BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA CLEAN ENERGY JOBS ACT
CITIZENS OVERSIGHT BOARD

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

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

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

FRIDAY, APRIL 3, 2020
9:30 A.M.

Reported by:
Martha Nelson
APPEARANCES

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT (*Via telephone and/or WebEx)
*Adrienne Alvord, Chair, California Citizens Oversight Board
*Randall Martinez, Vice Chair, California Citizens Oversight Board
*Darrell Park, California Citizens Oversight Board
*David Dias, California Citizens Oversight Board
*Barbara Lloyd, California Citizens Oversight Board
*Heather Rosenberg, California Citizens Oversight Board

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT
*Commissioner McAllister, California Energy Commission Commissioner
*Fritz Foo, Advisor to Commissioner McAllister, CEC

COB STAFF PRESENT
James Bartridge
Jack Bastida

CEC STAFF PRESENT
*Manuel Aquila
Deborah Godfrey
*Raj Singh
*Ian Baird
*Jennifer Masterson
*Sarah Williams
INDEX

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

1. INTRODUCTION AND ROLL CALL OF BOARD MEMBERS TO DETERMINE QUORUM. (Chair Alvord) 4

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM FEBRUARY 13, 2019 CITIZENS OVERSIGHT BOARD MEETING. (Chair Alvord) 12

3. UPDATE ON THE SCHOOL BUS REPLACEMENT PROGRAM. (Manuel Aguila, California Energy Commission) 14

4. UPDATE ON THE ENERGY-CONSERVATION ASSISTANCE ACT - EDUCATION COMPETITIVE PROGRAM. (Deborah Godfrey, California Energy Commission) 29

5. PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE VOTE ON THE ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE REPORT OF THE CALIFORNIA CLEAN ENERGY JOBS ACT. (Chair Alvord/Jim Bartridge) 38

6. PUBLIC COMMENT --

Adjourn 58

Reporter's Certification 59

Transcriber's Certification 60
PROCEDINGS

APRIL 3, 2020

CHAIR ALVORD: Thank you.

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

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Hello there.

CHAIR ALVORD: Hello?

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Hi, this is Randall Martinez.

CHAIR ALVORD: Hi, Randy. This is Adrienne.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Hi, Adrienne.

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

CHAIR ALVORD: And there's Heather.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Yes. Can you hear me?

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

MR. BASTIDA: I can’t hear you.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Can you hear me now?

CHAIR ALVORD: Excellent.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Okay, great.

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

MR. BASTIDA: Barbara Lloyd, have you joined?

MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay folks, just a minute or two.
I just spoke with Barbara on the phone, so I expect her to join shortly. We'll get started in just a minute. Thanks.

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

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

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

COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Yes, I can.

CHAIR ALVORD: Well you're echoing some things
that I planned to say. And I also want to express our
appreciation to the Administration for taking such swift
action on that pandemic. I'm usually grateful to be a
Californian, but unusually grateful this last month for the
swift action and for postponing this meeting initially
because of the need to protect peoples’ health all of the
sudden.

COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Yeah.

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

COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Yeah, well thank you.

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

CHAIR ALVORD: Indeed. Thank you.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Barbara Lloyd, have you joined?

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yes, I'm here.

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

Thank you all for joining today. And we're
actually in Hearing Room B, Jack and I, very social-
distanced apart. But it felt like it was worthwhile to actually be in the room and try and make a difference here.

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

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

The Board set its second meeting. It's typically held in March where we review the Draft Report, receive input and seek approval from the Board to finalize the report before submitting it to the Legislature, which we usually do by the end of March. We did cancel our March 17th meeting, given the outbreak of COVID-19 and the need to protect public health and safety through social distancing in order to slow the spread of the virus. So today's meeting is being held electronically consistent with Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-25-20. Today's agenda includes
two non-voting information items on Proposition 39 funded programs: the School Bus Replacement Program and the ECCA-
Ed Competitive Program, which you'll hear about before we provide an overview of the draft annual Citizens Oversight Board report and recommendations to the Legislature.

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

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

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

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

As everyone knows here California voters approved Proposition 39, the California Clean Energy and 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 new private-sector jobs to improve the energy efficiency of commercial and residential buildings throughout California, to help meet our climate and GHG reduction goals.

Program funding came 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, 2018.

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

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay -- anyway, to audit, review expenditures and maintain transparency and accountability of the Clean Energy Job Creation Fund. And 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 you all, especially today, for your service.

And I think it bears repeating what I said earlier to Andrew McAllister that we owe a debt of
gratitude to Governor Newsom and his administration for their swift action to contain COVID-19, which resulted in a brief postponement of our in-person meeting that’s protecting all of us, and especially the staff and the public.

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

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

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

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

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Thanks, Fritz.

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

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

CHAIR ALVORD: Thanks, Darrell.

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

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay, thank you very much.

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

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

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Thank you.
CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Jim, go ahead

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

So first, Chair Alvord?

CHAIR ALVORD: Here.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Vice Chair Martinez?

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: I am here.

MR. BARTRIDGE: David Dias?

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

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

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: (Indiscernible.)

MR. BARTRIDGE: There you go.

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Hello? Oh, okay.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Barbara Lloyd?

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yes, I'm here.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Heather Rosenberg?

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Here.

MR. BARTRIDGE: And Darrell Park?

BOARD MEMBER PARK: Here.

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

CHAIR ALVORD: Excellent. Thank you everyone.

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

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

CHAIR ALVORD: Thanks, Barbara.

Any other comments or corrections for the minutes?

Hearing none, I'd entertain a motion.

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: So moved, Randall Martinez.

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Second, Dave Dias.

CHAIR ALVORD: Thank you.

Can we go by affirmations, Jim?

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

CHAIR ALVORD: Aye.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Vice-Chair Martinez?

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Aye.

MR. BARTRIDGE: David Dias?

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Aye.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Heather Rosenberg?

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Aye.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Darrell Park?

BOARD MEMBER PARK: Aye.

MR. BARTRIDGE: And Barbara, we know you'll abstain. So very good, we're good to go.
CHAIR ALVORD: Yes.

MR. BARTRIDGE: The minutes are approved.

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

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

MR. AGUILA: Hello, can you hear me?

CHAIR ALVORD: I can hear you.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Yes.

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

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

The second component is for the charging
infrastructure. We received a $14 million allocation from the Clean Transportation Program. This provides up to $60,000 per awarded bus for charging infrastructure.

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

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

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

And there’s a requirement that any replaced school bus must be scrapped.

Next slide, please. Now this slide actually shows some of the minimum requirements for each school bus type. So the minimum battery range is based on the size of the vehicle. The Type A school bus is a smaller school bus. Type C is a larger school bus. And the Type D is the largest. So the Type A had a minimum battery range of 70 miles. Both Types C and D had a minimum range requirement of 100 miles.
Now we also have the seating capacity minimum requirements based off the size of the vehicle as well. So Type A receives a minimum of 16 students, Type C is a minimum of 44 students and Type D is 70 students.

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

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

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

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

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

Now Type B was not awarded. The reason for that is when (indiscernible) developing this solicitation manufacturers actually confided that they weren't really producing any Type Bs whether it be electric or standard internal-combustion engines. So we kind of removed those
from the equation. So we actually went to just the Type A, C and Ds for awards.

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

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

Now here we can see our estimated delivery timeline --

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Are you taking questions?
MR. AGUILA: At the end, if that's okay?
VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Okay.
MR. AGUILA: Okay. So the delivery timeline here
as you can see we’re just bid delivery of 5 percent by the end of 2019; 25 percent accumulative total by the end of 2020; 50 percent by 2021; and 100 percent by September 30th of 2022. And our first goal of 5 percent was met, so we did deliver that 5 percent by the end of 2019. And we are anticipating meeting our next goal of 25 percent or 58 buses by the end of 2020. Next slide, please.

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

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

Los Angeles, so you can see, is receiving 59 buses and our South region is receiving 57 buses. So they’re all roughly receiving the same number of buses. Next slide, please.
And one of the next steps is to actually collect data. So some of the things that we're looking at collecting is maintenance cost data. So we want to look at the cost of the diesel bus being replaced and our maintenance as well as compared to the electric buses' maintenance.

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

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

This map actually shows the distribution of recipients based on CalEnviroScreen 3.0. So this is a screening tool that's used to help ID communities disproportionately burdened by multiple sources of pollution and with population characteristics that make it more sensitive to pollution. So this was developed on behalf of CalEPA and we can see the distribution of our recipients. One of the great things about this program is the districts provided information regarding their routes.
in disadvantaged community areas. And approximately 90 percent of our recipients actually operate in the high-risk and (indiscernible) areas. Next slide, please.

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

And our final slide is going to be workforce development. So this is available to all of our recipients. And this is the Electric School Bus Training Project. And this is done in conjunction with community colleges for training of maintenance technicians and bus operators. And it’s also training topics include high-voltage safety, troubleshooting, and proper operation of electric vehicles. And training schedules and curricula are currently in development. But one of the plans is to
have this long-term bus electrical vocation training
through community colleges for certification and degrees.
So we're looking and hoping this is more of a long-term
project. And next slide, please.

That is it. And I am available for questions.
CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Thanks very much, Manuel.
I think we heard a question. Was that Randall?

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Yes, thank you.
Thank you for the information, a question about
the Lion Company that was awarded the buses. By chance are
they a California-based company or is any of this work at
least being done in California?

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

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Thank you.
MR. AGUILA: You're welcome.
BOARD MEMBER PARK: Hi, this is Darrell. I have
one more question.

MR. AGUILA: Yes?
BOARD MEMBER PARK: My concern on making sure
that the school districts and the people doing the charging
of the buses understand the difference in electrical
pricing based on timing and other things in their
districts. So I'm happy to have a conversation with you offline, but the numbers can be, once the school systems get back up and running probably during the next school year, my concern is that those electrical cost numbers can be really thrown off if you're charging at peak times or in peak costs versus nonpeak costs. You know, there might be a one-to-five or a one-to-ten ratio on that.

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

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

We are requiring that all of our charging stations are networked, so that will actually assist in charging the vehicles during off peak hours.
BOARD MEMBER PARK: Okay, great. And there may be high-use school -- or high bus-usage situations where they can't. And if you can just in your data have a note for that, so that we truly understand the costs. There will be places that will be using those buses, so much in the morning and so much at night and so much in the afternoon that they're going to need to charge sort of in that midday period when the electricity is more expensive. And as long as we have a break-out in the data, understand that, I'm comfortable with where we are.

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

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

MR. AGUILA: Yes. So we're actually looking at kind of breaking down all of the data, so we're separating
it as much as we can, so we can ensure that we're kind of tracking all of the individual aspects of that maintenance.

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

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

Anybody else? I've got a couple.

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


BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Sorry.

CHAIR ALVORD: Sorry. Yeah, please do.

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

And my first question is will all of this data be publicly available? Because working with other transit agencies outside of the school districts that are moving towards electrification, I think there are a lot of lessons learned here. Is that something that will be easily accessible?
MR. AGUILA: Yes, it's definitely one of the things that we want to do. Because one of our major goals is not just the program itself, but actually the adoption of better electric school buses overall. So even if they don't just go with our program we want to make sure that everybody is aware of the actual benefits of the buses themselves, whether it be the reduced costs in maintaining the vehicles or the reduction of any particulate matter in the air. We just want to make sure that we're providing as much information is possible to everybody.

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

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

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Great. Thank you.

MR. AGUILA: You're welcome.

CHAIR ALVORD: Thanks, Heather.

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Hi, it's Barbara Lloyd. I really only had one question and that is how long is the pricing that you guys have negotiated going to be available
if districts or other entities are able to come up with funds to buy additional buses? How long would these terms be available?

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

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Okay.

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Dave, any questions?

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

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

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

CHAIR ALVORD: In the event of fire events, I think you mentioned that the buses might help with resiliency. And I was wondering what that referred to, if that was use of the battery or something else?
MR. AGUILA: Yes. So it would be the using the battery electric school buses to run evacuation centers. Typically school districts or schools will actually be some of the most heavily used evacuation centers.

CHAIR ALVORD: Right.

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

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

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

CHAIR ALVORD: Well that's great. And I hope
they don't have to come in handy that way, but the way
things are going you never know. So that's great.

MR. AGUILA: (Indiscernible.)
CHAIR ALVORD: Those are all my questions.
MR. AGUILA: I agree. And that's one of the
things we're hoping is not necessary, but we want to
be prepared in case it is.
CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Okay if there are no other
questions, Manuel, thank you very much.
MR. AGUILA: Thank you.
CHAIR ALVORD: So next on the agenda we have the
ECCA-Ed Update with Deborah Godfrey. Deborah.
MS. GODFREY: Good morning everyone.
CHAIR ALVORD: Good morning.
MS. GODFREY: Start it here. As you remember,
the purpose of the background was the Energy Conservation
Assistance Act, which is a program that has existed since
1979. And SB 110 added additional Prop 39 funds to the
ECAA-Ed programs to be dispersed on a competitive basis.
The loans were at 0 percent as they had been for the ECAA-
Ed Subaccount for quite a while, so that didn't change.

And as you may recall there was the money, this
is an allocation from the remaining Prop 39 money. And we
didn't have quite as much as we had hoped for. There was
about $113 million that was remaining. The first $75
million was the School Bus Program as we’ve just heard; it was fully funded. Up to the next $100 million was available for the ECAA-Ed Competitive Loan Program. We’ve received slightly under $38 million and of course there was no funds remaining to extend the Prop 39 K through 12 Competitive Grant Program.

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

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

SB 110 based the priority for the competitive portion of this program on geographic diversity, the diversity in the size of the LEAs student population, the percentage of students eligible for the FRPM program in the previous year. That was given a weight of 50 percent. And
then the energy savings also was added to the total score for up to another 50 percent.

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

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

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

The solicitations that were received were spread throughout the state. We received these counties that did submit applications. And the applications that were received are as such. The pink are, as you can see, where we received none. We received a total of 21, and 5 of them
were administratively disqualified. So had everyone been
eligible we would have been able to get about --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can anybody else still
hear her?

MS. GODFREY: -- $20 million out.

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

The reason why or as such out of the 21 that we
received, 5 were administratively disqualified for very
interesting reasons. Frequently there were pages that were
missing, they were signed by someone or signed or submitted
by someone that did not have authority and so those
immediately came out. Of the 16 that remained they were
reviewed and 7 did not pass technical review. Two passed,
but there was no funding remaining in that size or region.
As was -- there we go -- and those, as you can see from the
earlier slide. We received in some cases such as if you
look at this slide for the Central and the Large we
received 4 applications, which would have totaled 7.7
million. So there was not an adequate amount of money in
that fund to fund more than 1 for the $2.75.
Reasons for the disqualifications were missing pages and information, wrong document formats. We had one very interesting one. They were directed to submit documents in Excel format. And we received one that just sent a statement, didn't send them in an Excel format, just sent a statement and, “Yeah, we did them in Excel,” which is kind of interesting. An unauthorized person signed the application or the Board resolution authorized a private firm to submit and accept the loan, which unfortunately cannot occur. And the calculations were not shown on spreadsheets or were not openable. Or the R formulas that are embedded had been overwritten and information was not accurate. So based on that, approaching the second solicitation, which of course is still competitive.

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

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

And we have done a mass marketing on trying to
explain how you will be a successful applicant. We made things in the second solicitation a little bit bigger and bolder and underlined and highlighted it and everything else we could think of, to stress that the application instructions need to be strictly adhered to.

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

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

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

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

The non-competitive program as you may have heard we have received quite a few complaints about it being competitive. There has been the comment that it was so much easier and workable when it was non-competitive. And
that is true to some extent, but unfortunately the
direction of SB 110 did want to make sure that it was
fairly distributed amongst size and region. And this
competitive program does allow for that.

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

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

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

MS. GODFREY: Yes, I can.

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

MS. GODFREY: I think so. We had a lot more
people inquire in the interim. We also had a lot of
unsuccessful applicants that requested a debrief, some of
them numerous debriefs. And we have stressed in through
our hotline and as calls have come in, and while we cannot
answer specific questions regarding specific projects, we have really stressed that at all points that this really needs -- you really need to read it. Don't just give it the cursory glance as you would with the regular ECAA, knowing that when the regular ECAA application comes in staff looks at it, contacts you, goes back and forth and eventually it's massaged into an eligible application.

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

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Awesome.

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

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: That sounds great. Thank you.

CHAIR ALVORD: Anyone else? That's so ironic to
everybody, because the first thing you learn in school supposedly is follow instructions. (Laughs.) So hopefully you'll have more success next time.

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

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

MS. GODFREY: Thank you for the opportunity.

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

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

So the Annual Report, we’re supposed to distribute it within 90 days of the end of the calendar year, by March 30th. We're a little bit late this time given -- well this would be the first time that we've been late, so we’ll work within those bounds. There's a lot of extraneous things going on.
The report is supposed to include the activity of
the previous year, our findings and recommendations based
on annual reports from the agencies that report to us and
then findings on quantifying total employment. The
Workforce Development Board you'll recall in the February
meeting presented us with their last report, so we won't
have new data -- I did include in the report those findings
from last year, because there's no additional project
funding going out. The job calculation wouldn't have
changed.

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

The objectives of the Clean Energy Jobs Act,
particularly relevant at this point is to put Californians
to work repairing and updating and improving energy
efficiency in public schools and universities and public
buildings. And promote private-sector clean energy and
energy efficiency jobs. And then finally to leverage
existing energy efficiency and clean energy programs to create increased economic and energy benefits for California.

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

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

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

So again the mandates, review the Clean Energy Job Creation Fund expenditures, the annual independent audit of the fund on selection of projects, publish the accounting, which we do. Again, that’s posted. And then submit an evaluation to Legislature identifying changes
needed to Clean Energy Jobs Act programs. So that's what we're required to do as the Citizens Oversight Board. And that's what we try to cover in some of the chapter.

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

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

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

Here's a look at that distribution geographically. And you may recall in past reports that we
had some counties that hadn't participated. Now they're fully participating and everyone's in the loop.

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

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

Chapter 3, also the Loans and Technical Assistance Programs, we just heard about ECAA-Ed Competitive. Here’s an overview of the ECAA-Ed existing program. So the loan program, it did start in 1979. This revolving loan program was started in 2013. So far there’s
35 approved project loans totaling $52.3 million; 3 of those totaling $4.8 million with final reports due after 6.30.19; 4 projects totaling over $4 million; 28 completed projects at $43.1 million. And that came to 21.5 million kilowatt hours of electricity and over 15,000 gas therms and those are savings projected.

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

Finally, on the Workforce Development, and again this is the results from the previous year, but the workforce through Prop 39 invested over $13 million, developed 12 construction pre-apprenticeship programs. You'll remember that they gave us a great presentation back in February on this. The workforce-training and supportive services prepares at-risk youth, women, veterans, ex-offenders, and other disadvantaged job seekers to complete a state registered apply-and-enter and complete a state-registered building trade apprenticeship program.
So of the 2,700 enrolled, 2,100 completed training and earned the Multi-Craft Core Curriculum Certificate. And after program completion, 1,660 graduates were placed in state-registered apprenticeship programs, 41 percent of them; construction or energy-efficiency specific employment, 23 percent; post-secondary education, 10 percent; and other employment, 26 percent.

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

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

This includes supplemental funding for clean energy education at 96 colleges. And students earned almost 9,000 degrees and certificates in various programs.
Over 1,600 received Associate Art or Science degrees; over 4,000 certificates requiring 18 units or more; over 2,300 certificates requiring 16 to 18 units and 887 other or non-credit awards, including apprenticeship certifications.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So Number 1, provide annual appropriations to the Clean Energy Jobs Fund to allow for continued energy
savings, emission reductions, and jobs in California public 
schools. We see that the investments were substantial and  
benefits continue to accrue as projects are completed.  
It’s resulted in significant economic and employment 
activity throughout the state. And the program has  
demonstrated success and should be funded through annual  
appropriations to allow progress to continue now that the  
initial five-year term has concluded. In particular, the  
Board recommends the Legislature appropriate a minimum of  
$175 million per year for the Proposition 39 Program.  
Recommendation 2, absent the annual  
appropriations from Recommendation 1, would be to provide  
direct appropriations to the Energy Commission for the  
development of a Proposition 39 K through 12 Competitive  
Grant Program. Again, the SB 110 established three  
programs: The School Bus Replacement and ECAA-Ed, the  
Proposition 39 Competitive K through 12 wasn’t funded. So  
given the success of the K through 12 program to date, we  
recommend the Legislature provide a one-time appropriation  
of $125 million to support a K through 12 Competitive Grant  
Program.

And then 3, Recommendation 3, again absent annual  
appropriations to the Clean Energy Jobs Fund in  
Recommendation 1, we recommend the Legislature provide  
direct appropriations to the Community Colleges
Chancellor’s Office to support continued energy savings and projects there. Given the success of the program to date, we recommend the Legislature provide a one-time appropriation of $50 million to support continued progress at Community Colleges.

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

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

And then Recommendation 5, as you know we’re sort of closing up shop slowly here at the Citizens Oversight Board. If the Legislature feels that the work of the
Oversight Board and independent audits are useful and worthwhile to the Legislature, we recommend that they provide funding for the two positions and at least $300,000 a year for the independent audits. Those were initially funded though the Energy Resources Program Account, but that fund is experiencing what we call a structural deficit and is phasing out support of the Board. And so if the Legislature believes continued oversight is warranted, a direct appropriation to the Board from an alternate funding source would be necessary.

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

CHAIR ALVORD: Great. Thanks very much, Jim.

Just for the purposes of efficiency maybe the first thing is to see if people have any questions about the overall report. And then we can go into the discussion of the recommendations if that works for everyone. And hearing no objection I'll entertain questions for Jim about the overall report. I have one small one, so I'll start with that. Jim, how are jobs defined, the 19,812, are those full-time equivalent?

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

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. And it’s the $3.35 billion
approximately for approximately 20,000 jobs. Is there any kind of a state metric in terms of expenditures and jobs created? Is there any kind of a way to evaluate those numbers relative to other types of programs for construction or energy?

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

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

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

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

MR. BARTRIDGE: Yes, certainly.

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

MR. BARTRIDGE: Nobody raising a hand or does
everybody feel comfortable with the way the recommendations look at this point?

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

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

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Great.

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

MR. BARTRIDGE: Thank you, Barbara.

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

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

MR. BARTRIDGE: Well at this point, Randall, we have $300,000 expiring this year and $300,000 in the budget for next year to support our audits with the State Controller's Office. And as you know the staffing, Jack and I are both Energy Commission employees, but a portion of our time is spent on the Citizens Oversight Board. And
so they have covered that. But I think I don't know about
the realities of this, but I would definitely like to, if
the Board’s going forward we do need to find some sort of
alternative funding mechanism to support our work. And so
that's a discussion that needs to be had in the
Legislature.

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

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

CHAIR ALVORD: Yeah, I think the thing that
concerns me is that -- and Randall I had a similar question
-- is I mean clearly there is if you're talking about
oversight of expenditure we have a couple of years to go
here. And so there may not -- even if there's no more
money in the pot for the types of programs that we think
provide value, there presumably is still some kind of a value in providing oversight to how this money is spent. And the Legislature may or may or may not ultimately agree, but I guess I'm concerned that we could run out of funds for the Board's activity before the projects are completed and the audits are done and all of that. And so I wonder if there's been discussion within the CEC for that eventuality and how that would be handled.

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

CHAIR ALVORD: Uh-huh.

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

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay. Is this something that the CEC is planning to bring up at the Legislature?
MR. BARTRIDGE: Well as you know we're an independent agency within the Energy Commission, so I haven't had that conversation with Energy Commission folks. I think that's a conversation that might be best come from the Board themselves.

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

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

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay.

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

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

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: And this is Randall, so moved.
BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Dave Dias, second.

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

CHAIR ALVORD: Aye.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Vice-Chair Martinez?

VICE CHAIR MARTINEZ: Aye.

MR. BARTRIDGE: David Dias?

BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Aye.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Barbara Lloyd?

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yes.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Heather Rosenberg?

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Aye.

MR. BARTRIDGE: And Darrell Park?

BOARD MEMBER PARK: Aye.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Great.

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

MR. BARTRIDGE: Sure, absolutely.

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

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

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

CHAIR ALVORD: Okay, thank you. And I think we
kind of --

MR. BARTRIDGE: Any other --

CHAIR ALVORD: Oh, go ahead.

MR. BARTRIDGE: Any other public comments out there?

(No audible response.)

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

BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Okay, thank you.

CHAIR ALVORD: Thank you everyone very much.

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

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

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

(Adjourned at 10:52 a.m.)
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