on an ongoing rolling basis. Apprenticeship programs open their doors when demand actually increases, when there's real demand to hire these new workers.

The last thing I want to note on this slide is about an increase in representation of women in the building and construction trades. That continues to be a major goal for the industry and the apprenticeship community nationwide. And so it's not on this slide here, but it's in the report, which is the success of placing women in apprenticeship. That placement rate exceeded the
total rate of placement in apprenticeships, so for women, it was 56 percent of the people that completed the program were placed in apprenticeship compared to 41 percent overall.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Shrayas, can I ask just real quick?

MR. JATKAR: Yeah.

MR. BARTRIDGE: On the 10 percent that went to post-secondary education do you have any kind of tracking on that? I wonder if they may have gone on to programs through the community colleges?

MR. JATKAR: We do not track specific schools or where they went.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Sure.

MR. JATKAR: I can look into that further though. So actually I want to spend a little bit of time on this slide compared to the others. I think we've presented on the data in years past and I think we have not spent enough time describing what we've done with this program or what this program has really enabled for us and for California really.

So for us, Prop 39 was really -- the funding represented an investment in the pilot phase of a single comprehensive High Road Construction Careers Initiative that could meet the workforce needs of the construction
sector industry-wide. And so to that end we dedicated some
Prop 39 funds to technical assistance that was to help
grantees with program implementation. And also was to help
us build a model for construction sector pre-apprenticeship
in the state. And we did that by producing different types
of educational resources with each one sort of built upon
the previous one.

So to start with, we convened regular communities
of practice over the course of the program that brought
together the grantees and subject matter experts to learn
from one another to identify common challenges, possible
solutions and receive training to improve service and
outcomes.

And so some of the examples of the improvements
facilitated through communities of practice include one,
developing effective recruitment and retention plans to
increase representation of women in the construction
trades. That was with the help of Tradeswomen,
Incorporated. And another is incorporating trauma-informed
care among the supportive services available to pre-
apprentices, particularly for certain populations like
those coming out of prison. And that was thanks to the
help of an organization called 2nd Call.

So these convenings and then regular interaction
with our grantees helped us identify three major lessons
early on for a successful design and execution of multi-
craft pre-apprenticeship, which we've included in the
annual reports to the Board, but I'll just repeat them very
quickly.

Those three early lessons were active involvement
with the local building trades is key to apprenticeship
placement. Number two, placement in state registered
apprenticeship is not an overnight process. And three, a
successful program provides more than just curriculum.

So expanding on these core lessons, we then
produced a thorough best practices report featuring Prop 39
projects learnings and innovations. That report covers the
elements of successful pre-apprenticeship programs
including an emphasis on training partnerships, not just
programs, meeting industry demand, running comprehensive
programs from recruitment to placement, and lastly
assessing program effectiveness and opportunities for
expansion.

And we also commissioned a report from the East
Bay Alliance for a Sustainable Economy and the Alameda
County Building and Construction Trades Council about
building effective partnership between community and labor
organizations to support the expanded use of community
workforce agreements or CWAs.

These agreements are a critical component to our
training programs, excuse me, a critical complement to our training programs by connecting workforce development to regional labor market demand. You can think of this as combining push and pull strategies. Community workforce agreements help pull target populations into good jobs whereas the training we provide pushes them into these labor markets.

And community workforce agreements are distinct, but very intimately related to project labor agreements. Project labor agreements address job quality while community workforce agreements are needed to advance equity. Both of these best practices reports are on our website and they're linked to in the final training report we submitted last week.

And lastly, I'll say based on this research and practice in the field we were able to take things to the next level under SB 1 or the Road Repair and Accountability Act. And as mandated under SB 1 we established 10 standards for multi-craft construction pre-apprenticeship in California. We call this document the SB 1 Workforce Guidelines and at the same time we do believe that those standards are applicable to a wide range of entities that are investing or involved in major construction projects, not just the local agencies receiving SB 1 monies.

So we also had a series of short videos made, to
show what pre-apprenticeship entails and what the pre-apprentices directly tell their stories about the deep and lasting impact that these programs have had in their lives.

Most of the videos focus on a particular Prop 39 funded training partnership and highlight their union contribution in this field. For example a particular target population served or in some cases a successful partnership that they developed with clean energy and transportation projects like the Solar One project in Richmond and High-Speed Rail in the Fresno area.

And again, there's a link to all of these videos in our final report. But I do want to play this one, which is more of an overview of the entire pre-apprenticeship program. And what I might do is I have a feeling it's not going to go full screen from here, so it's --

(Off mic colloquy to set up video playback.)

(Video playback begins.)

Tim Rainey: There are jobs in construction right now, because number one the economy is great. But you add to that what people call this silver tsunami.

Juanita Douglas: The Baby Boomers are retiring and there is a major shortage in skilled labor.

Myllex Guadamuz: There is about a $70 billion expectation of construction that's going to come around in the next two to three years.
Fred Lucero: Construction is one of those things that can't be outsourced. It's got to be done right here. Because of Prop 39 we're able to serve the people from the community that want to go into the trades.

Juanita Douglas: And we're finding it's harder and harder and harder to find people that's qualified, so with these programs it literally keeps the workforce going.

(Music and Title Card: Apprenticeship Readiness, A Pipeline to the Trades)

Chris Hannan: The MC3 or the Multi-Craft Core Curriculum is a curriculum developed by the international unions of the building trades. This is what we're looking for when we get somebody ready for apprenticeship.

Jonathan Brito: A lot of us don't go to college right, so you know programs like this help people find real living-wage jobs.

Jaime Alvarez: Pre-apprenticeship programs are very useful in that it helps the students come to terms with what they're getting themselves into.

David Lopez: So we basically tell them this is what you're going to be doing every single day for the next 30 years. Is this what you want to be doing?

[Place card: What I Want To Do - interviews with apprentices, no names given.]

1) The craft I would like to go into land
surveying.

2) I want to be a painter and drywall finisher.

3) Labors would be my craft.

4) I'm leaning towards the Plumbers Union.

5) Carpentry and I want to become a craftsman. I want to actually start with finish work.

   Renee Edwards: They start you off with the basics of the math learning the different terminology with building and everything, just learning stuff that I never knew existed.

   David Robinson: We walk past all these buildings; everything's being built by construction workers and just having a knowledge of how it starts.

   Fred Lucero: A really broad understanding of Labor history, which is critical.

   Eduardo Benitez: I want to learn a little bit about everything and it's just like it prepares physically and mentally.

   Daniel Torres: The construction industry can be very physical. We've actually had students give up, because of how hard it is.

   Jose Zarazua: What we're doing, PT, it's called physical training. They're pretty much preparing us for all the hard work that we'll be doing.

   Marlin Jeffreys: We get them first aid, CPR
training, OSHA 10 cards.

Adriana De La O: Safety handling the tools, which is a very important, because we want to go home with our fingers.

Brian Liston: We're in the process right now of building small structures that have all the same components of any residential or commercial building.

Lewis Ingram: We learn how to do all types of different skills from measuring to hammering and sawing.

Isamar Marroquin: We're out in the yard, we're doing or grading the leveling, like that's really cool.

Juanita Douglas: I'm basically teaching them life skills, how to stay on a job, how to keep their jobs.

David Lopez: Anything from showing up on time, having the proper tools, proper communication skills.

Mario Mathis: How to work with other people, how to work in close proximity with somebody else.

Jose Zarazua: Brotherhood, we all look out for one another. We come to work together. We get to know each other. We go through pain together.

[Place card: Visiting Apprenticeship Programs and Jobsites]

Isaac Lopez: During those 10 weeks, we're traveling to different union halls, the Sheet Metal Workers and the Painters Union and Plumbers Union, IBEW Local 11,
so they can start thinking about, "Okay, what is it that I'm gonna do?"

Daniel Torres: A visit like today at LAX is super valuable. Our students actually get to see what a live jobsite looks like.

Myllex Guadamuz: They get to see how the symphony of crafts working together flows. They get to see the cool hardware, the cranes, you know, the bulldozers, seeing people on the lifts, seeing people on the roof, seeing just how exciting working in this industry actually can be.

Richard Brady: It's crazy that my first jobsite that I've ever visited was that extensive, that big, a huge project. I'd like to see myself there.

Toni Tonico: We took students to three different sites. We started at the San Joaquin River Viaduct, it's in the City of Fresno, to get the students out there to see what other people are working on, the men and women working on the project.

Tania Borjas: I've never really been so close to something, you know, know so big like the high-speed rail. And I just hope I can be part of it pretty soon.

[Place Card: Who The Students Are]

Tim Rainey: The pre-apprenticeship programs we've funded over the last six or seven years of Prop 39
have seen a lot of really great success on the individual level for formerly incarcerated at-risk youth, people of color from communities that otherwise would have had no access to these kinds of wonderful middle-class jobs. We've seen success in getting more women into the trades and moving that small percentage to a larger percentage.

Marlin Jeffreys: Fifty percent of the participants that we train are women. We train a lot of participants who are entering back into society from incarceration or people who are have other barriers to employment.

Tim Rainey: One of the big elements of success in terms of reduced recidivism is a good job and a paycheck.

Jose Zarazua: You know, we're coming out of prison. Most of us come out with no experience.

Eduardo Hanke: And being a felon, like there's not many jobs I can get and construction is a career that they look past that and that's what I like about it.

David Lopez: We don't care what your background is, right? All we care is that you're willing to commit yourself to the craft.

Juanita Douglas: Actually the ones that have been incarcerated are the ones that are really the best students, because they pay attention and they know what
they have to go back to if they don't make it here.

Belia Lopez: They actually believe in us and that's what you need, people to believe in you and actually give you that second chance.

Mario Mathis: But with the state taking a chance on me, so you know I'm going to make them proud.

[Place card: The Pride That Comes With A Solid Job]

Molly McCobb: I like to see our participants come through the program and then find themselves in a secure job where they have potential to grow, to see their confidence build from the beginning to the end of the program.

Brian Liston: It's great for the group that's in the class right now to see someone who's come through the program being successful and thinking to themselves like, "If they can do it, I can do it."

Christopher Bell: To be honest before I got to RichmondBUILD I was on a crash course. I was in and out of jail. I didn't believe I would ever have a job. I didn't believe in myself. BUILD gave me the opportunity to go out and do something with my life, to change my life around.

Miguel Castillo: I wanted a career and I knew I going through the ARC boot camp, pre-apprenticeship boot camp, would get me towards a career instead of, you know, a
job.

Vernon Jefferson: I look at what I'm doing now, like I'm working now. I was the first person that started working out (indiscernible) and everybody looked like, wow like he was the first person they grabbed.

Trent Roan: I went to the pre-apprenticeship and now here I am working on high-speed rail. It's like really cool once you get out here, because it's like you're a part of something that's, you know it's kind of big.

Tim Rainey: If we can build this model of access into really great jobs through pre-apprenticeship and apprenticeship training, and get more people who (indiscernible) jobs into good jobs we can move the needle on poverty in the state.

Isaac Lopez: Because it's an everybody's best interest to give these folks an opportunity to succeed and provide for themselves.

Peter Mattich: It changes the individual's life, but it affects their families and neighborhoods.

Daniel Torres: For a lot of our students this is life and death for them. This may be the last opportunity they get before something drastic happens in their lives.

Jose Zarazua: This is definitely a blessing for me, to help me have a second chance at life. A future, you know, to be able to provide for my family.
(Video playback end)

MR. JATKAR: So I think I'll just say thank you again, dedicated multi-year funding for Prop 39 really gave us the opportunity to build a foundation for the High Road Construction Careers Initiative. Again, thinking about serving the construction industry-wide. And we're now taking this initiative to the next level with significant funding from SB 1 and from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund. Currently we're scoring applications for the first round of grants under SB 1. We anticipate announcing awards in May.

And notably, for this group virtually all of the partnerships developed under Prop 39, we're expecting them to continue the work under SB 1 and GGRF.

We have 10 million from the GGRF that we received last week and we expect or it's probably better to say we hope that this initiative will receive an additional $40 million from the GGRF over the next four years. But as (indiscernible) familiar with the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund and the legislative appropriations process now that is not guaranteed.

And while our Prop 39 funding has ended we still think that this program can benefit the group in clean energy deployment in California that we need to achieve our SB 100 targets. And we really look forward to continuing
the collaboration and we really believe that this
initiative will play a major role in developing a skilled
workforce that will move us towards a carbon
(indiscernible) economy in California, so thank you.

BOARD MEMBER PARK: Thank you.

CHAIR ALVORD: Such a great program, do folks
have questions?

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: I have a comment. After 37
years in the trades, I want to start over again.
(Laughter.) Just kidding, I'm retiring.

Although the thing about the veteran thing, yeah
I know you said you only had 3 percent, but most of the
trades have direct entry for veterans so don't let those
low numbers fool you any. They can just come right in, so
that's the way we are in our trade. That's the way it is,
so they just come in.

CHAIR ALVORD: Yeah.

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: I was curious about the 22
percent that did not successfully get placed. What your
lessons learned might be and how you might mitigate that
for the future?

MR. JATKAR: You know, I don't think we've
explored that enough. I think we should continue to look
at that. I will say that to some extent construction is
not for everyone. We do the screening at the front end, so
that the people who go through pre-apprenticeship have a
decent sense of what they're getting into, but folks may
wash out. After they've gone through this program they may
see that this is not the right fit for them and turn out as
a result of that.

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: I'll comment on it as well is
that what we see through our pre-apprenticeship program is
they actually will figure out that construction is actually
work, I mean physical work.

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Yeah, that's why I went to
college.

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Yeah, exactly. That's what
happens sometimes even in our pre-apprenticeship program
when they go through it. It's actually a good thing to
have a pre-apprenticeship program, because you can weed
people out that, "Oh wow, I cannot physically do these
things."

MR. JATKAR: Absolutely. I think and that's one
of the benefits of pre-apprenticeship for the
apprenticeship community and the industry, is that there's
a need for committed people. People who really have a
sense of what they're getting into, even in an
apprenticeship program. My understanding is that
apprenticeship programs invest tens of thousands of dollars
on apprentices, so this is making sure that there's a
return on their investment as well.

BOARD MEMBER PARK: Do you, do we have any from

the larger word, ideas of longevity in terms of somebody
coming in through your program versus a person in the
trade? Do you have any comparison of sort of what the
expectation is how the folks, the 78 percent that were
placed, what the longevity in the industry is or will be?

MR. JATKAR: We're not able track that. We're
looking to expand, I mean largely this is a data systems
issue, that in our data system we track them through
placement. And then for especially the folks in an
apprenticeship program then that's through the Division of
apprenticeship standards. And what we hope to do, and we
really need to upgrade our software significantly to be
able to do this, is that we should be able to know exactly
that are they completing apprenticeship? And it'd even be
great to know what projects are they getting dispatched to.

That may be too much data to capture or I'm not
familiar enough with the dispatch system and how that's
tracked, but I imagine we could. We should be able to, to
be able to actually show the connection or the nexus
between people going through pre-apprenticeship into
apprenticeship and where they're actually on a project that
addresses, is it clean energy, transportation
infrastructure.
And as folks know, what we're really trying to build here with one initiative is a system, a model that works regardless of the project type. Including, but not limited to of course, clean energy and transportation infrastructure.

BOARD MEMBER PARK: Great, thank you.

CHAIR ALVORD: I want to congratulate you not just the program, but being able to tell the story. Because I think one of the things that drives me a little crazy about state government is there are a lot of positive stories. And we're not always the best at telling them, you know, government, so just that alone is fantastic.

I wanted to ask a couple of questions in terms of like what the overhead is. The Workforce Development Board, you clearly contract out to these twelve centers that do probably most of the work. But how much overhead is there from the standpoint of the Workforce Development Board, how many staff do you have that are working on this full time, approximately?

MR. JATKAR: About two that are really full time, yeah. And that's shifted over time, but --

CHAIR ALVORD: Put that in your -- that's a really good stat.

MR. JATKAR: Yeah.

CHAIR ALVORD: And another thing, the 6 percent
homeless, I would imagine it's incredibly difficult and
challenging to reach that population. But given that it's
a big issue, are you learning anything going on about how
we might better address the needs and the ability to help
folks get a better situation?

MR. JATKAR: I'll have to follow up with you on
that. We are trying to do more data analysis, so that
we're going just beyond the numbers to answer questions
like that. I don't have that as this time.

I will just note that this, the two programs in
the South Bay, so San Mateo and Santa Clara County, are the
ones that have really focused mostly on the homeless
population. Of course, its' an issue throughout the state,
but it's something that we want to continue to learn from
as we continue to grow the program.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. And one other thing I'm
really curious, you may have addressed this when you
presented last year, but were there any (indiscernible) for
this or are you guys just learning as you go?

MR. JATKAR: Well, this is really building on
experience and research nationally that's been going for
years if not decades. Of course, the apprenticeship system
is probably well over 100 years old, and so there's a lot
of lessons that the industry and the apprenticeship
community has learned about how do people successfully get
through an apprenticeship? And so, you know, even
identifying the need for pre-apprenticeship, that came well
before us and that's build on years of experience and
research.

When I started working here two years ago my
first month or so was reading reports about best practices
from groups like the Aspen Institute that look at this very
closely. There's a number of groups that have been focused
on this, so the best practices are not -- you know, we're
really building on other people's work, I guess that.

CHAIR ALVORD: Were there other state or federal
programs that you were able to derive information from or
is this kind of unique or regional for that matter?

MR. JATKAR: I don't want to say it's unique. We
always try to sort of tout California as being exemplary or
pioneering in this space. I don't know that for a fact. I
think there's a number of places that have been doing
excellent work. In a lot of cases when we talk about High
Road, all of our workforce development programs are really
orienting entire the workforce system to a High Road model
that's for us based on the principals of equity, climate
and job quality.

That sort of model of High Road came out of the
Midwest largely, but there's group in California that have
been practicing that. So we're really taking lessons from
a broad community of folks in California and around the
country.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Well, congratulations.

MR. JATKAR: I don't know, maybe since you asked
I'll just offer one other anecdote, which is from my own
research in grad school what I did is looked at different
types of programs similar to this. One of the big lessons
that I took away from that research was that programs like
this that are thinking about training industry-wide are
much more successful than those that have sort of a green
construction or energy efficiency focus sort of solely.
Because construction, you move from project to project,
that's the nature of the industry.

And so if you want to give people a career and
skills for life in the long haul, it's really thinking
about it more systematically at an industry scale. Because
technologies will change, new developments will always
occur and there's already a robust system for incorporating
those new skills and knowledge through apprenticeship and
these types of programs.

CHAIR ALVORD: That's interesting. Thank you so
much and congratulations.

MR. JATKAR: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER PARK: Yeah, great job.

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Thank you.
MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay. And with that let's move forward. Do we have a motion to accept the Workforce Development Board's Jobs Report us to or Jobs (indiscernible)?

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Motion to accept.

CHAIR ALVORD: Second.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Then all in favor?

(Ayes.)

MR. BARTRIDGE: Thank you.

Okay. So that essentially wraps up our February meeting. We'll take this information, build it into our draft report that we will bring to you at our next meeting. Again, that's March 17th. We're working on the agenda for that. We will post an agenda for that probably during the week of March 2nd.

Programs-wise we'll have more of an update for you on the School Bus Program, their presentation. We're hoping to have a lessons Learned Prop 39 Report presentation for you that we would also wrap into our report. So that when it goes over to the Legislature they have a full picture, not only of what we've been doing and how we've pulled this information together, but the lesson they've learned out of the program as well. So we're still working on the agenda on that, but we will get back to you with that.
CHAIR ALVORD: One quick question, Jim. When do we need to approve that by, discuss for the 17th, the --

MR. BARTRIDGE: We will bring that report to you at the 17th, so I won't have it ready when we post the agenda. But I'll be working with you and others closely and hope for your review prior to that meeting. And then we'll be having some discussions about recommendations and where we want to go this year. And then we'll finalize that report at our March 17th meeting.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Do we have to wear green?

(Laughter.)

MR. BARTRIDGE: We should wear green, yes. We didn't plan that. But any other public comments, any other comments in the room, anybody else? No.

I just want to thank everyone today, all the program staff, oh and Jack wanted to remind our Board Members to please be sure to file your Form 700s if you haven't already.

And with that, I think we're --

CHAIR ALVORD: I think we're ready to adjourn.

(Adjourned at 2:38 p.m.)
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