



**STATE OF CALIFORNIA
EMPLOYMENT TRAINING PANEL MEETING**
California Environmental Protection Agency
1001 "I" Street
Sierra Hearing Room, 2nd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
October 19, 2012

PANEL MEMBERS

Barry Broad
Chair

Carol Farris
Member

Sonia Fernandez
Member

Michael Hart
Member

Janine Montoya
Member

Edward Rendon
Member

Janice Roberts
Acting Vice-Chair

Sam Rodriguez
Member

Executive Staff

Jill McAloon
Acting Executive Director

Maureen Reilly
General Counsel

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
EMPLOYMENT TRAINING PANEL MEETING
California Environmental Protection Agency
1001 "I" Street
Sierra Hearing Room, 2nd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
October 19, 2012

I. PUBLIC PANEL MEETING CALL TO ORDER

Jan Roberts, Acting Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:37 a.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Present

Bill Davidson
Sonia Fernandez
Michael Hart
Janine Montoya
Janice Roberts

Absent

Barry Broad
Edward Rendon
Sam Rodriguez

Executive Staff Present

Jill McAloon, Acting Executive Director
Maureen Reilly, General Counsel

III. AGENDA

ACTION: Ms. Montoya moved and Mr. Hart seconded the motion that the Panel approve the Agenda.

Motion carried, 5 – 0.

IV. MINUTES

ACTION: Ms. Montoya moved and Ms. Fernandez seconded the motion that the Panel approve the Minutes from the September 28, 2012 meeting.

Motion carried, 5 – 0.

Ms. Roberts introduced Bill Davidson, Deputy Secretary of Administration & Finance, from the Business, Transportation & Housing Agency. She said that Mr. Davidson is sitting in on the Panel on behalf of Carol Farris. Mr. Davidson said it was a pleasure to serve on the Panel and

that he has been with the Agency for almost two years. Prior to that, he worked for the Department of Motor Vehicles for about 12 years as a budget officer.

V. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Jill McAloon, Acting Executive Director, said today's meeting includes the standard mix of single and multiple employer projects. Three of the regional office managers are joining the meeting via teleconference: Diana Torres; Creighton Chan and Wally Aguilar. Rosa Hernandez and David Guzman are in attendance today and they will present all of the projects to the Panel.

Ms. McAloon began with the budget and said if the Panel approves all of the projects before it today, we will approve \$5.2 million, with approximately \$20.1 million remaining in contracting capacity for the remainder of the Fiscal Year to be allocated between delegation orders and core projects.

Ms. McAloon said as she mentioned last month, we currently expect that our only source of alternative funding will be AB118 through our partnership with the California Energy Commission. We are still waiting for funds and we anticipate that we should receive about \$6.2 million in December.

Ms. McAloon said there are currently six apprenticeship projects before the Panel today, and after approval, the Panel will have approved seventeen apprentice projects totaling \$5.7 million. As you recall, the Panel decided to spend \$7 million on the pilot, and as you can see there is much demand for these projects.

Regarding Legislation, there is not much to share since the Legislature is currently in recess.

VI. MOTION TO DELEGATE IN EVENT OF LOSS OF QUORUM

Ms. McAloon asked for a motion to delegate in event of loss of quorum, authorizing the Executive Director in conjunction with the Panel Chair or Vice Chair, to approve projects.

ACTION: Ms. Montoya moved and Mr. Hart seconded the motion to delegate in event of loss of quorum.

Motion carried, 5 – 0.

VII. REVIEW AND ACTION ON FUNDING CAPS FY 2012-13 (non SET)

Ms. McAloon said as mentioned at the prior meeting, ETF revenue estimates from EDD indicate we will have approximately \$2.1 million more than we previously thought, leaving us with \$48.1 million. Staff has assessed the revenue increase and the demand for training and has determined that our funding caps approved by the Panel at the May meeting warrant reassessment.

The funding caps in May were based on EDD's lower projection of ETF revenue and funding obligations for payment earned under ETP contracts that would carry over from the prior Fiscal Year. Due to the increase of popularity of our small business program, with many of those being approved under SET, and also the popularity of the new apprenticeship pilot program

which is being funded under SET, we actually have a shortage of available funding for SET. SET is limited to 15% of the training funds in the Fiscal Year and that is \$13 million this year. If the Panel approves the projects before it, we will have spent \$10 million, resulting in approximately \$3 million available for SET.

Ms. McAloon said, because of that staff is recommending upward adjustments to the funding caps for non-SET projects for the remainder of the Fiscal Year only. Ms. Reilly said that the document that Ms. McAloon is reading from and the funding cap table will be posted online after the meeting.

Single Employer – Priority Industry	Currently \$450,000	Proposed \$600,000
Single Employer – Non-Priority Industry	Currently \$350,000	Proposed \$500,000
Job Creation – Retrainee	Currently \$600,000	Increase case-by-Case
Combined Single Employer & Job Creation – Retrainee	Currently \$700,000	Proposed \$800,000
Critical Proposals	Currently \$750,000	Increase case-by-Case
Multiple Employer	Currently \$700,000	Proposed \$850,000
Small Business	Currently \$50,000	No Change
Fast Track	Currently \$100,000	No Change
Annual Employer Limit (all facilities)	Currently \$1M	No Change
Apprentice Training	Currently \$300,000	No Change
AB118 Single Employer-Priority Industry	Currently \$500,000	Proposed \$650,000 (possibly higher case-by-case)
AB118 Multiple Employer	Currently \$750,000	Proposed \$850,000 (possibly higher case-by-case)

Amendments Requests to increase funding in these areas for existing contracts will be evaluated case-by-case based on performance and the increase approved via in-house amendment for \$100,000 or less. If more than \$100,000, the amendment will be approved via the Panel.

Ms. McAloon asked the Panel if they had any questions regarding the proposed funding cap recommendations. Ms. Montoya said part of her hesitancy is that there are so many businesses

in California that do not even know about ETP yet. She said she would much prefer to spread the money around to other people instead of giving it to those who come to ETP on a regular basis. She said that the small business funding cap hasn't changed, which seemed a little prejudicial, and asked if someone could lobby her concerns. Ms. Reilly said the small business program is limited to \$50,000 by policy partly because small businesses, especially very small businesses, sometimes do not have their own HR departments or training staff. She said in our experience, it is just more geared toward, especially in their first contract, to better their performance. Small businesses can come in for successive contracts and small businesses can also come in for any higher amount; it just would not go on the delegation order. She said they could come in for \$100,000 on a fast track delegation order; if they come to the Panel for a higher amount just like any other company, they can go up to the caps. In all cases, staff works closely with small business to make sure the project is right sized given their needs, in-house training, and administrative capacities. Ms. Montoya said she agrees with that, but still had a problem with some of the big companies, the same unions, and the same multiple employer contractors getting more funding instead of spreading it around. She said I know we don't have a marketing department right now, and that is also a concern of mine. So I would rather not raise it, and use some money to market so that more companies come to us and the money is spread around the state. Ms. McAloon said well, our marketing staff is aggressively trying to market, and we do have marketing staff that reports to Peter Cooper, Assistant Director, and they are doing all sorts of things to reach new businesses; they are aggressively trying to bring folks in to ETP. Ms. Montoya said she would not hold up the vote on this matter, but she would like to see more companies, instead of the same people increasing their money. Ms. Reilly said one more comment; this does not necessarily mean the same people. Ms. Montoya said yes, she is aware of that.

Ms. Roberts asked when the funding caps would go into effect if they were approved by the Panel today and when would the caps start to change. Ms. McAloon said it is for the remainder of this Fiscal Year, so anything coming now to the Panel, we would take the new caps into consideration. Ms. Reilly said these caps would be applicable to projects coming to the Panel in November and throughout the rest of this Fiscal Year. For amendments, it would be applicable to amendment requests beginning right away, as long as it is under the delegation process up to \$100,000; otherwise, if the amendment is over \$100,000, it would have to come to the Panel. Ms. Roberts said she has been on the Panel for about seven years and in the past she has only seen a reduction in the funding caps, so it was positive to hear about increasing the caps.

ACTION: Ms. Fernandez moved and Ms. Montoya seconded approval of the increase in funding caps.

Motion carried, 5 – 0.

VIII. DELEGATION ORDERS

Maureen Reilly, General Counsel, said there are no Delegation Order calendars included in the Panel packet binder this month since the Delegation Order meeting was held recently just this past Wednesday. She said those Delegation Order calendars will be included in the November Panel packet for information purposes. At the recent Delegation Order meeting, we approved six small business proposals totaling about \$260,000 and eight fast-tracks, meaning standard

size businesses with \$100,000 or less in funding, and that totaled about \$544,000. She said this procedure continues to be successful and helps move projects along on a flow basis.

IX. REVIEW AND ACTION ON PROPOSALS

Single Employer Proposals

Riverside Healthcare Systems, LP dba Riverside Community Hospital

David Guzman, Chief of Audits, Fiscal & Program Operations Division, presented a Proposal for Riverside Healthcare Systems, LP dba Riverside Community Hospital (RCH), in the amount of \$424,488. RCH is one of the largest full-service, acute care community hospitals in Riverside County. Licensed for 373 beds, the hospital has approximately 1,400 full-time employees including 550 Registered Nurses (RNs). The hospital provides Level II trauma/emergency services with air-ambulance capabilities, STEMI (cardiac emergency) center services and heart care institute (cardiac catheterization and electrophysiology lab). In addition to emergency services, RCH provides cancer care, transplant services, orthopedic surgical services, pediatric care, neonatal intensive care services and a breast feeding center. Intensive care services provided at RCH include both a medical intensive care unit (ICU) and a surgical/trauma ICU.

Mr. Guzman introduced Fran Paschall, Senior Vice President/Chief Nursing Officer.

There were no questions from the Panel.

ACTION: Ms. Fernandez moved and Ms. Montoya seconded approval of the Proposal for RCH in the amount of \$424,488.

Motion carried, 5 – 0.

Sorensen Engineering, Inc.

Mr. Guzman presented a Proposal for Sorensen Engineering, Inc. (Sorenson), in the amount of \$228,960. Sorenson offers hi-volume precision micro machining products. The manufacturing facility encompasses 66,350 square feet of production space, housing a fleet of specialty machining equipment, primarily of Swiss origin but also proprietary as designed by Sorenson. Unique among most screw-machine providers, Sorenson specializes in mass-production of complex geometry products with high-tolerances and small diameters. The core business serves many industries, trades and other areas vital to California's economy: aerospace, electronic interconnect, defense & military, test probe, microwave test equipment, telecommunications, fiber optics, medical & dental, electronic test equipment, computer, automotive and hydraulic.

Mr. Guzman introduced Angie Nett, Organization Development Coordinator.

Ms. Roberts asked about the post-retention wage in Job No. 2 of \$8.84 per hour. She said this is only slightly above minimum wage, and asked how many employees would receive this wage. Ms. Nett said only one-to-two employees will receive \$8.84 per hour. Ms. Roberts said the reason I say that is if you looked at the contract and it said 172 employees starting at

\$8.84, since their retention rate is fairly low, and if she was only earning \$8.84 per hour, she would be looking for a better paying job. Ms. Nett said they have employees that have actually been employed with them up to 41 years, and the company has grown very much in the last three years.

ACTION: Ms. Montoya moved and Mr. Hart seconded approval of the Proposal for Sorenson in the amount of \$228,960.

Motion carried, 5 – 0.

Stearns Lending, Inc.

Mr. Guzman presented a Proposal for Stearns Lending, Inc. (Stearns), in the amount of \$324,600. Stearns is a privately-owned mortgage bank headquartered in Santa Ana. Stearns is licensed and approved to conduct mortgage banking in 46 states with federally guaranteed loan programs (HUD, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, FHA, etc.). Stearns also provides jumbo, conventional and portfolio loan products.

Mr. Guzman introduced Suzy Lindblom, Executive Vice President, Fulfillment.

Ms. Roberts noted this was their first ETP contract and asked if Ms. Lindblom is the training coordinator for all four locations. Ms. Lindblom said yes, she oversees all of operations and training. Ms. Roberts asked if she was aware of the due diligence that goes behind these contracts. She said the funding amount is a lot of dollars to administer, and she is concerned that the mortgage business itself is still on shaky ground. Ms. Lindblom said that is one of the things they are trying to train their employees in, in order to make it easier for the consumer, since it is a very daunting process to go through.

ACTION: Ms. Montoya moved and Mr. Davidson seconded approval of the Proposal for Stearns in the amount of \$324,600.

Motion carried, 5 – 0.

PRN Ambulance, Inc.

Mr. Guzman presented a Proposal for PRN Ambulance, Inc. (PRN), in the amount of \$249,240. PRN is a provider of non-emergency inter-facility ambulance services through the Los Angeles area. PRN currently operates nearly 60 emergency response vehicles equipped with state-of-the-art technology, including advanced radio communications, paging, and vehicle tracking systems, utilizing the RescueNet Dispatch system. PRN provides ambulance service seven days a week, 24 hours per day.

Mr. Guzman introduced Patricia Peltier, Director of Quality Assurance and Critical Care and William Parker, President/CEO representing National Training Systems Inc.

Mr. Hart asked if they only transport patients from hospital to hospital, as they are a non-emergency ambulance service. Ms. Peltier said that is correct, they transport solely inter-facility.

Ms. Fernandez asked if they have much turnover. Ms. Peltier said their turnover is currently 7%. She said in their industry, EMTs that come to their organization are fairly new and recently out of EMT school and they try to assist them in career development. They begin as EMTs and many go on to become paramedics, and some have even gone further to become RNs or doctors. She said in that segment of their employees, they have a little more turnover than in different areas.

Ms. Roberts asked if she is the trainer. Ms. Peltier said yes, she is the quality assurance director and she oversees the training education. Ms. Roberts asked if they already have a program in existence such as a training database. Ms. Peltier said yes one is already in place.

ACTION: Ms. Fernandez moved and Mr. Hart seconded approval of the Proposal for PRN in the amount of \$249,240.

Motion carried, 5 – 0.

Aerojet – General Corporation

Ms. Hernandez presented a Proposal for Aerojet – General Corporation (Aerojet), in the amount of \$555,000. Aerojet develops and manufactures propulsion systems for space and defense industries, in both domestic and international markets. Specific customers include the U.S. Army, Air Force and U.S. Navy, as well as the Missile Defense Agency and NASA. Products include all four of the current propulsion types: solid, liquid, air-breathing, and electric.

Ms. Hernandez introduced Duncan Brand, Director, Human Resources, Talent & Organizational Development and Margy Gonzales, Senior Human Resources Representative.

Ms. Fernandez said as a veteran herself, she congratulated Aerojet on their emphasis on hiring veterans. She said she was sure they are finding that veterans bring about skills that are very beneficial to their company. Mr. Brand said yes, very much so, thank you. Ms. Roberts said she wanted to expand on that in hiring veterans, and said there are other veteran benefits and credits that Aerojet could also take advantage.

She asked if the company in Woodland Hills is near Canoga Park. Ms. Gonzales said that is near that facility. She said it is a facility they opened so that when they recruit people from Rocketdyne, which they are now acquiring, that they could allow them to work in that same area without having to relocate to Sacramento. Ms. Roberts said very good, this is a great contract.

ACTION: Ms. Fernandez moved and Ms. Montoya seconded approval of the Proposal for Aerojet in the amount of \$555,000.

Motion carried, 5 – 0.

GEI Consultants, Inc.

Ms. Hernandez presented a Proposal for GEI Consultants, Inc. (GEI), in the amount of \$202,200. GEI provides a broad array of geotechnical, water resources, environmental and

ecological science, and engineering consulting services to clients nationwide. GEI provides technical expertise related to sustainable development and management. The company considers the total economic and environmental impacts, from raw material extraction and product manufacture, to design, construction, operations, maintenance and reuse/disposal.

Ms. Hernandez pointed out a correction to the ETP 130 on Page 6 of 7. She said the correct development services flat fee is \$12,000.

Ms. Hernandez introduced Ginny Barnhill, Regional Human Resources Manager.

There were no questions from the Panel.

ACTION: Ms. Fernandez moved and Mr. Hart seconded approval of the Proposal for GEI in the amount of \$202,200.

Motion carried, 5 – 0.

Multiple Employer Proposals

Managed Career Solutions, Inc.

Ms. Hernandez presented a Proposal for Managed Career Solutions, Inc. (MCS), in the amount of \$231,899. MCI is a provider of workforce development services in Los Angeles County. MCS provides services that include outreach, intake, case management, job training and job placement for adults and dislocated workers, with priority service to Veterans.

Ms. Hernandez pointed out a correction to the ETP 130 on Page 2 of 5. She said the post-retention wage under Job No. 1 should be \$9.82, consistent with the applicant's request for a high unemployment area waiver, for Job No. 1.

Ms. Hernandez introduced Philip Starr, Vice President and Executive Director.

Ms. Roberts noted that in reviewing their past performance, they only earned 50% of the funds. She said that Mr. Starr stated that because of some veterans' issues, that they wanted to get their education versus continuing on with the training program, that is why they could not fulfill that obligation. She said they are now requesting double the dollar amount of their previous proposal, and asked how he could convince her that the veterans will stay with their program. Mr. Starr said the first grant was specifically to train in information technology. The veterans loved the program and they all completed it. They found that as they advanced, became confident, and took the exams in information technology, that many of them did commence work and met the hours. They earned half the grant, but many felt confident to then use their GI bill and attended community college to further their education and did not go to work within the time period of the grant, which is why they did not earn all of the income. He said all of the veterans benefitted and completed the training. From that experience, they have learned that they need to focus on those programs that really center on job placement. He said in the Executive Protection Agent occupation, they have done that through their standard Workforce Investment Act funds, and with veterans' funds. They have found that veterans want that work and very consistently take it when offered when they complete the training. With the CNA training, half of

the training takes place at the work site, so it then becomes very appealing since they are at the work site to begin working there and to gain that work experience.

Ms. Roberts asked if he sees more veterans in that workforce now. She said many of them are returning from out of state and asked if there is more availability among veterans now, to go through these training programs. Mr. Starr said the veterans they have worked with really want training and want to succeed. He said many come from diverse backgrounds and that some, immediately when they separate, want to use their GI bill and have a plan to move forward. He said some have already started their education in the military, but many have not had successful experiences in education and would like to enter the workforce. He said that EDD is co-located with them at the work source center, so they have veterans represented. The veterans come speak to them and when they realize there are job training dollars available; they then move to them and want to access those dollars. He said it has been their experience that if they intervene quickly and get the veteran into a training program and job placement, they have a very successful experience. Sometimes when that step is missed, problems ensue and readjustment to civilian life is more challenging. Ms. Roberts thanked Mr. Starr for answering her questions and said she commends them for taking on the veterans and sometimes the Panel sees applications come through that include veterans, and they can be a very hard group of individuals to place.

ACTION: Ms. Montoya moved and Ms. Fernandez seconded approval of the Proposal for MCS in the amount of \$231,899.

Motion carried, 5 – 0.

Southern California Sheet Metal Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee

Ms. Hernandez presented a Proposal for Southern California Sheet Metal Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee. (SoCal Sheet JATC), in the amount of \$298,936. SoCal Sheet JATC operates a training center for apprentice and journeyman sheet metal workers. Located in the City of Industry, the facility has eight classrooms and multiple laboratory areas including a welding lab, a field installation lab, two shop labs, and a heating/ventilation/air conditioning (HVAC) service lab.

Ms. Hernandez introduced Leslie Reinmiller, Director and Steve Duscha, Consultant.

There were no questions from the Panel.

ACTION: Ms. Fernandez moved and Ms. Montoya seconded approval of the Proposal for SoCal Sheet JATC in the amount of \$298,936.

Motion carried, 5 – 0.

West San Gabriel Valley Consortium dba Career Partners

Ms. Hernandez presented a Proposal for West San Gabriel Valley Consortium dba Career Partners (Career Partners), in the amount of \$125,130. Career Partners is a one-stop career center that works with employers, employees, and job seekers to optimize workforce solutions

under the Workforce Investment Act (WIA). Career Partners provides a comprehensive system of training, placement, and career planning for job seekers and offers an array of services for employers, such as labor market information, human resources and consulting services, and economic development resources.

Ms. Hernandez introduced Lily Hoa, Career Counseling Coordinator.

There were no questions from the Panel.

ACTION: Mr. Hart moved and Ms. Montoya seconded approval of the Proposal for Career Partners in the amount of \$125,130.

Motion carried, 5 – 0.

San Bernardino Community College District

Mr. Guzman presented a Proposal for San Bernardino Community College District (SBCCD), in the amount of \$699,896. SBCCD provides academic instruction leading to a degree, certificate or transfer to a four-year college as well as customized not-for-credit training to incumbent workers employed by local area businesses and community-based organizations.

Mr. Guzman introduced Robert Levesque, Workforce Development Manager.

Ms. Roberts said she noticed some of their participating employers are very large companies and asked if the companies approach them or if they market to them and asked how the partnership works. Mr. Levesque said they do a little bit of both. They have been doing this about ten years now, so they have a history and track record. In addition to those they have worked with, they actively market to the community, hence the acquisition of additional participants.

ACTION: Ms. Montoya moved and Ms. Fernandez seconded approval of the Proposal for SBCCD in the amount of \$699,896.

Motion carried, 5 – 0.

Ms. Roberts said the five apprenticeship proposals under Tabs #11, #13, #14, #15, and #16 would all be considered together under one vote. She asked that Tab #12 be considered before the consolidation of apprenticeship proposals.

City of Richmond Workforce Investment Board

Mr. Guzman presented a Proposal for City of Richmond Workforce Investment Board (RWIB), in the amount of \$183,000. RWIB provides policy direction and guidance on all workforce development activities in Richmond and neighboring cities, and proposes to train at-risk youth, veterans, and individuals with multiple barriers to employment including ex-offenders. Graduates will be placed and retained in a job in the construction and green technology industries. They will be prepared for eventual apprenticeships in occupations such as construction laborer and carpenter pre-apprentice. RWIB representatives report that one of its

most successful programs is the RichmondBUILD Careers Academy which provides vocational skills training in high-growth construction, energy efficiency, and renewable energy fields.

Mr. Guzman introduced Sal Vaca, Director of Employment & Training Department.

Ms. Roberts asked if they have worked with the Lawrence Livermore Labs and Chevron about hiring people that are at risk. She said he mentioned they are working with some of their legal entities to make sure there is no already set protocol for hiring practices. She said she works for a large company and they have limitations for hiring felons and asked if that is something they can get waived. Mr. Vaca said that fortunately with Chevron, because they are a private company, there is much more flexibility, and they are asking Chevron to make a commitment similar to the city's local employment ordinance which requires 25% of the project hours be worked by local residents and they are open to that discussion. Ms. Roberts said that is terrific and this is a very good proposal.

ACTION: Mr. Hart moved and Ms. Fernandez seconded approval of the Proposal for RWIB in the amount of \$183,000.

Motion carried, 5 – 0.

Ms. Roberts said the following five apprenticeship proposals would be presented and voted on in one motion. Mr. Guzman said all five of the apprenticeship proposals are JATCs presented by the CA Labor Federation and will be administered by Strategy Workplace Communications.

Mr. Guzman said the five apprenticeship proposals being considered are Tab #11 Alameda County Electrical Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee; Tab #13 San Francisco Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee; Tab #14 San Mateo County Electrical Joint Apprenticeship and Training for the Electrical Construction Industry; Tab #15 Santa Clara County Electrical Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee; and Tab #16 Sacramento Area Electrical Workers Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee.

Mr. Guzman introduced John Brauer, Workforce and Economic Executive Director of the California Labor Federation and Jan Borunda, Project Coordinator of the California Labor Federation.

Mr. Brauer said there were five representatives present from the five apprenticeship proposals. 1) Kathleen Barber, JATC Training Director of the San Mateo County Electrical Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee; 2) Stephen Powers, Training Director of the San Francisco Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee; 3) Byron Benton, Training Director of the Alameda County Electrical JATC; 4) Daniel Romero, Training Director of the Santa Clara County Electrical Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee; and 5) Dennis Morin, Director of the Sacramento Area Electrical Workers Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee. Mr. Brauer said all of these proposals involve IBEW and their NECA partners. He said he believes they are the reflection of the revival of the construction industry in general, and a lot of what is going on within the electrical sector. He said as you saw before with the sheet metal workers and what is going on around the HVAC, AB32 is changing the nature and hiring requirements for building conditions and are really mandating that the workforce they have is continually improving. These five proposals are predominantly about apprentices, roughly 80%,

where as previous, applications that have come before the Panel have been more journey-level focused. He said this is a joint apprenticeship training, so it also involves employers, and some of them such as Alameda County for instance, 80% of those employers represent small businesses under the ETP definition; so it is a range of employers in addition to labor that is represented here.

Byron Benton from Alameda County Electrical JATC, said their program is really excited about this opportunity. He said our country really has three challenges: 1) jobs; 2) energy; and 3) the environment, and ETP's funding is going to help offset the loss of funds that they have all experienced from their community colleges' Montoya funds. He said they have been hit very hard by that these past several years. With ETP's help, it would allow them to move forward to confront those challenges. He said they all provide electrical training for sustainable careers. Their programs do not turn away felons from applying and getting into their apprenticeship programs, and they provide those opportunities.

Stephen Powers, from the San Francisco Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee, said these funds will really help them. For training apprentices, it is not to only get them jobs but careers. When they are done with their programs, they can move on to get married, buy houses, have families, and feel confident that they have something for the rest of their life that they can work with.

Kathleen Barber, San Mateo County Electrical Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee, said among her colleagues, she is a journey-woman electrician, so she could speak to what apprenticeship offers for women. It offers the opportunity for parity in salaries, the opportunity for a career that will allow them the flexibility that some must have to have as we are rearing our children, and also the opportunity for them to have an advancement in their living situation. She said she owes everything she has today, such as her degrees and her position, through having gone through an apprenticeship.

Daniel Romero, from the Santa Clara County Electrical Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee, said training veterans is a priority for them. They employ and encourage outreach to veterans to come into the construction trades, and it is a trade that is sought after by returning veterans.

ACTION: Ms. Fernandez moved and Mr. Hart seconded approval of the five apprenticeship proposals under tabs #11, #13, #14, #15 and #16.

Motion carried, 5 – 0.

Tab #11 Alameda County Electrical Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee
Amount Approved \$354,796

Tab #13 San Francisco Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee
Amount Approved \$340,178

Tab #14 San Mateo County Electrical Joint Apprenticeship and Training for the Electrical
Construction Industry
Amount Approved \$277,345

Tab #15 Santa Clara County Electrical Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee
Amount Approved \$361,118

Tab #16 Sacramento Area Electrical Workers Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee
Amount Approved \$337,401

X. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

XI. PUBLIC MEETING ADJOURNS

ACTION: Ms. Montoya moved and Mr. Hart seconded meeting adjournment at 10:52 a.m.

Motion carried, 5 – 0.