



**STATE OF CALIFORNIA
EMPLOYMENT TRAINING PANEL**

Zoom Virtual Meeting
June 25, 2021

Panel Members

Janice Roberts
Acting Chairperson

Gloria Bell
Member

Chris Dombrowski
Ex-Officio Member

Ernesto Morales
Member

Gretchen Newsom
Member

Rick Smiles
Member

Douglas Tracy
Member

Madison Hull
Member

Executive Staff

Reg Javier
Executive Director

Peter Cooper
Assistant Director

Michael Cable
Staff Attorney

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA
EMPLOYMENT TRAINING PANEL**
Zoom Virtual Meeting
June 25, 2021

I. PUBLIC PANEL MEETING CALL TO ORDER

Acting Chairperson Janice Roberts called the meeting to order at 9:31a.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Present

Janice Roberts
Gloria Bell
Chris Dombrowski
Gretchen Newsom
Madison Hull
Douglas Tracy
Ernesto Morales

Absent

Rick Smiles

Executive Staff

Reg Javier, Executive Director
Peter Cooper, Assistant Director
Michael Cable, Staff Attorney

III. AGENDA

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel Members reviewed the Agenda.

ACTION: Ms. Bell moved and Ms. Newsom seconded approval of the Agenda. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative for approval of the Meeting Agenda.

Motion carried, 7 to 0.

IV. MINUTES

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel Members reviewed the Meeting Minutes from the last Panel Meeting.

ACTION: Ms. Newsom moved and Ms. Hull seconded the approval of the Meeting Minutes from the last panel meeting. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative for approval of the Meeting Minutes from the last panel meeting.

Motion carried, 7 to 0.

V. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Mr. Javier welcomed the Panel Members, Applicants, and Stakeholders and recognized the following persons in attendance: Robert Meyer, Economic Development Unit; Mario Maslac, Research and Analytics Division Manager, Ryan Swier, North Hollywood Regional Office Manager; and Chris Hoover, Foster City Manager, San Francisco Bay Area Regional Office, Manager.

Mr. Javier wanted to start off by announcing a few staff changes that we're going to have within ETP. First, today is Todd Phillips, our senior regional office manager last day, He's accepted a job with the city of Chula Vista in the planning department at the city of Chula Vista. Mr. Javier wanted to publicly thank him for all of his work at ETP and wish him the best of luck in his new role.

Mr. Javier also reported Kulbir Mayall, who oversees our field units, as well as fiscal unit will be retiring at the end of this month. Although Kulbir is not here today, Mr. Javier wanted to publicly say that he's really been a true leader, colleague and friend of many of us here at ETP and he's definitely going to be missed and thanked him for over two decades of service with ETP. Mario Maslac, who you all know presented the annual report just a couple meetings ago. He currently manages our IT security and planning and research units. He has been selected to succeed Kulbir in that position, overseeing both the field units and the fiscal team. The two of them, Mario and Kulbir have been spending a lot of time together so that Mario can download as much information before he retires. It's a whole lot to learn but Mario's up to it. Then lastly I wanted to let everyone know that we have hired a new Chief Deputy Director to fill the vacancy that was left when Jill McAloon had retired some time back. We are excited to announce that Jaime Gutierrez, who's on the call today will be joining ETP at the beginning of July. Jaime is currently the chief of the Central Workforce Services Division at EDD. He comes to us with a strong background in an understanding of the broader workforce system. In his current role, he is overseeing everything from policy development, guidance and implementation to Performance Reporting and management to funding management and distribution to even engagement of local area leaders. He's also overseeing contracts and sub agreements. He's pretty much done it all in the workforce world, all that to say that he comes to us with a wealth of knowledge and background and experience.

Mr. Javier also reported today's Panel is \$10.8M. If all FY 20/21 proposals are funded today, the panel will have approved just over \$74.7M in 332 projects to date and expended the remaining funds for this year. Last month I told you we were inactivating applicants in the que that had no chance of being funded. There were roughly 700. We have cleared out the old pre-apps and begun receiving pre-apps for the coming fiscal year and we already have over 400.

Mr. Javier then reported last month that we still had over 700 applications that we just weren't going to be able to fund this year. As such, we sent out notifications to everyone letting them know that there was no funding room remaining to fund applications for this year. Then also notifying every one of the start of our accepting new applications for the new program year. We open that new application pre app window on May 15. To date, we have over 400 applications already for funding and we began our transition to our new application process. There were some questions raised at the policy committee. Staff have been working really hard to address all of the comments, input and feedback that we heard over this past year around the application process. Everything from length of process to lack of transparency, we're working really hard to put in place a process that addresses

all of the big issues. With that said, within the first quarter of this new fiscal year, we will have a full automated application within the CAL-E-FORCE system. The application process itself will become a singular process as we currently know as the pre app and the application processes. Those will be merged into a singular process and this automation is going to streamline and reduce many of the bottlenecks that are in the application process, thereby creating a much more efficient system. What this means is that the pre app can no longer stand on its own. The expectation is that if a pre app is submitted to ETP, a full project application is ready as well. That is where we heard a lot of feedback because we sent out eligibility notices and ask them to have full application submitted back to us in seven days so that we can get them processed and going to panel. So two things around that. First, we're just really trying to move projects through the system much more expeditiously. In order for us to move those projects through to the panel, they will need to be ready to go once they're found eligible. Second, because we heard that the seven day window had caused a lot of heartburn, what we've essentially done is, we've put the application itself onto our website so that any applicants, or who has submitted a pre app can absolutely just download that application and begin completing that package so that when we do send them notification of their eligibility, that seven day window issue is no longer an issue. So we've literally addressed the seven day heartburn issue. Once we send you notification, you'll also be given seven days to submit your full application, you have as much time as you need to download the application, complete it and get it ready. That will essentially get submitted so that the field offices can begin to process those immediately and have applications ready to go as opposed to just pre app information and an entire development process having to occur at that point.

Mr. Javier also reported applicants that aren't prepared to submit their full application, those will be deactivated because they're not ready to go to make room for applications that are ready to go, sort of shovel ready projects that are ready to go immediately to panel. This is absolutely how we're going to get much more efficient so that we know what's coming in be able to move it through our process and get it right to panel. Last month, you also heard me talk about, the bad news around the reduction of our funding as a result of the economic downturn. Again, as you all know, our funds are tied to the unemployment insurance system, when lots of people are employed, a lot of monies are paid into the employment training taxes paid into the unemployment insurance system. When people are unemployed, that employment training tax collection drops, which drops ETP funding.

Mr. Javier then reported last month our contracting capacity in the coming year will drop to around \$45M. We are hoping to hear some good news on the funding front and we're close to securing funding for ETP through the state budget process. I've been working very closely with the Labor Agency, the Department of Finance and the Governor's Office to advocate for more funding for ETP through the general fund. I just want to say thank you to the panel, staff, and especially the stakeholders who sent in all the letters of support to the legislature and the governor's office on behalf of supporting the additional funding that was being requested to go to ETP. I also wanted to point out that as this process played out, and I was finding myself in hearings, testifying in a lot of meetings, talking through ETP its capacity and why the money should come to ETP. I just have to say the biggest reason why ETP would be getting any additional resources is absolutely a result of the work that you all have been doing, and have done over the years, the performance shines through and through and the story that we tell is resonating with everybody. As the legislature, governor's office, Department of Finance, or anyone who is listening, began to realize that the type of work and the impact of that work that you guys have all been doing. The impact of that work in California, they realize that in a time where we need to accelerate economic recovery, we are a really good avenue to do that.

Mr. Javier reported at this point we have been working, pretty sure we're going to get some resources don't know what that level looks like. We had two requests in one at \$50M and \$42M. We don't know where those are going to land, we have been going back and forth on language and allow abilities of that money so that back and forth suggested will likely get something in the budget has come down to a two stage process. One that the general budget has been generally approved and in second, they've moved a lot of detailed stuff in the budget into what they're calling a junior budget bill, which hopefully will be approved by maybe July 15. We're trying to ensure that we are a part of that sort of streamline process and nail down all other requirements. So at this point, all I can really say is that it looks really good but we just don't know for sure. Lastly, I wanted to say that we had on intended on coming to the panel with our strategic plan, we actually decided that we wanted to go through a much more intentional process, given the fact that we may benefit from additional resources and would really cause us to want to think about what our contributions to economic recovery and our impact is in California in a much more deeper fashion. So we want to go through an intentional process around the designing and planning of that strategic plan. You'll hear more about that in the coming months as well.

VI. REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

Mr. Cooper reported regarding funding today's panel meeting is approximately \$10.3M plus \$587,553 in delegation orders for a total \$10.8M.

Regarding the COVID Pilot there are 28 COVID Pilot contracts going to the June panel for \$3,164,000. This program has been very popular and successful at getting funding out quickly to support employers and workers. After today's Panel, they will have funded a total of \$18,330,000 and supported 9,165 workers in new hire training in 117 contracts.

Regarding Core Funds for this Fiscal Year if all FY 20/21 proposals are funded today, the panel will have approved just over \$74.7M in 332 projects to date.

Regarding Delegation Order these proposals will all be capped at \$75K to be approved under the Delegation Order on a continuous flow basis, which as of today they have approved a total of 42 delegations.

Regarding 20/21 program funding currently, they have approximately 396 Pre-apps submitted, with a value just over \$55.8M.

Regarding Demand and Allocations for 2021-22

Single Employer Contracts: requests in Regional Offices & AAU \$34.3M demand with an allocation of \$16.9M.

MEC: requests \$5.8M demand with an allocation of \$11.25M

Small Business: \$6.1M demand with an allocation of \$2.8

Critical Proposals: \$0 demand with an allocation of \$2.8M

Apprenticeships: \$9.6M in demand with an allocation of \$11.2M.

Overall demand is currently \$55.8M with an allocation of \$45M

Number of projects for 20/21 in AAU and applications received by the RO's

Total number of projects in the RO: 35

Total number of projects in AAU: 361 currently a total of 396.

Regarding possible new funding

As you heard from Director Javier, they are hoping to receive new funding from the State General Fund in addition to the \$45 in contracting capacity from the Employment Training Fund. This is part of our strategy to expand and diversify our funding streams, and not be reliant solely on the ETF. This diversification and expansion represents changes for ETP and they have been making preparations internally to administer these new funds. The grant work will permeate throughout all aspects of ETP operations, including staffing, Cal-E-Force, fiscal operations, policy work, and staff field work. Once the budget for these grants funds is approved, they will have a better indicator as to how the disbursement structure will happen within ETP. While details are still being negotiated, the funding is expected to support ETP's ability to play a much larger role in supporting an equitable economic recovery with inclusive investments in re-employment and sustainable employment, expansion of apprenticeship programs, support for small businesses, and greater support and coordination with the community colleges system, and much more. They see this possible new funding as a way for ETP to reposition ourselves within the workforce sector. If this funding is approved, then ETP will conduct stakeholder information sessions via Zoom to explain how they will be administering these funds. They will also ramp up our engagement with the Division of Apprenticeship Standards and the Community College Chancellor's Office as they partner to develop and administer new programs.

Mr. Cooper requested a Motion to Approve the Consent Calendar.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if there were any other questions from the public or Panel regarding the Consent Calendar and asked for a motion.

Ms. Newsom stated she would like to pull Tab Nos. 4, 6, 16, 27, and 30 from the Consent Calendar.

Acting Chairperson Roberts also added that Tab No. 17 be removed from the Consent Calendar.

ACTION: Ms. Newsom moved and Ms. Hull seconded approval of the Consent Calendar with the removal of Tab Nos. 4, 6, 16, 17, 27, and 30, which will be heard by Panel. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative for approval of the Consent Calendar with the removal of Tab Nos. 4, 6, 16, 17, 27, and 30, which will be heard by Panel.

Motion carried, 7 to 0

VII. REPORT OF STAFF ATTORNEY

Staff Attorney Michael Cable stated there is still some bills pending in order to amend the Open Meeting laws in order to allow for remote meetings because the executive orders that are allowing us to do so now are set to expire at the end of September. Accordingly, he will be tracking these issues, tracking these developments and anticipate there will be some changes that will be made to the legislation but he'll be tracking that and reporting back as things develop. The other item, AB 1106 is the bill that would require ETP to establish a pilot program to serve the employment training needs of small business. They've talked about this bill before and like a similar bill that was in the previous legislative session, AB 1106 would require an appropriation by the legislature and at this time, although AB 1106 continues to be changed and there's a committee hearing that set for July 5, but there is no appropriation for AB 1106 at this time. Our Executive Director and others are

involved in conversations concerning AB 1106 and they'll continue to monitor and report any developments concerning it.

VIII. UPDATE ON CAL-E-FORCE

Tara Armstrong provided an update stating they will have all of their active contracts, fully functioning and fully in the Cal-E-Force system so that they will have over 900 contracts doing all transactions within the system. They are planning their legacy shut down for later in summer early fall, after they migrate over some inactive contracts as well. Ms. Armstrong then thanked all the staff and stakeholders for getting all that into the system and fully functioning in there. They will have their new application, which is merging the pre app and application as one new application that is planned for the first quarter of the fiscal year 21/22. They are developing a grants management system as well and they are in the early stages of their prototype, working with other state agencies and looking at a portal view for all of their potential funding opportunities so there's a one stop shop, to the stakeholders. Ms. Armstrong stated if there are any questions, please don't hesitate to email us at our command center. ETPCalEForce@etp.ca.gov.

Acting Chairperson Roberts thanked ETP for the flexibility that was mentioned earlier around the pre apps versus the regular apps and noted that probably took a little bit of effort there.

IX. POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING REPORT TO PANEL

Ms. Newsom reported the Policy Committee Meeting was on Thursday, June 10, 2021 at 1:00pm via Zoom, they had the Policy Manager report, which was an update on SEED and the PFL grants all were executed, and everything is going well. They're hoping for a finalized approval of an additional \$1M for the grant coming this fiscal year.

Ms. Newsom then reported there was a quick discussion on the UC Berkeley Labor Center Report: "Putting California on the High Road: A Jobs and Climate Action Plan for 2030". They reviewed a summary of report, including key concepts of 'greening' of economy and occupations to meet net-zero carbon goals using high road strategies and ensuring a just transition that ensures job access to underrepresented groups and geographic areas, and that minimizes the negative effects of the economic transition on fossil fuel heavy industries.

One portion that connected deeply was this passage:

"California can achieve greater social equity in labor market outcomes for disadvantaged workers and communities when policymakers pay attention to job quality. Identifying high-quality careers (like ones that offer family-supporting wages, employer-provided benefits, worker voice, and opportunities for advancement), and then building pathways up and into such careers, is critical to ensuring that investments in workforce education and training meaningfully improve workers' economic mobility." And "deliberate policy interventions are necessary in order to advance job quality and social equity as California transitions to a carbon neutral economy."

Ms. Newsom also reported another discussion item was Small Businesses and the discussion focused on how they can better serve this population in the coming year. Proposed ideas included giving expedited processing for eligibility and development, raising reimbursement rate, allowing non-Priority Industry small business projects, creating a pilot program with a pre-set off-the-shelf curriculum of generalized training topics and a streamlined application process. Staff is considering

each recommendation and will finalize an approach for this population in the coming weeks to come.

Ms. Newsom then reported another discussion item was New Hires and Retrainee Job Creation: on how they can better serve this population in the coming year. Proposed ideas included expedited processing for projects that have at least a certain percentage of New Hires and Retrainee Job Creation trainees, raising the reimbursement rate, and removing the net new jobs requirement from the RJC program on either a temporary or permanent basis. Staff will be reviewing each recommendation to finalize an approach in the coming weeks to come as well.

Ms. Newsom also reported the final discussion item was on Proposed Agenda topics for next meeting. No additional topics were provided, but support costs, the individuals with disabilities pilot, the temp-to-perm guidelines, the revision process, and contract language updates are all potential topics. Next Committee meeting will be late summer/early fall. If you have any topics you'd like considered for the agenda please email Lis Testa with your suggestions.

The final Policy Committee item was a proposal on Definition of Entity: discussion over the problematic lack of a concrete definition for business entity, and how this complicates various areas of the ETP process. Staff proposed two possible ways to define entity: by using the California Employer Account Number or the Secretary of State Entity Number. They reviewed the advantages and disadvantages to each. After hearing public comment, Committee moved and approved a motion to table this discussion until a later date.

X. REVIEW AND ACTION ON PROPOSALS

Tab No. 4: Bradford College of Nursing

Ms. Newsom stated she looked up on their website and the CNA program states on the website, its 21 days, and that tuition is \$1,350. But the average cost per trainee for ETP is \$4,033 and wondering why there's that difference.

Mr. Quial, the School Administrator replied in regards to the differences in the total tuition amount, and the average cost per trainee. They're new to this and didn't really look at it in terms of the average cost per trainee. They're in a situation right now, where their main job is to provide the community with individuals that know what they're doing, especially in this specific sector. What they were planning on doing here was just to simply separate any individual that would be coming in as an ETP student, would hold separate classes for them, and obviously file them because it gets a bit confusing if they're lumping them in together and commingling them with private pay students. They have regulations to abide by when it comes to filing processes and everything like that. But as far as the tuition and average cost per trainee, it's 100% accurate, that the tuition for walk in student is \$1,350. There are only two separate expenses that they would need to cover and the ones that are paying private that are essentially mandatory, the first one would be a live scan fee and depending upon where they would be receiving the live scan, that would determine what that specific cost would be. The other fee that is mandatory would be for the state certification exam depending on what specific exam that they're going to take it through and don't see needing \$4,000 per trainee. Even if they were to hire an additional instructor, don't think it's going to hit that number and they are comfortable with whatever the panel decides or deems fair. But just on record, they would probably need to hire a specific instructor that would be training those individuals that would be coming through ETP, they need to make some scheduled adjustments in terms of being able to accommodate people that are paying out of pocket versus the ones that would be coming through ETP.

Ms. Newsom inquired if ETP is essentially providing scholarships for these students to attend the private vocational training facility, since they can't charge them tuition.

Mr. Quial replied they won't be charging them anything, not even the cost of the books and the school would essentially cover every cost that they would have. The point of this is that, they have been with San Joaquin County Work Net and they've done what they can, in terms of allowing people to come through the program and have done maybe five to ten a year. This specific occupation itself, is in high in demand and it's really a bridge for people to get into the nursing field and then from there, then decide if they want to continue into it, or decide if they want to go another route into health care, but it does bring to them options. He doesn't know how they are able to determine who would qualify for that program or not. But he hasn't seen very many, and he gets calls all the time with people that are interested in doing the program and can tell that their heart is into the field, but they just don't have the resources in terms of the tuition amount. They can go through 45 people in less than six months and they're in San Joaquin County, Stockton, California, specifically and thinks everyone is aware of the financial condition of the city itself. It's low income, and the amount that they charge for tuition has not increased very much through the years, even throughout the pandemic. Since the pandemic hit, the pricing has increased for that and have seen a huge increase in terms of the gloves that they use, the masks, and the gowns that they use. Again, it's not an issue because they've been here for 25 years and their goal has always been to provide the community with individuals that can care for a specific sector. Unfortunately, because of COVID, that specific sector was brought to the limelight .You need people to care for elderly people. When COVID first hit, they were getting skilled nursing facilities calling and saying when is the next group of people going to be able to test and become certified because they have staff that are leaving because they're scared of what's going on with COVID. There is stories coming out of LA that skilled nursing facilities entire staff were walking out and there's 120 elderly people that need bedside care, but no one's there to care for them.

Ms. Newsom replied that is absolutely an industry that needs to have additional persons trained and put into it. It's just the optics there that look a little difficult, and requesting the average cost of the training. Ms. Newsom then asked the applicant to work with staff to correct that amount so that it is more reflective of what the true cost per trainee is that ETP is paying.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Ms. Newsom moved and Ms. Bell seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Bradford College of Nursing in the amount of \$181,485. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 7 to 0.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked to make a correction to the earlier motion regarding the Consent Calendar, noting that she meant to include that Tab 18 be pulled from the Consent Calendar.

Staff Attorney Michael Cable asked for clarification as to which proposals are to be pulled from the

Consent Calendar, and suggested that the Panel correct the record by way of a new motion.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Ms. Newsom moved and Ms. Bell seconded correction of the prior motion and approval of the Consent Calendar with the removal of Tab Nos. 4, 6, 16, 17, 18, 27, and 30, which will be heard by Panel. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative for correction of the prior motion and approval of the Consent Calendar with the removal of Tab Nos. 4, 6, 16, 17, 18, 27, and 30, which will be heard by Panel.

Motion carried, 7 to 0.

Acting Chairperson Roberts added if everyone looked at the proposals this month, especially the MEC's, everyone could see how many small businesses were actually in those participating employers and added that is what they are asking for, and would say 95% of those MEC's are holding small businesses as part of their training plan and thanked the staff for recognizing the importance of small businesses as well as the stakeholders.

Tab No. 6: Central California Builders Exchange

Ms. Newsom stated in the proposal that ETP funds will not displace any existing approved apprenticeship programs. But then stated it looks like much of the curriculum under commercial skills is duplicative of apprenticeship training and wanted to ask the contractor and staff to address that.

Ms. Taylor replied she is not sure under the commercial skills, what training Ms. Newsom thinks is aimed at apprentices.

Ms. Newsom then replied they have a list of the training that's going to be going to construction workers, occupation title and electricians and then when looking under commercial skills, laborers and construction workers without having a further occupational title, crane operation, electrical safety, equipment operation, forklift training, full protection, scaffolding, scissor lift, traffic controls, trenching. Then asked the applicant to work with staff to make sure that they're not duplicating apprenticeship training.

Ms. Taylor replied they are definitely not going to be duplicating any apprenticeship training. They work closely with unions in fact, a lot of the unions are members of their exchange and they do not train apprentices at all here. But they do have some members that are non-union, and they will possibly send some of their employees for those type of trainings. A lot of the training is geared towards the safety managers and that's what a lot of that training is about for them to then be able to train their staff on the job site.

Ms. Newsom then stated that there are non-union apprenticeship programs and will be hearing from one of them later today. It looked like when reviewing the list of the small multiple employer contracts, none of them appear to be union. Ms. Newsom then pointed out to staff, it's interesting to have more information, but as long as it's not duplicating apprenticeship programs.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Ms. Newsom moved and Mr. Tracy seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Central California Builders Exchange, with an additional requirement that the training curriculum be reviewed again by staff for any training that is duplicative of existing apprenticeship program training. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal as moved.

Motion carried, 7 to 0.

Tab No. 16: Kern County Builders' Exchange Incorporated

Ms. Newsom stated they have under occupation titles, labor, and they also state that they are not going to be duplicating any approved apprenticeship programs or curriculum. But then under commercial skills, the labor curriculum does include equipment operation of forklift training, silica and dust control and wanted to direct staff to please work with the applicants and make sure that their curriculum is not duplicating apprenticeship curriculum.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Ms. Newsom moved and Ms. Bell seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Kern County Builders' Exchange Incorporated, with an additional requirement that the training curriculum be reviewed again by staff for any training that is duplicative of existing apprenticeship program training. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal as moved.

Motion carried, 7 to 0.

Tab No. 18: Los Gatos Tomato Products, LLC (COVID Pilot)

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated she has a problem with this one and just to be consistent from in the past, they've looked at companies that had a very low employee rate. This company has 50 and they're asking for 74 new hires, for this COVID project and in the past, they would have said to wait a minute that is one quarter more than what you have now. Acting Chairperson Roberts stated she would approve this project if they bring it down to 25 approved workers for \$50,000 versus \$148,000. That's what the panel has done in the past and it just seems very hard to approve a project for more than twice the amount of workers they have already now.

Mr. Clements replied they are seasonal operation but they do operate all year round and have close to 250 employees in total and of those 50 is considered full time. They relied on contractors for

many years, and they decided to pull it in house and bring them in, and they seem to have a better control of people. By doing so, they're implementing a program to build the bins, to clean the bins, to repair the bins that come through their facility. By doing that, it requires a large amount of people to do so and so part of that is due to that. The other portion is they're having a largest season on record that they've ever produced, they're going to produce little over 1.1 billion times of tomato production coming from the Central Valley than they have ever done before. Because of COVID and the pandemic, a lot of the situation with the demand for tomato products has increased in order for them to complete and operate, they need people and have decided to bring these folks on but doesn't think the seasonal aspect number of 250 employees is in there. They are nonunion, but they do follow the Teamsters and as you see in the proposal, and wanted the panel to know that they do pay their employees very well.

Acting Chairperson Roberts then added that doesn't really reflect that when she was reading them, and am still going to ask to reduce the amount because she knows that they're saying they're going to hire all these part timers to full time and thinks that's great. But from a COVID pilot standpoint, wants to say that, it's a kind of ambitious as far as she is concerned and still going to ask to reduce the amount of funding and the amount of new hires to 25, and would say that if they want to come back at a different time, not a COVID pilot, the panel encourages them to come back. They do pay good wages, and suggested to come back for a regular project. Acting Chairperson Roberts then added she would like to also make counsel to Propel Consulting, to also reduce their developmental fees to reflect that as well.

Ms. Newsom then mentions that the applicant stated they are a seasonal employer, and was wondering roughly how long they're at full capacity with their workforce and what's tomato season like.

Mr. Clements replied four months. It's about the last week of June and it goes all way, until the third week of October so it's about 120 day.

Ms. Newsom then inquired what happens to them after tomato season is done.

Mr. Clements replied they go on unemployment and shared how the company has a 99% retention rate on their employees and has had that going on 15 years at least and expressed they all come back because they pay so well, plus it's a great company to work for but the position they're talking about, the bin building, and the bin washing are all year round. They will not stop, and they continue to receive bins back for the year prior, and then they have to repair, wash them and prepare for the next season.

Mr. Tracy then wanted to clarify that their employees, work four months of the year and they go on unemployment for the remaining eight.

Mr. Clements replied correct. Tomatoes only grow during those periods of time.

Mr. Tracy then asked if the 74 they are looking at are not full time before would then actually work all year round?

Mr. Clements replied that is correct.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Acting Chairperson Roberts moved and Mr. Tracy seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Los Gatos Tomato Products, LLC (COVID Pilot), with a reduction in the amount of \$50,000 for development fees. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal as moved.

Motion carried, 7 to 0.

Tab No. 27: Swan Consulting, Inc.

Ms. Newsom wanted to ask them how they are doing because they also received a COVID pilot program and wanted to check in with them and see how training is going and how they're progressing before awarding additional monies.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated that's was also her comment as well and didn't see any progression on their COVID project and they did send a spreadsheet regarding their training, but didn't see the information still regarding the \$100,000. The panel reduced that if you recall, they actually coming in for 100 new employees and they were reduced to 50. Yet don't see any progress on that project and is one of her concerns. The panel reduced them and they said okay, they'll come back in a different way to get that funding and will come back with a regular project. She just feels that maybe they've kind of skirted the issue or found loopholes in the system to come back to get the remaining \$100,000 that they lost during the COVID project.

Mr. Brama stated he knows they are hiring continually and doing so quite a bit and doesn't see any reason that they're not on schedule to satisfy the prior project. There's no overlap in the training population and again that has provided quite a bit of info and training.

Mr. King stated they have had great success, and have submitted about 10 and his perception was ideally best to submit it once the retention had been met, and wanted to make sure that it was very clear and transparent that the staff had not been coming aboard and then dropping off. The retention has been 100% and have submitted those and will have another eight names coming in in probably the next 30 to 45 days. Since this has started, they've been growing rapidly, a lot of ABA companies have shut down, especially in rural communities during COVID. Today's plan is all about projected growth and is located in Fresno County and have expanded into Kings County, also added 35 employees down there. Right now they're all in home direct and all of their services are one on one with autistic children. They're in negotiations to open a new facility in that area that should hopefully be finalized by October if the construction timeline meets the standards. Then they're also now just starting to expand into Merced in home operation and would like to open a clinic up there because that's one of the areas that has been decimated for services. There's a lot of families that need services that can't find support being waitlisted right now. They're also expanding in Kern County as well, but that probably won't happen for another nine months to a year. In addition to that, they're waiting to be credentialed through their insurance company to add in mental health services, speech pathology, as well as occupational therapy. Their growth strategy and plan right now is providing

support to these rural areas and career development is exponential. They've had a slow start coming out of COVID but it has been great progress. Once they get the green light from their insurance providers to go and add those services, they plan on having a multifaceted development center for their staff, as well as the clients that they serve in these communities.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated she does appreciate the information regarding the training, it was helpful. It mostly talked about the retrainees versus the new hires, but did not see the curriculum, and didn't see any hours in there and can see where she was coming from. They were reduced by 50 and now asked for 50 more retrainees in this project. So it just seems like they moved from the one that they reduced the funding to this one. Her perception was that they're trying to find a different method to get those other 50 trained even though it's not a four hour training program, and wanted to make sure that they are on track. Acting Chairperson Roberts stated she does like the idea that they're expanding out through the different counties, especially the high low income county.

Mr. Brama wanted to put the panels mind at ease that they definitely took into account the other project and did not again, duplicate any of those trainees. They had those conversations with the staff as well and want to make sure that the panel know that they're not trying to work around and they would not pull that also making sure that they did not do that.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Acting Chairperson Roberts moved and Ms. Bell seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Swan Consulting, Inc., with the new hire count being reduced to 25. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal as moved.

Motion carried, 7 to 0.

Tab No. 30: Whittier College

Ms. Newsom stated this one had jumped out because the wage ranges are much lower than entertainment industry standards. Since then, ETP staff member Diana Torres followed up with the applicant and provided her with their true wage range, and they are much higher.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Ms. Newsom moved and Ms. Hull seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Whittier College in the amount of \$172,200. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 7 to 0.

REVIEW AND ACTION ON PROPOSALS MULTIPLE EMPLOYER CONTRACTS

Tab No. 31: AHMC Garfield Medical Center LP dba Garfield Medical Center

Mr. Phillips presented a proposal on behalf of AHMC Garfield Medical Center LP dba Garfield Medical Center. Garfield Medical Center is part of AHMC Healthcare which has two hospital entities proposed for panel consideration this month, Garfield Medical Center, and Anaheim Regional Medical Center which is tab 36 in your packet. Although under the same AHMC umbrella AHMC Garfield and AHMC Anaheim are two different California employers and are therefore eligible to contract with ETP up to the per contract amount per fiscal cycle. Garfield Medical Center is a repeat contractor and this proposal represents their fifth ETP contract and the second proposal in the last five years. They are requesting \$248,032 in funding for a set priority industry contract. Garfield Medical Center plans to serve a total of 674 retrainees with this funding, with all of the training being provided at Garfield Medical Center's Monterey Park location. Garfield Medical Center has also provided ETP with union support letters from both SEIU United Healthcare Workers West and SEIU Local 121RN for this proposed project.

Mr. Phillips stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Zyliza Theybber, Acute Rehab & Education Director; Claudette Caronan, Sr. Director of Nursing; Barry Menzel, Subcontractor.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Ms. Newsom moved and Ms. Hull seconded approval of the proposal submitted by AHMC Garfield Medical Center LP dba Garfield Medical Center in the amount of \$248,032. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 7 to 0.

Tab No. 32: Encompass Health Corporation

Mr. Phillips presented a proposal on behalf of Encompass Health Corporation which is a repeat contractor and this proposal represents their fourth ETP contract and the second proposal in the last five years. ETP regulation 4445C states in part that the panel will consider a contractor's prior performance on any prior contracts when considering whether to approve a new contract. During Encompass Health's last project, they earned \$60,724 of an approved \$261,324. This represents a performance percentage of 23% on their last contract. However, during the preceding contract, Encompass earned \$237,702 of an approved amount which represented 96% of the contract value. After lengthy discussions with representatives from Encompass Health, and considering ETP regulations, ETP staff recommended a funding proposal up to the preceding contracts earned amount of \$237,702. However, Encompass has requested ETP staff to bring the full application

amount forward to the panel for consideration. Therefore, Encompass Health is requesting \$409,584 in funding for a set priority industry contract. They plan to serve a total of 318 retrainees with this funding, with all training being provided at one of Encompass Health's four hospitals located in Bakersfield, Modesto, Tustin, or Marietta.

Mr. Phillips stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Shawn Patzkwsky, Director of Tax Compliance; Kathy Szura, Chief Nursing Officer; Tammy Bialek, Subcontractor.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated they are very close to their five year cut off point where actually their bad performance would drop. But as they see it, it's still within that five year range. Her counsel to them would be if they want to come forward for the full amount of \$409,000, then they would wait a month or two, when that would drop off. If not, she is going to have to hold them to what she would hold most companies to base on their past performance, which is \$60,000. However, she is not going to hold them to that \$60,000 only because it has been four years. But would hope that they would listen to what the staff recommendation was going back to their previous performance of the \$237,000. If they want to wait a few months and work on this, they can wait a few months, come back when that one drops off for the full amount. If not, they can approve the lower amount at \$237,000.

Ms. Bialek stated their intent was always to try to come to the July panel meeting because they are out at that five year window. They were told that their contract would become inactivated and that they would have to resubmit and do a pre application all over again. Ms. Bialek then asked if they can panel their application into the next board meeting without going back into the queue.

Acting Chairperson Roberts then stated at this point, she is going have to ask the staff that because she is not sure of what that would be.

Mr. Phillips added Ms. Bialek is correct, the staff had told all contractors that they needed to get in front of the panel, because they were going to be clearing out the queue.

Staff Attorney Michael Cable added that what he is hearing is not necessarily a reapplication. It's a continuance of the existing application, continuing this matter to the next meeting; and doesn't see an issue with doing so.

Ms. Bialek then asked if they continue this in July, if they can remove their performance from the five year because they would be out of the five year window.

Mr. Phillips replied that is correct. However, Diana Torres did indicate to Ms. Bialek that because this is being heard in a public forum, that when this comes back, this discussion will come up at the next presentation by staff. But yes, the five year window would pass and that performance would drop off.

Ms. Bialek then stated they would like to go to the next panel meeting at this time.

Acting Chairperson Roberts then wanted to confirm that they will forfeit the \$237,000 that she would recommend and come back to the next panel meeting for the \$409,000. If they decide that would be the right amount, is that correct.

Ms. Bialek then stated yes.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Mr. Tracy moved and Ms. Bell seconded that this item be continued until the next panel meeting. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 7 to 0.

Tab No. 33: Digital Path, Inc. (Critical Proposal/RESPOND)

Mr. Meyer presented a proposal on behalf of Digital Path, Inc. (Critical Proposal/RESPOND) and they are headquartered in Chico and offers wireless broadband networking services, including wireless internet, installation services to residential and commercial customers. The company also manufactures components used to deliver these wireless network, traffic, internet voice and data. The project's been developed under the rapid employment strategies pilot on natural disaster, response program. Under the respond program, the panel funds training for economic impact and recovery related to natural disasters, such as drought, earthquake, COVID-19, and catastrophic wildfire. The company is addressing the impact of its services and infrastructure located within the fire impacted regions of the Sierra and in Northern California regions. The company is requesting \$380,650 in funding to serve 130 existing and 75 net-new workers in customer service, tech support, installation, manufacturing and R & D Project Leads. The company actively recruits veterans, maintains a marketing campaign aimed specifically to attract and hire veterans given the region that they're in, which is a large military and ex-military demographic in the north state. In their project they've included nine veterans and Job Number 3, paying the same wages as the normal job creation retraining Job Number 2 to the company's previous ETP contract, earned \$60,528 representing 100% of approved funding.

Mr. Meyer stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Tim Corey, Director of People Operations; Greg Navitsky, Corporate Trainer; Jill Meeuwsen, CEO, Synergy.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated it's a good proposal they really appreciate RESPOND and what they're doing regarding all of the tragedies that they've had in especially in Northern California regarding fires but did want to make a comment regarding the subcontractor and their developmental fees. She thinks that's pretty high and doesn't know what really went into this and worked on ETP contracts in the past and was giving counsel to the contractor, because she'd rather see that money go towards the training of the employees versus paying a subcontract for the development fees, because technically, she thinks they come out of the ETP funds, even though they're not supposed to. But in the future, she'd like to see more accountability regarding that, if it's

more than 5% of the funds allocated, would like to see maybe an invoice to say yes, it was paid prior to ETP funding.

Ms. Newsom wanted Mr. Meyer to clarify under Job 3 Veteran Job Creation, their wages are not the same as Job 2 Job Creation. It looks like they start off in the range a little bit higher, but the end of the wages are wrong. Under tech installer it says entry level is at \$20 to \$22 then your next one would be \$25 to \$25 opposed to \$25 to \$35, Ms. Newsom also noted that these are really dangerous jobs, fixing cell towers and having to be high up in the trees and fixing things that have collapsed from after fires and hope that they share the panel's sentiment that safety is of utmost importance.

Mr. Meyer replied that the correct was made prior and noted.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Mr. Morales moved and Ms. Bell seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Digital Path, Inc. (Critical Proposal/RESPOND) in the amount of \$380,650, with the correction to the wages as noted by Ms. Newsom. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve as moved.

Motion carried, 7 to 0.

Tab No. 34: Infinity Energy, Inc. (Critical Proposal)

Mr. Meyer presented a proposal on behalf of Infinity Energy, Inc. (Critical Proposal) been designated as a critical proposal by the governor's office for Business and Economic Development. The company is expanding into stationary solar battery solutions and zero emission vehicle charging infrastructure. This is the company's first ETP contract, and they are requesting \$437,000 in funding to train 200 existing tech installers, engineering and surveying staff, and 250 job creation retrainees is representing new workers in tech installer, project tech, as well as engineering surveying, inventory, warehouse, customer service and administrative support. The company actively recruits veterans as part of its overall recruitment effort and plans to hire 20 veterans as part of job group two however, the company is not including a separate veterans job number and all be treated the same levels. The company is headquartered in Rocklin and has other California locations in Riverside, Temecula, Bakersfield, Fresno, Chico, San Diego and Escondido. Training will take place at all of its California locations. Some of the trainees work in a high unemployment area in Bakersfield, where the unemployment rate is exceeding the state average by at least 25%. Infinity location is not requesting a wage modification.

Mr. Meyer stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced "Cameron McKinty, Director of Learning and Development; Jesse Kailahi, Sr. Learning & Development Consultant; Trevor Smith, Lead Quality Assurance Technician; Jill Meeuwssen, CEO, Synergy Lead Quality Assurance Technician.

Ms. Newsom stated this was tabled from the last meeting and it looks like it has been updated to

remove curriculum that was duplicative of apprenticeship training and construction, specifically electricians and wanted to follow up though, it looks like now the training that they're doing is very much proprietary technology and wanted to ask the applicant as they're pursuing installing more EV installations, how are they going to do that with EVITP certified electricians, which are used by the PUC and all utilities and also President Biden has been talking a lot about that too. That's a certification for journey level electricians, it doesn't matter if they're union or non-union. But if they are going to be doing these installations of electric vehicle charging stations, they have to be journey level electricians and go back and have that kind of training.

Ms. Meeuwsen replied they've already reached out to ABC Nor. Cal and the company embraces the apprenticeship model. They're having an executive meeting to take next steps with that and it is their plan along which is the journeyman electrician path and in that certification for EV charging station electricians.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Ms. Hull moved and Mr. Morales seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Infinity Energy, Inc. (Critical Proposal) in the amount of \$437,000. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 7 to 0.

Tab No. 35: MP Mine Operations LLC

Mr. Meyer presented a proposal on behalf of MP Mine Operations LLC is designated as a "Critical Proposal" recommended by the Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development (GO-Biz). MP materials headquartered in Las Vegas, MP Materials operates the Mountain Pass Rare Earth Mine and Processing Facility in Mountain Pass, California. The Company produces and processes rare earth minerals and essential components used in a wide range of clean energy, information technology, defense and industrial applications. For example, the magnets used in traction motors for electric vehicles, and wind turbine gearboxes. Currently, there is no rare earth metal capacity processing in the Western Hemisphere. MP Materials owns and operates the only scaled rare earth mining and processing facility in the Western Hemisphere. Currently, the United States relies on China for an estimated 80 percent of its supply of rare earth elements. The purpose of this training is to provide skills and knowledge to expand the Company's specialized and skilled workforce to operate a growing, global industrial processing facility safely and professionally. The company is requesting \$543,950 in funding to serve 150 existing manufacturing, engineering and operation staff and 170 job creation retrainees including manufacturing engineering operation staff, those will be new workers. The purpose of this training is to provide skills and knowledge to expand the Company's specialized and skilled workforce to operate a growing, global industrial processing facility safely and professionally. The training also focuses on safe and efficient operation of manufacturing and processing equipment. This is MP Material's first contract. To ensure success, the company has mobilized its executive leadership and management team along with dedicated

internal trainers and vendors with existing relationships to prioritize that the training outlined in the contract will be achieved. The company maintains a robust documentation process which is required at all times to be able to document skills training provided to workers to ensure safe operation.

Acting Chairperson Roberts wanted to mention that this is a critical proposal and did want to say this is a wonderful proposal and pays high wages. It's out there in the desert, somewhere between Nevada and California. But it's great and think that the whole idea of using mining for rare earth is hopefully going to be more popular here in the Western Hemisphere. They certainly would need that for our space programs and so forth. So the only question she had and this is what she asked Robert was regarding the infrastructure and was curious around their experience with ETP and just wanted to make sure that they would be successful and earn the full amount of money and hopefully can come back again.

Ms. Newsom added she loves the wages.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Ms. Newsom moved and Mr. Morales seconded approval of the proposal submitted by MP Mine Operations LLC in the amount of \$543,950. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 7 to 0

Tab No. 36: AHMC Anaheim Regional Medical Center

Mr. Phillips presented a proposal on behalf of AHMC Anaheim Regional Medical Center as mentioned earlier, AHMC Garfield and AHMC Anaheim are two different California employers and are therefore eligible to contract with ETP up to the per contract amount per fiscal cycle. Anaheim Medical Center is a repeat contractor and this proposal represents their fifth ETP contract and the third proposal in the last five years. They requesting \$499,629 in funding for a set priority industry contract and AHMC Medical Center plans to serve a total of 557 retrainees with this funding with all of the training being provided Anaheim Medical Center's Anaheim location.

Mr. Phillips stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Lisa Hahn, CNO; Barry Menzel, Subcontractor.

Acting Chairperson Roberts inquired what AHMC stands for and asked if they are a publicly traded company?

Mr. Menzel stated it stands for Advanced Healthcare Management Corporation and added that not to his knowledge, each hospital is independently owned and operated.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Ms. Hull moved and Ms. Newsom seconded approval of the proposal submitted by AHMC Anaheim Regional Medical Center in the amount of \$499,629. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 7 to 0.

Tab No. 37: Cepheid (Critical Proposal)

Mr. Hoover presented a proposal on behalf of Cepheid (Critical Proposal). They are a priority industry and a repeat contractor. The total ETP funding being requested is for \$399,280. That's the training estimated number of trainees of 334 for Job Number 1 which are retrainees and 100 for Job Number 2: Job Creation. Cepheid is designated as a critical proposal based on the company's continued planned and expansion and commitment to adding jobs in California. The company plans to spend over \$200 million to build an advanced biotech manufacturing plant in Lodi California by the end of 2022 and add over 1,000 manufacturing jobs. ETP training will be delivered to trainees at its Sunnyvale, Newark and Lodi facilities. This will be Cepheid's fifth ETP Contract, and its fifth in the last five years. Cepheid works with a third-party, Orion Talent, to recruit and hire veterans. The Company reports that Orion has assisted them in filling machinist and inspector positions. While Cepheid will continue its commitment to hire veterans, it is not requesting a Veteran's Job Number. In this proposal, Cepheid will hire 100 net-new employees (Job Number 2).

Mr. Hoover stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Esther Rivera, Plastics Operations Learning & Development Manager; Derek Beattie, Vice President, Injection Molding Manufacturing and Technical Operations; Phil Herrera and Monica McDaniel, Herrera and Company (Subcontractors).

Ms. Newsom stated she wanted to make sure with the applicant that there's no duplication of the former trainees from the previous contract?

Acting Chairperson Roberts also inquired the same and stated she spoke with Mr. Herrera who stated he did say that there was not going to be any duplicity regarding past training for employees.

Mr. Beattie, stated he definitely appreciates the panel hearing their proposal and shared a lot of exciting things are taking place in Lodi, huge expansion. As far as the duplicity, they are in the process of hiring over 300 additional associates here as far as plastics goes, and then over the course of this next year, they'll be hiring approximately 12 to 14 additional associates in their new IBD manufacturing facility. So they have a huge amount of new associates that they're going to be bringing in and focusing on as far as training and development. It will be new individual unique associates, it will be training, utilizing the ETP funding.

Acting Chairperson Roberts than inquired what this is going to be funded for. She asked if these are rapid test kits and the COVID test kits and hopefully they won't be doing much more testing on

COVID but asked if they can interchange that with some other kind of testing. Versus just COVID?

Mr. Beattie, stated the company started in molecular diagnostics years ago, one of their first contracts was actually with the US Postal Service for anthrax testing. Their devices have been protecting the United States population from anti anthrax attacks, by sensing the air and the samples around our Postal Service mail that goes through the major hubs. They have 26 other tests that are approved in the United States. Along with COVID, they have flu, RSV, and a number of sexual transmitted diseases, AIDS, and they're even getting into cancer related testing. There are a wide variety of other tests that their devices can perform besides COVID.

Mr. Herrera added they are stoked about having an advanced manufacturer and having these kinds of jobs here at those wages, the wages are good. They're just really, happy about it and wanted to thank GO Biz, ETP, and Robert Meyer, all of the team there.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Acting Chairperson Roberts moved and Ms. Bell seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Cepheid (Critical Proposal) in the amount of \$399,280. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 7 to 0.

Tab No. 38: A & E Arborists Tree Care, Inc.

Ms. Lazarewicz stated A & E Arborists Tree Care, Inc.'s (A & E) is a new contractor and total funding being requested is \$223,560 to train a total of 182 workers including 62 new employees. A & E Arborists Tree Care, Inc.'s (A & E) proposal is determined eligible as a RESPOND project based on the impact of the Company's services in clearing trees and debris in fire-impacted regions of California. Training under this proposal will be for the Company's location in Yuba City. This is A & E's first ETP Project.

Ms. Lazarewicz stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Eva Berlfein, Administrator; Michael Snead, Subcontractor - Carrazco LP, Innovative Tax Solutions.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Ms. Newsom moved and Ms. Hull seconded approval of the proposal submitted by A & E Arborists Tree Care, Inc. in the amount of \$223,560. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 7 to 0.

Tab No. 39: Arrow Drillers, Inc.

Ms. Lazarewicz stated this is a Critical Proposal for Arrow Drillers, Inc. They are a repeat contractor and total funding being requested is \$235,520 to train a total of 168 workers including 40 new employees. Arrow Drillers, Inc.'s (Arrow Drillers) proposal is determined eligible as a RESPOND project based on the impact of the Company's services in clearing and replacing utility lines within fire-impacted regions of California. Training will only be delivered at Arrow Drillers' location in Sacramento. This is Arrow Drillers' second ETP Contract and the second in the last five years.

Ms. Lazarewicz stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Deon Bozzo, Risk Management; Michael Snead, Subcontractor - Sierra Consulting Services.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Ms. Bell moved and Mr. Morales seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Arrow Drillers, Inc. in the amount of \$235,520. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 7 to 0.

{10 minute recess}

Tab No. 40: Saisoft Enterprises, Inc. dba Professional Career Development Center

Mr. Phillips stated Saisoft Enterprises, Inc. dba Professional Career Development Center is a repeat contractor and this proposal represents their third ETP contract and the third proposal in the last five years. They are requesting \$457,333 in funding for a multiple employer contract. The core group of employers represents two small businesses and six large priority industry employers. Saisoft Enterprises plans to train approximately 238 retrainees with this funding, with all of the training being provided at the participating employer sites in various locations throughout California. Additionally, Saisoft Enterprises has informed ETP staff they're licensed with the Bureau of Private Postsecondary Education (BPPE) expires in August and they have provided proof of their application for recertification by the (BPPE) in April of this year.

Mr. Phillips stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced AK Thakore, President.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated she did look up on the certification process and noticed that she couldn't find anything regarding that submission of approval. She knows they paid their fees, and

sure they sent all that information into ETP and they verify that which is fine. But looked up their address in Whittier, California and what triggered her on this was that it said Whittier. She thought originally their operation was an Irvine and don't know how it moved but when she looked it up, it came out to a place called Hair Cut Place and wasn't sure if they're cohabitating in this building and asked to give an idea as to exactly where you're located.

Mr. Thakore said thank you for the opportunity to present their proposal today and expressed they do not cohabitate this with anybody. That used to be the previous renter and they moved into this facility in the middle of COVID. They've been occupying this ever since and they're the only tenant prior to this, they were renting a facility in Montebello, when their previous two contracts were awarded to them. The Saisoft Enterprise Inc. headquarters is in Irvine and the school facility used to be in Montebello now in Whittier and this is where they've been, they moved there in December. They are the sole occupants of this place and Google has still not updated for whatever reason, they still call it the haircut place. There was an email exchange between him and Diana Torres, where she did send a Google screenshot showing them as the current occupant of this address. So some websites and some search engines probably have not updated it yet.

Acting Chairperson Roberts then stated okay and the reason she says that is that there's been some problem between their residents and their buildings and they move around a lot.

Mr. Thakore replied that's not the case at all Saisoft Enterprises has always been headquartered in Irvine, that's the parent corporation. Professional Career Development Center is the school that Saisoft Enterprise owns, has been declared not only to ETP, but as it exists in all our documentation as well. The laws in the state of California's, allow a corporation to own a school, which is how they are structured. They've always been structured that way.

Acting Chairperson Roberts then stated she knows they're funded up quite a bit through the state. And asked if they are funded from any private individual because she asked his wife this on a previous contract, and she said, no, you didn't have any private paying people going to your school, it was just state funded, is that correct.

Mr. Thakore replied the current classes that they're running for the CNA program, which has nothing to do with this proposal, this proposal is strictly for IT retraining. Going forward for CNAs, 98% is going to be under WIOA funding, and there's about 2%, maybe 3% who choose to pay our pocket.

Acting Chairperson Roberts then asked what about this contract? Anybody paying out of pocket on this.

Mr. Thakore none whatsoever all of their IT contracts have been that way throughout their history.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated she didn't know you could get certified as a private Post-Secondary College without any private funding. Is that not correct and thought you had to have private funding.

Mr. Thakore asked to explain what she meant by that.

Acting Chairperson Roberts then asked does people actually pay to go to their school versus them

getting all of it funded by the state.

Mr. Thakore stated there's no such restriction and there's no such requirement. It can be a mix of ETP, WIOA, grant funds, private pay, it can be a mix of all of those, ma'am. There's no such legislation whatsoever from BPPE.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated maybe in California and knows that in other states, they do have a restriction regarding private pay.

Ms. Newsom stated once again she googled Saisoft and again, the first thing that pops up on Google is their advertisement for their company describing, free government funded IT training. For her as a panelist, it just gives really bad optics on how to view their application and makes it seem like they're using ETP funds for their profit. ETP training isn't about free government money. It's about creating skills for workers and placing them on high road careers. Your messaging feels really wrong to me and our values focus on the participant, the trainee and how the training is done. Really also nothing in life is free, so how you're presenting yourself publicly coming before the panel just doesn't feel good.

Mr. Thakore stated they have made that change and it's not yet reflected because it takes 48 to 72 hours for all the prior versions of that to disappear off the internet. But hopefully by Monday, it should all be cleared up. We've already made that correction and notified Diana Torres, and in full agreement with you, ma'am. There's no justification for what we've done, it's far easier for us to explain to the employers, to the managers, and the trainees, that this is your own funding. Employers have paid money into the employment training fund, and it's their own money coming back to them through the training that they provide. However, that explanation takes 10 minutes, and it's far easier for them to catch their attention without using the F word. But it is off the website. I've already done that.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated she still is a little bit concerned, and asked. You're not getting anybody that saying I want to pay for this, or an employer comes in and says, I need to send my 25 employees to your center, to get trained in computer training. You get fully funded from the state or from counties or cities, nothing is come out of pocket for the employer, is that correct?

Mr. Thakore stated for the purpose of this contract, nothing will come out of the pockets of the employers, for the purposes of all ETP contracts they've ever held, nothing came out of the pocket of the employers. However, as an educational institution approved by BPPE if there is a potential market for them to have employers pay for additional trainees that are not California residents, and cannot come into the ETP program, they definitely would like to keep that option open. He doesn't want to tell the panel that he will never ever do paid training whatsoever that would not serve their business interests.

Acting Chairperson Roberts replied even though your school is certified as a nursing school, now branched out to IT and computer work. Eventually you've got to work on your own, and know you can go out to companies, because they like your training and ask companies if you could provide training to them, and they would pay for it, but you have to figure out a different way to continue to get funds besides ETP. There's got to be kind of two programs going, one from employers, one from private individuals in the state, but it can't all come from the state.

Mr. Thakore stated he understands Acting Chairperson Roberts intent behind the question and appreciates her clarifying. They're focused on that as well, to make sure that they are broadening their revenue streams. There are certain programs that they're going to add to the curriculum that nobody else is doing out there. They don't want to be another run of the mill IT training company out there. For example, artificial intelligence and machine learning. These are advanced topics that are going to become more and more prevalent, especially with self-driving and so on. They definitely will have some courses in those areas for which there will be demand. They have an instructor that will do a wonderful job. It is absolutely their intent to diversify their revenue sources so ETP and government funding is not the only source that they will rely on.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated in the future she is going to look at their contracts very closely only because of the issues they've had in the past. Every time I see one come through, red flags come up in my head, and I have to research it a little further. So unfortunately, that's the case and that's kind of what you presented us with in the past.

Ms. Bell also expressed she too was concerned and stated she as well did look into the website but when she goes to the IT courses schedule, and when she sees, that it says "not received state funding to conduct IT training classes and they are in the application phase currently". However, you may avail state funded IT training by clicking here. My question to you, are you waiting for state funding before you offer any form of training? Because according to website, it states what I just said.

Mr. Thakore replied that the reason for that is they've been getting lots and lots of calls, they constantly get calls from the employers that they've served in the past as well as new employers who have found out about the training. It's far easier to put that saying on the website that they are still awaiting funding. If they are to get funded today, he will change that message and updated accordingly. Because it's far easier to do it that way, then take individual phone calls and deal with that volume of inquiry and that's the only reason that they're worded that way.

Ms. Bell then asked, you're just waiting for some funding to offer the training.

Mr. Thakore stated that's the panel meeting today that I'm a part of, and if you're kind enough to fund us today, then of course, that message will change, and the schedule will get updated accordingly.

Ms. Bell then stated I will go on record, to say I could not support the model. Now, you're telling us okay, they're going take it down. I will not be voting in any way until I actually see that.

Mr. Thakore then asked how she would like them to word that.

Ms. Bell then replied asking if he said he was going to take it off.

Mr. Thakore replied I could certainly take it off and come back in front of the panel.

Ms. Newsom stated the model feels wrong, the model feels like ETP has created a private business and then taxpayer dollars are being used for like this private business and then the one profiting is Saisoft.

Mr. Thakore replied they are a private organization and they do have other sources of funding, such as the WIOA, and they will work very hard to also add privately paid revenue stream from companies that need additional IT training from them and doesn't know how else an entity should be structured because they are an educational institution that is owned by Saisoft Enterprises and does not know if ETP regulations strictly allow funding only for nonprofits.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated no, that's not the case, they fund both profit and nonprofit.

Ms. Newsom stated it's more of like refund training for where the training is needed and it's coming from the employers, it's coming from the contractors, perhaps they are collaborating with education facilities, but it's not the education facility that is trying to create the demand, the demand is already there. That's why it feels different in this concept and in this model, you're creating the demand without the demand being there and then also saying, you're only going to begin the training, if you receive ETP funds. But it feels like from what I've seen in my entire duration of being a panelist is the demand is already there and people are coming in saying they are already doing training, they'd like to do more training with these specific workers to upskill them and put them on that high road path to better careers and how can ETP help, and this doesn't really seem to fit those values or that model.

Mr. Thakore replied if you look closely at the justification that they've submitted, each of the employers have specifically stated that this is for retraining and to upskill their employees exactly. They've been doing this for a while now and these are employers that have gotten to know them and they know that they are a resource they can turn to, for upscaling their employees. The optics doesn't look like normally the case where the employers are coming to ETP, even in the case of single employers, most of them come to ETP directly. However, if I've understood this right, historically, MEC's exist for the purpose of spreading the message of ETP and reaching out to the employees and that's exactly what they've done, ma'am. So why are they being penalized for that?

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated most of their training is going to be not at your facility, but in the employers' facility. So you're going to send your staff out to Mountain View and San Jose to train the employees in this computer classes. Is that what you're going to do?

Mr. Thakore replied they've done that and yes, they will continue to do that. Now because of COVID they don't know how many of them will come back or what the mix is going to be for working from home versus in office but will be prepared for all eventualities. So those that will get trained in person will definitely do that. They're equipped to that and they've done that in the past as well.

Ms. Bell stated, I personally will decline this proposal.

Ms. Newsom also stated I'm in the same vein, I don't feel very comfortable.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated I am also in the same vein. I feel like you're making the profit on this. You're doing your training, you're developing the curriculum, and you're paying the trainers to do the training. You are getting support costs for it as well. You're a shrewd businessman, there's no doubt about it, you'll find a different way to handle it, and I'm sure. But when it comes to this one, I'm going to also have to decline it.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Ms. Newsom moved and Ms. Hull seconded denial of the proposal submitted by Saisoft Enterprises, Inc. dba Professional Career Development Center. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to deny the proposal.

Motion carried, 0 to 7.

Tab No. 41: Workforce Development Corporation of Southeast

Mr. Phillips stated Workforce Development Corporation of Southeast this is a proposal for the Workforce Development Corporation of Southeast Los Angeles County Incorporated, also known as SELACO. SELACO is a repeat contractor and this multiple employer contract proposal represents their 19th ETP contract and the fifth proposal in the last five years. The requested \$512,418 represents a right sizing to the projected earnings of the current agreement. Their core group of employers represent 10 small businesses and six large priority industry employers. SELACO plans to train approximately 359 retrainees with this funding. With all the training being provided the various participating employers sites in various locations throughout California. Some employers are located in high unemployment areas of Los Angeles County, and therefore SELACO is requesting the HUA wage modification from \$19.77 to \$14.83 per hour for Los Angeles County for approximately 10 trainees in Job Number 3 only. Also provided in your packets is the union support letter for International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, District 190, Local 1484. For those retrainees employed with the Marine Terminals Corporation.

Mr. Phillips stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Larry Lee, ETP Manager; Kay Ford, Deputy Director; Kevin Kucera, Board Member.

Ms. Newsom wanted to clarify with the applicant that it's not duplicative training of their workers since this is yet another time they're coming back, they are new workers or its new curriculum.

Ms. Ford asked whether they are repeating training to previous company.

Ms. Newsom responded correct, specifically the workers of those companies. It's either a new set of workers or its other workers that you already trained or new curriculum.

Ms. Ford replied they are up skills training, either existing employees or new employees.

Acting Chairperson Roberts then stated she does not agree with the two hour training and is aware that they mentioned there were some modifications regarding two hour training due to COVID. This is not a COVID project, nor respond project and not going to agree to the two hour training and is sure that they can do the eight hour training that they had in the past. You just put the two hour training in to make it a little easier on your behalf.

Ms. Newsom, Ms. Bell, Ms. Hull, Mr. Tracy all disagree with the two hours of training.

Acting Chairperson Roberts then asked Ms. Ford if she wants to speak to that regarding this two-hour training, or can you manage this contract with an eight-hour training program?

Ms. Ford replied absolutely, they were just reacting to what they're experiencing with some of their employers trying to get production up and running and two hours under the pandemic was more successful for some of them. But absolutely, they will go back to eight hours to 200 hours is their range.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Ms. Newsom moved and Ms. Hull seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Workforce Development Corporation of Southeast, with an eight-hour stipulation. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve as moved.

Motion carried, 7 to 0.

Tab No. 42: American Education Systems Corp dba American College of Healthcare

Mr. Phillips stated American Education Systems Corp dba American College of Healthcare system is a repeat contractor and this proposal represents their third ETP contract and the third proposal in the last five years. They are requesting \$447,720 in funding for a set priority industry multiple employer contract. American Education System plans to train 182 retrainees with this funding at American Education Systems, Santa Ana and Riverside locations.

Mr. Phillips stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Barry Maleki, Executive Director; Steve Duscha, Steve Duscha Advisories (Sub-Contractor).

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Ms. Newsom moved and Ms. Bell seconded approval of the proposal submitted by American Education Systems Corp dba American College of Healthcare in the amount of \$447,720. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 7 to 0.

Tab No. 43: Centers for Equity and Success, Inc. dba Success Centers

Mr. Hoover stated Centers for Equity and Success, Inc. dba Success Centers which is a priority industry and a repeat contractor in this proposal, it is requesting \$223,079 in ETP funds to train 59 (New Hire) trainees primarily to become (entry-level) Construction Workers and Computer Support Workers within the Information Technology (IT) sector's related fields. Although a Veterans component is not included in this project, Success Centers partners with the Employment Development Department (EDD) to serve clients including veterans. EDD operates its main office in close proximity to the Company's headquarters. EDD has a veteran's program via its Workforce Services Branch that refers eligible trainees to Success Center's programs.

Mr. Hoover stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Liz Jackson- Simpson, C.E.O.; Steve Duscha, Steve Duscha Advisories (Subcontractor).

Ms. Newsom asked are these pre apprenticeships and is that what this is for the construction industry?

Ms. Jackson replied yes, they are pre apprenticeship training in the construction industry and they also do training in tech.

Ms. Newsom then asked to talk to a little bit about after they graduate from their pre apprenticeship program what are they doing to connect them into apprenticeship programs so they can continue their career?

Ms. Jackson replied yes in the construction field in particular, they are funded with WIOA funding, and do get funds for the youth build contract. They also get some local, and WIOA for the adults. they're in 18 weeks of training every day, they try to model what expectations of the field are in ours instructors, our journey level, folks from the union, largely construction and the building trades, and they placed them on internships for another 500 hours, largely is working on affordable housing spaces. Then they support them with sponsorships oftentimes into the basic union traits.

Ms. Newsom replied that is excellent and so there is a good connection between your program and entity and the local building trades.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated regarding the progress on the COVID project that was approved in March. How are they coming along with that?

Ms. Jackson replied yes, they never closed, they continue to stay open, and they learned to work virtually. So the first few weeks of COVID. Actually, they did a number of placements and a number of those COVID jobs largely in healthcare with the healthcare providers.

Mr. Duscha added that's correct he is guilty of being slow to get the data registered. But they do and have done training, they have done placements and will get them entered in the system soon.

Acting Chairperson Roberts then replied okay and didn't think there was going to be a problem with that because it looked like there was no progress.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Ms. Newsom moved and Ms. Hull seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Centers for Equity and Success, Inc. dba Success Centers in the amount of \$223,079. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 7 to 0.

Tab No. 44: The Corporation for Manufacturing Excellence (Manex)

Mr. Hoover stated The Corporation for Manufacturing Excellence (Manex) are also in the priority industry and repeat contract. Total ETP funding being requested is for \$399,996 that's for an estimate number trainees of 94 under Job Number 1 retrainees and for 250 under Job Number 2 for the Small Business retrainees. This will be Manex's seventh ETP Contract, and its fifth in the last five years. Even though Manex is not including a separate Veterans' Job Number, its participating employers (PE) actively recruit veterans for training by contacting Concord's Veterans Affairs Center for leads.

Mr. Hoover stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Walt Tarpley, Vice President of Client Services.

Ms. Newsom asked if the applicant can just kind of give them an update on how they're doing on the current contract that they received under the COVID response plan.

Mr. Tarpley replied they have currently used 75% of that funding, and currently have paperwork all in process to get all of that completed. They had just a handful that were not entered into the system before they went on lockdown. They kind of got caught a little bit by surprise on that.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated they still have some time left on their contract. So no problem there and I did want to just make a comment, I love to see the manufacturing companies come through and I know Manex has been a big good partner with ETP over the years. So just keep up the good work and keep those manufacturing companies going here in California, they really need their expertise and their higher wages and so they appreciate that.

Mr. Tarpley replied thank you very much and they absolutely love what they're doing and they love our relationship with ETP, and all the support that they get from Chris, and all of you guys.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Ms. Newsom moved and Ms. Bell seconded approval of the proposal submitted by The Corporation for Manufacturing Excellence (Manex) in the amount of \$ 399,996. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 7 to 0

Tab No. 45: Associated Builders and Contractors Northern California Chapter Training Trust Fund

Ms. Miguel stated Associated Builders and Contractors Northern California Chapter Training Trust Fund is a repeat contractor with good prior performance requesting \$249,537 in ETP funding to serve 100 apprentices and 9 veteran apprentices. This project will serve 22 counties in Northern California and training will occur at the trust facility in Livermore.

Ms. Miguel stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Michele Daugherty, President/CEO; Charles Vernocy, Chief Operating & Finance Officer; Sagit Woodbury, Apprenticeship Operations Officer; Joseph Garofolo, Trust Attorney.

Ms. Newsom asked the applicant if it serves 22 different counties but has one training facility in Livermore. Is that correct?

Ms. Miguel replied that is my understanding. One of the representatives could speak to any additional training centers as well.

Mr. Vernocy, replied our headquarters are in Livermore and with our apprenticeship training programs, they have daytime training. So the students are on unemployment when they come for their daytime training and so they have our 35,000 square foot training facility and Livermore.

Ms. Newsom then asked does he mean that they're on unemployment when they come to train with you.

Mr. Vernocy stated when apprentices are out of work for training, they're eligible for state unemployment.

Ms. Newsom stated I'm used to the model in San Diego, which is similar to the ABC model in San Diego to where the apprentice is working full time during the day and then takes night classes and that's not the case with you guys.

Mr. Vernocy replied that is not the case. They do daytime training.

Ms. Newsom then asked do you guys provide housing for the apprentices.

Mr. Vernocy replied yes, they provide stipends to students that travel over 70 miles that they can use for hotels or if they choose to drive, gas, whatever they so choose.

Ms. Newsom then stated I heard sometimes with some apprenticeship programs that the apprentice is not receiving the apprentice prevailing wage at all times during the duration of their apprenticeship. Is that the case with your program?

Mr. Vernocy replied no apprentices always receive state prevailing wage.

Ms. Woodbury added yes, our apprentices are paid based on the applicable prevailing wage on non-prevailing wage projects as well.

Ms. Newsom stated she is a little bit flummoxed right now, with trying to wrap my mind around us with apprentices from all over northern California and different counties. So if an apprentice was in San Mateo County on a job site, and then they moved to Butte County, what wage would they be paid?

Ms. Woodbury replied it is based on a project that they are working on. So if they are working in Butte County, the wage reflect just like the prevailing wage, it is trade specific and county specific.

Ms. Newsom stated I've also heard some concerns, not necessarily with yours, that sometimes with an apprentice with a unilateral program, once they work themselves out of a job, because construction workers are gig employees, the second they step onto a construction site, they're working themselves out of a job, and it's going to get built. What happens to your apprentice after they have built themselves out of a job? Do they stay with that one contractor? Or what if that contractor doesn't have any more work for them? What happens to them?

Ms. Woodbury replied they have an out of work list, they dispatch from our office to the various projects in the various contractors, when the contractor does not have enough work to keep the apprentice working full time, or the apprentice exceeded hours in a specific category, they are returned back to the workplace, and they then dispatch them to the next contractor.

Ms. Newsom then stated I pulled them up. It doesn't look too great. The last report that I have for specifically looking at electrical because I can kind of compare you to the Southern California ABC and also the San Diego ABC, and then also their other versions, and you guys are at one of the lowest for graduation rates.

Ms. Woodbury responded the information on the state website actually has not been updated since July of 2019. So it doesn't even capture all the way to the end of 2018. I did receive an updated report from deputy chief foreman and it shows that our final graduation rate for the electrical for 2018 was 59.5 and they have jumped that up in 2019 to 82.6. They're definitely always focused on improving graduation, and they focus on the success of the apprentices making sure that they get the support from us that they need and that they are employed and get all the classes so they can graduate on time. They're definitely the numbers reflected I know they're not on the website because the state converted to the website. So they're not yet updated.

Ms. Hull would like to get clarification on the job description. It says a retrainees apprentice. So I'm wondering if those are two different people. Is it a retrainees and an apprentice? Or are they retrainees apprentice?

Ms. Miguel stated the retraining is a term used by ETP and all of the apprentices that fall under our apprenticeship program are classified as retrainees under the ETP program.

Ms. Hull replied awesome. I appreciate that clarification, then also, in some of the commercial work processes, I also found and recommend to work with staff to not duplicate some training, specifically in the painting where it delineate into specific industrial paint. There are some duplicate processes that do not have a parallel program. So in alignment with the ETP, not to replace current program or existing standards.

Ms. Miguel stated they actually looked into the painting curriculum and all of the painting curriculum that's included in the ETP contract is actually the RSI curriculum, and then in line with the standards for this occupation.

Ms. Newsom then asked does this reflect all of your apprentices.

Ms. Woodbury replied No, it does not.

Ms. Newsom then asked how many total apprentices you guys have.

Ms. Woodbury replied they have approximately 400 apprentices currently.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Acting Chairperson Roberts moved and Ms. Newsom seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Associated Builders and Contractors Northern California Chapter Training Trust Fund in the amount of \$249,537. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 7 to 0

XI. OPPORTUNITY FOR PANEL MEMBERS TO REQUEST AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE PANEL MEETINGS

Acting Chairperson Roberts provided an opportunity for Panel Members to request for consideration an Agenda Item for a future Panel Meeting.

No future Agenda Items were suggested.

XII. PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for public comment on matters not on the Agenda.

Robert Meyer did want to acknowledge the support and technical assistance that was received from the Division of Apprenticeship Standards: Eric Elberg, Kelly Mackey and Eric Rood who provided a great deal of content on a curriculum that we needed to see to be able to make sure that we were aligned with the panel's goals. It is part of a larger merging of efforts, but I just wanted to acknowledge their assistance. Also, GO Biz particularly the technical expertise of Poonum Patel who provided a lot of support for those projects coming in. They have a great team, and I'm proud to work with them. And lastly, most importantly, I wanted to acknowledge the work of Elsa Wadzinski, who bring four projects to the panel this month, all requiring a tremendous amount of technical assistance and review and detail and expertise that frankly, was impressive to see. But that was only overshadowed by her tremendous commitment to the program.

Phillip Herrera wanted to acknowledge Kulbir and his contributions to the agency. He is a pioneer of this thing and remember it has to be over a decade ago when I had my first electronic management project come under a post project audit and he was working with the audit group at that time. He had mad skill and everything and he just really struck me as someone who got it, was ethical, but fair. Remember that we had some instructor names missing from the LMS and rather than writing us up for it, he asked for some authentication and but he was just a real, real good contributor to where the agency needs to go. I wish him the best and thanks Kulbir for all your help.

Rocio Leon wanted to say thank you so much for the earlier comment about the delay in the 100% right transition over to Cal-E-Force. As we were hearing different dates all the way up to it, the legacy system could be turned off, as, as soon as the 30th of this month and quite frankly, we were a little nervous about that. We've been going through our own system transition for the last year and a half and system transitions are hard. There's a lot of things that you know that you think things are going to work a certain way, and you've got to make adjustments and changes. So the fact that there is that acknowledgement that there's still some work to be done, we appreciate the fact that we've been asked to the table to participate in providing the feedback on how the system's working, and some things that need to be addressed. We are again, we've been going through our own pain in that that same process. So appreciate the fact that we're going to be able to work together on that. The organization, ETP is going through so much change and I just wanted to express my gratitude for the staff's hard work, rolling with the punches, trying to adjust to all the change, and still make things work for all of the partners and all of the employers that are coming forward with their training plans, and they're trying to achieve their training goals. So thank you so much, and thank you to the panel.

XIII. MEETING ADJOURNMENT

Acting Chairperson Roberts adjourned the meeting at 12:27 p.m.