



Employment Training Panel

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA
EMPLOYMENT TRAINING PANEL**

Zoom Virtual Meeting
August 20, 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
August 20, 2021

I. PUBLIC PANEL MEETING CALL TO ORDER

Acting Chairperson Janice Roberts called the meeting to order at 9:37a.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Present

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

Executive Staff

Mr. Javier, Executive Director
Peter Cooper, Assistant Director
Michael Cable, Staff Attorney

III. AGENDA

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

Mr. Javier stated there is a modification that we'd like to make. Staff would like to pull the apprenticeship funding for fiscal year 21/22 item off the agenda. explanation as to why, as we were putting together our funding levels for this fiscal year we use projections that were given to us, based on what was happening over the course of last year and the anticipated collections that make up the ETP fund . we've recently started hearing that we may be in a better position than we actually had thought at the time that we've had put together the budget so we really won't know exactly what that looks like in terms of the actual numbers until sometime in September, when we get the reports back around the last year's close out and the actual collections.

Mr. Javier added what we would like to do is bring back to the panel at the next meeting, a clear picture of what the budget looks like in the core funding levels look like, which we're hoping impact in a positive way, any core funding CAP discussions whatsoever so we'd like to pull this one off the table for now.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated to Ms. Newsom anything that we've discussed on the subcommittee meeting you can talk to that as well, but it's off the agenda today and asked if there

were other changes to the order of one of the projects.

Ms. Lazarewicz replied yes and stated she will be presenting Tab 33 after Tab 20 because it's a single employer, but it was mistakenly put in with the multiple employers, so we will jump ahead after Tab 20 to Tab 33 and then continue on after that, with the multiple employers.

Mr. Brauer stated he wanted to comment on the item that that was pulled in consideration for when it comes back in the future and glad to hear that the amount may be considerably higher that you're thinking about I came to that policy meeting recommending a significant increase with the new monies that were coming in. My suggestion would be strongly I think for us in the building trades is something around another \$15M on top of that \$11M towards apprenticeship would be entirely appropriate, you have a governor who set a goal of 500,000 apprentices that include the building and construction trades, a lot of the proposals that come forward. As well as their importance to the overall economy, and had a chart to share later on the benefits of supporting apprenticeship. In addition to raising that core funding, hopes the panel and staff will do everything that they can to avoid trying to do an RFT pay process.

Mr. Duscha wanted to say thank you and it's a good move.

Glenn Arvin SMJATC 617 also wanted to say thank you for considering them and the funds we've received in the past have been instrumental in us keeping with the highest level of training for our practices.

ACTION: Mr. Smiles moved and Ms. Hull seconded approval of the Agenda as the changes have been made. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative for approval of the Meeting Agenda with the changes made.

Motion carried, 8 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 Mr. Smiles 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, 8 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, Mr. Swier, North Hollywood Regional Office Manager;

and Chris Hoover, Foster City Manager, San Francisco Bay Area Regional Office, Manager.

Mr. Javier also reported today's Panel represents about \$12.8M in proposals with about their which includes about \$91,000 in delegation orders.

Mr. Javier then reported a few updates that the team has continued to work on the development of the new application Cal-E-Force. We are also, as requested, preparing to provide you all, with a status update on both the PFL and the SEED initiatives and will be receiving the progress reports on those initiatives in the next few weeks and Liz Testa will provide you all with that update at the next meeting. Also later this morning Kellen Hernandez from our staff will be reporting on an innovative way to better manage staff and contractor time. He'll be reporting on leveraging zoom for group startup meetings and Cohorts. And lastly wanted to provide some clarity and insight as to how we are putting out a new monies that have come to ETP and how we work with our thought process is around it because there's been a lot of discussion around it.

Mr. Javier then reported the intent is to get the money out as quick as possible, so we can give all of the contractors' ample time to hit the performance targets which are pretty robust with these monies. There are some factors are considerations that we had to take into account as we planned for the rollout of these funds, and most of those factors are considerations were born from experience.

Mr. Javier also reported as we were launching the PFL and SEED projects which were both funded through the general fund, were told by EDD and DGS at the time that we had to go through their procurement and contracting process, because in fact it was general fund. We debated that a little bit we were trying to use the ETP process, essentially for those projects as well, essentially, we were told that we had delegated authority over the ETF, which are the collections, by which ETP is funded, but not general fund.

Mr. Javier also reported as you all know, for PFL and SEED we complied, we did a procurement and subsequently brought to contracts back to the Panel for approval.

Mr. Javier then reported Legal counsel is working on developing our interpretation of ETP authorities as it pertains to the resources that come to ETP for us to manage. Our desire is to have the same authorities that we have with the ETF be applicable to general fund monies as well. All that to say that we are working on gaining as much flexibility in our processes, as we can, but with that said, in the spirit of trying to get these monies out quickly without delay, while we continue to work on our delegated authority issue we're trying to gain those authority, so we can just run things through ETP traditional process, we're moving forward with a plan to put out all the money through RFP very quickly, in a very, very short timeline in hopes to get all of the new monies out on the street, In the contractors hands by the end of the calendar year maybe early January at the latest. So that way we wouldn't lose any time in terms of having to create an RFP and then release that in the RFP process should we find out, we don't have the authorities that we were hoping for.

Mr. Javier reported Peter is going to talk about all of the RFP timelines during his presentation on all the new monies and lastly as Peter talks about those timelines we've been working internally to align all of the staff resources necessary to complete those RFP on time and consistent with the schedule that Peters going to present a little later on.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated regarding the RFP for some reason we do get the flexibility to manage ourselves without having and putting it back into our core fund, we do have that flexibility at any one time to pull the trigger on that, Is that correct.

Mr. Javier replied that's correct, essentially what we're saying is that in trying to save time we don't know the outcome of the debate that we're having around our flexibilities if we lose that debate then we wouldn't have lost time.

Acting Chairperson Roberts so more of a contingency plan in case something else doesn't happen, we need to think of how we can use these funds, like expediently if we need to.

VI. REPORT OF THE CHIEF DEUPTY DIRECTOR

Mr. Gutierrez stated today's panel meaning is for approximately \$12.8M that includes \$90,850 in delegation orders are proposals cap that \$75,000 and approved under delegation authority by the director on continuous flow, since the last panel meeting we've had an approval of three delegation orders.

Mr. Gutierrez state If all the proposals scheduled for this panel meeting are funded today the panel will be approving 36 projects and also, please note one project Airport Services is a holdover from last panel meeting and will be funded from prior year funding. As such, it is not included in the 21/22 funding. After today's panel meeting the employment training panel will have approximately \$32M left in contracting capacity Based on our previous projections some of that may change now that we're getting additional information on what our ETF funding is going to look like, so we will be doing a reassessment of our contracting capacity, once we have all the data.

Mr. Gutierrez then stated we have received approximately 515 applications, with an estimated value of over \$68.6M, 65 of those applications are in the Regional Offices and 450 applications are within the Application and Assessment Unit.

Mr. Gutierrez regarding the demand and allocations, we're currently within our allocations, we do have \$47.7M in demand for single employer contracts. We have \$5.4M in demand for multiple employer contracts, and we have \$7M in demand for small business contracts. We also do have \$8.5M in demand for partnerships and at this point we have zero demand for critical proposals.

Mr. Gutierrez that is the final portion of my fiscal report, and I do have one action item, I would like to request the motion to approve the consent calendar.

Acting Chairperson Roberts had some comments, some of them are more concerns. Tab No 2, 4, 6, 7 and 8 are all by the same subcontractor and this is just a comment that each of those that subcontract the same subcontractor is getting 10% of the funds on top of the 13% so in a sense, are getting 23% of the dollars ETP for very small proposals, I don't know if that's just and I think that we need to figure out a better way to handle that. It's something that I know that the staff is looking at trying to develop other means to but at this point, I said that I don't know if it's just unfair for the small amount of dollars that we're talking about and Tab 4 we're going to see more and more of this, so the panel has to address. as we go forward and the ETP staff is probably going to work on it as well, but we're going to see more and more COVID related projects regarding performance and

retention as we go forward have to take each one individually, but we'll be seeing that, and how we manage that will see in the future.

Acting Chairperson Roberts had some comments Tab 6, 7, 9 we have a disparity of retraining wages versus new hires. there is a big difference between \$4 to \$6 difference between that and don't know if they're here to discuss it, but one of the things that I would like to see in the future if there is such a disparity with the wages of those contracts that we could have some justification in our 130 that we could look at to determine why there's so much difference in the training dollars in the wages of those both new hires and retraining. Mr. Snead stated I do know that there is a difference between starting versus after a short while they tend to increase the wages and am not sure if you're asking about the low start wage and believe there is a wage progression and they do increase it fairly soon.

Acting Chairperson Roberts but remember those wages that we're seeing on our wage list those are Those are post retention wage so you're talking two years you are still going to be staying at that same wage that's why I don't know what kind of progress you're talking about. Five year progression or talking about a six to nine months progression

Mr. Snead replied that he believes the way you wrote the proposals that when the proposals approved how many people will have that starting wage from the gecko not two years from now, so two years from now yeah they should all be up wage one for job one wages. But when they first hire them and they start to train we enroll them and so that's usually they're starting wage as long as the starting wage makes the minimum wage, then we enroll them and track their hours, but so that's more starting wage not wages from two years from now.

Acting Chairperson Roberts added but if you look on our training plan table, you'll see under post retention wage, you see under job initiative \$17. Post retention means after two years after the project is ready to come to completion, so to me it's not saying that it's the wage currently it seems like it's going to be the wage two years from now. that's just a discrepancy that I have that around the wages that can be very confusing for a lot of people and what they put down on the packet, but remember we don't see the whole application process and only see what's in front of us and, sometimes, what in front of us isn't consistent so that's why we're asking you to explain it to us.

Mr. Snead replied since I put it together I've always written these as starting wages, so that you know if the start date on the contract is this Monday or a week from Monday whenever it starts and if they've hired anybody in the last few months that qualifies for job two then as long as they meet that \$15.65 , we can enroll them but again that's starting wage that's not ending wage, and can talk with staff and happy to change things on a go forward basis if that's the understanding of how many people will be making the retention wage and that's actually better for the company and happy to make those changes, for the ones that you outline, which is, six, seven and nine those will all be beginning wages not end of retention wages okay.

Ms. Newsom asked can those wages be more reflective of job number one

Mr. Snead replied absolutely the wage progression go up pretty quickly so I don't think they'll be a problem.

Ms. Newsom noted some of the commercial skills does seem to be duplicated apprenticeship training or curriculum that would be covered in apprenticeship, are you affiliated with an

apprenticeship since you're doing auction.

Mr. Snead stated that as a Union shop, they're not training apprentices, but I also do know that, based on talks to them, there are some needs some times for a refresher courses, if there's been people that have not been on a certain type of project but also know that they do some things in Paradise rebuilding things and so they're working on some PG&E work and PG&E is also requiring them to have a number of skill sets and to be retrained within each year, some of those skills are definitely mandated from PG&E. whether or not they're overlapped or not they're overlapped With any union skills in general, would just be an overlap, but they're not training any apprenticeship, I can assure you.

Ms. Newsom just to be clear it's not a matter of being a Union versus non Union but there's opportunities for to do some of these commercial skill upgrades and curriculum and training through apprenticeship Union or non-Union. And I just want to make sure that we're not duplicating those efforts, so you can work with staff on that to make sure of that there's ways of making sure that these workers are receiving this training through apprenticeship, and also getting the additional benefits of that as a best practice.

Mr. Snead but one of them does go through an apprenticeship formal Program. it is accredited and they do bring their staff up through that.

Ms. Newsom it's a matter of having that curriculum go through the apprenticeship too so if you can look into that that'd be good okay.

Acting Chairperson Roberts inquired if Mr. Snead is the consultant.

Mr. Snead a consultant.

Acting Chairperson Roberts you heard my comment earlier regarding a consultant wages is that correct. It's not illegal to get 10% of the dollars, it's just doesn't seem to be equitable. We'll watch it and we'll make a comment on it, if we continue to see it.

Mr. Snead I do cap my fees they're not 10% on everything and some things are actually lowered so it's not an across the board.

Acting Chairperson Roberts that again your jobs for retrainees versus your new hires are about \$4 or \$5 difference and when I look at the post retention wage it mimics what In the panel packet, can you explain why the differences between new hires and retrainees.

Acting Chairperson Roberts as long as you do more due diligence around it, so we don't see those big discrepancies between the wages that's all.

Mr. Snead i'll make adjustments on the applications in the future for sure, but rest assure these are beginning wages these aren't the two year from now retention wages.

Acting Chairperson Roberts But you see in the panel packet it says post retention weight range so that's what we go by.

Ms. Newsom stated she would like to see those wages move up to being more consistent with Job Number One, please.

Mr. Snead they usually are and is very familiar with the company and they go up pretty quickly.

Ms. Newsom they have my support.

Acting Chairperson Roberts make a motion to approve the consent calendar by pulling Tab 7 for further comment and may approve it down into the single employer contract or further down the road.

Acting Chairperson Roberts out of the \$50M, \$10M is going to go to SEED as well.

Mr. Cooper No, there are there are four different pots of money. \$50M for Earn & Learn, Community Colleges, which is \$15M, SEED \$20M additional dollars that are going to be added on to our existing SEED program and then Paid Family Leave which is just \$1M in recurring funding that we get from the state.

VII. REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

Mr. Cooper reported the recently signed budget provides \$86M in new funding from the state general fund. This is an amazing opportunity to build and expand ETP and work with new partners as well as old. We are trying to get the funds out as fast as possible while still following a process to insure they are successful. With the over-arching intent of getting the funds out quickly, we are going to deploy all the funds through the RFP process. We have assigned a manager to spearhead each of these programs and they will insure we have clear communications and information for stakeholders. Information will be posted on ETP's web site.

Both ETP's current contractors and new applicants can apply for these funds. The PFL funds are awarded on an annual, on-going basis while the rest of the funds are one-time funds. Disbursement and encumbrance of these one-time funds will commence this fiscal year through June 30, 2024. These new programs will support goals and objectives for outcomes as directed by the administration and the legislature. ETP will report back to the panel and the legislature on the use and outcomes of the funds.

Regarding process for entering into contracts through RFP process, dates of the stakeholder information sessions will be posted on the ETP web site. Once this has been completed, ETP will finalize and release the RFPs.

Went through the goals, contracting, and timelines for each program. While the program specifics are still being developed, we do know some specifics: Earn & Learn Program: -- \$50M. This is to expand ETP into high-demand sectors and support 'earn-and-learn' programs. Goals expanding ETP programs to serve high-demand sectors, and support an equitable economic recovery serving sectors not served by core funds: public sector, healthcare nonprofits expanding the earn and learn and apprenticeship models support new apprentices in both traditional and non-traditional sectors supporting new-hire training supporting a just transition to a carbon neutral economy supporting

economically disadvantaged communities.

Contracting, the funding will go out in the form of a RFP, anticipated eligible applicants may include, DAS registered apprenticeship programs, apprenticeship intermediaries employers, workforce development board, non-profit organizations, community colleges, business associations, associations or other MECs, public entities (hospitals & localities).

Community College Program, \$15M, this will be used to align and operate programs with the community college system, in partnership with the California community college strong workforce program, will include goals strengthening coordination between workforce programs and long-term engagement with employers and the community college system. Target small businesses and workforce affected by pandemic to assist with economic recovery contracting after administrative costs are deducted, \$13M will be available for contracting with community college contract education partners through a RFP.

SEED program: \$20M, this will augment the \$10M, that we already have in place for seed. SEED is Social Entrepreneurs for Economic Development. Goals to establish new small businesses and worker-owned cooperatives that meet a community need, by supporting the entrepreneurship of immigrants of any status and limited English proficient individuals contracting funding applicants that did not get funded in the first round of seed contracts. Augmenting successful current contractors with additional funds panel will approve the selections that have the highest score as presented to them, although they are not involved in the scoring of the applications themselves.

PFL Program: we have \$1M for paid family leave for small businesses with goals to ease the strain on small businesses with less than 10 employees when one or more employees are out on paid family leave by supplying micro-grants to affected businesses which can be used to hire, train, or retrain other staff to cover the duties of the employee utilizing paid family leave; to increase outreach to small businesses on the paid family leave program. Contracting panel will approve the selections that have the highest score as presented to them, although they are not involved in the scoring of the applications themselves.

Timelines:

Paid Family Leave: this program is well established and we already have the applicant pool from the first round November panel meeting – approval of contract augmentations and newly awarded contracts by panel December 1st – newly awarded contracts start.

SEED: this program is well established and we already have the applicant pool from the first round. November panel – projected approval of contract augmentations and newly awarded contracts by panel January 1st – projected newly awarded contracts start.

Earn & Learn and Community College Programs: displayed a table showing the different dates

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

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated 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 stated 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

VIII. REPORT OF STAFF ATTORNEY

Staff Attorney Michael Cable stated AB1106, which comes up on page 18 of that document to point out that's our ETP bill. It's officially within the suspense file, which is essentially a holding location for the Senate committee rules. So it's waiting for some type of appropriation for it. So it really hasn't changed much since we've last spoke. But I just wanted to point that we're still tracking that. The other item I just wanted to point out is that the memo is definitely long. So between now and the next time, we're going to go through and make some kind of formatting type changes to make it a more concise and user friendly type of document for you.

IX. UPDATE ON CAL-E-FORCE

Tara Armstrong provided an update on ETP's IT systems and happy to announce that we have over 1300 contracts into our Cal-E-Force system, and we are now going to start moving over inactive contracts, so that we can have historical contracts in there and look at data like repeat contractor on prior performance things like that, over the next six months. The new application process, we are moving on to phase two are still on track for our paper process is going to go away and we will have it up and running this quarter, so that would be next month and we'll be sending out communications on our website and via email so everyone is aware of when that effective date will be. It will be relatively similar to the paper questions, it's just going to be on a web format. We are keeping that process the same and then using phase three to change those questions and think about what we really want to ask, in order to get the information we need and move them forward quickly. On our legacy systems, we are going to start the closed down of our back end which is online forums and online tracking Here in the next month or two and communications will also be going out about that so we've left them open for a few months to let people use and compare information back and forth and they are correct in the system now so we're able to shut those down. The front end of our legacy systems, which is our application registration that will go away once the new application is up and running, so that we have one application process. As for grants fund management added on to our Cal-E-Force system, we are working with the business side, so that our applications for these grants can be through our system so that we can collect the information more efficiently and be able to award these grants and manage them on the back end. We also

have our website, you have any questions and we've added a link on our webpage for recommendations, so if you have any ideas of how to enhance our system,

Ms. Armstrong stated if there are any questions, please don't hesitate to email us at our command center. ETPCalEForce@etp.ca.gov.

Ms. Bell asked regarding the pre applications that have been submitted by employers my employer being one of them, those are all going to be thrown out and all the companies have to reapply on the application process.

Ms. Armstrong replied yes, that's the process that we had set up, was in order to have the information and made it make it a fair process was to shut down the current pre app and Apps that are in progress and allow for a complete submission of the application through our portal through our website. So that's why it's important that we do communicate to all when that will be happening so that you guys are ready to submit your applications when you're prepared.

Ms. Bell then noted that it's my understanding that is around 500 companies that need to receive the message is that correct.

Ms. Armstrong replied yes, considering the ones I think I may give that report as around 500 but will also be put it in our website and on our new page for those who have not yet applied as well.

Ms. Bel and my understanding as well, in September, when this portal is open and you're accepting application is going to be first come, first serve.

Ms. Armstrong Yes, we'll continue that same process.

Ms. Bell You see any fallout or any type of Feedback from employers that have to reapply and have to go through that motion and that process and that hurdle again.

Ms. Armstrong there could be some but if their projection for the application is the same, they would just be putting it on to the online system they copy and paste from their application before into the system but it's going to help us be able to be more efficient and accepting them and processing them forward.

Ms. Bell I get that part of that I agree with you, because we do streamlining information. I know companies are going to be affected because I mean ours is as well in this process. Do you see the system being able to have capacity for everyone? Do you feel that the systems that you have right now have the capacity to take all these applications in on the day it opens?

Ms. Armstrong that's a good question and I do. We are on top of the line platform, and we have licenses to cover that but I will be double checking so thanks for bringing that up.

Acting Chairperson Roberts mentioned just from what I see in this panel packet when you opened it up and that one time, you had seven days or something I can't remember the timeline on it to put a complete new application together guess what all of these are from consultants so consultants certainly have the advantage. To go ahead and submit applications on a first come, first serve basis

versus somebody that's a company that has just internal people that are working in manufacturing that now are in charge of submitting an application. I don't know if they're going to have the same type of information or knowledge to get in on the right time, so if you even look at the panel pack you'll see they're all consultants, there is not one project in here that's non consultant, so that is a concern I have is that we are favoring consultants versus non consultant company.

Ms. Bell added because that's how I see it as well. It's almost making it on user friendly for a small company, a mom and pop company to apply for the application file for the funds. And it almost seems like it's easier to go through a consultant, because they'll get it through faster.

Acting Chairperson Roberts on the consent calendar, and the delegation calendar, normally would see, companies come through that didn't have any consultant, but all of them are consultant based. So what that's what I'm afraid of. So I don't know if there's something we can do internally to make sure that we have a fair and equitable system for all companies to come through in the future.

Ms. Armstrong stated we're actually have our application workgroup who's taking a look at how we ask questions on the application, so that it makes sense to everyone and every entity and not just someone who has worked with us before or is a contractor or consultant. So that is our goal for the future on enhancements to the application.

Acting Chairperson Roberts

X. POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING REPORT TO PANEL

Ms. Newsom reported the Policy Committee Meeting was on Thursday, July 15. at 1pm via zoom the only topic on the agenda was a discussion regarding apprenticeship funding for this fiscal year. We just heard a lot of that public commentary again, after staff presented a few potential ways to handle the enormous apprenticeship demand with our very limited allocations and resources. The public comment discussion was quite extensive. In general, the comments centered on not cutting the allocations for apprenticeship projects, expanding funding for new hires and potential uses for the new funding awarded ETP by the legislature, for which there are many different ideas proposed, the next policy committee meeting will likely occur sometime this fall. If you have any ideas on for potential agenda items, please email them to Liz Testa.

Acting Chairperson Roberts also did want to mention that we did take the apprenticeship funding off the agenda, but I did want to make a comment to Willie and his staff for all the hard work they did put in to putting all the options together, what was equitable and any of those considerations but because we're going to relook at it. I just wanted to tell Willie, I appreciate all the hard work behind that.

XI. ETP GROUP START-UP MEETINGS & CONTRACTOR COHORTS

Mr. Hernandez provide a quick overview on some of the work that we're doing and implementing, rolling out here shortly. So I'm going to start with our infographic. One of the things I wanted to mention was a quick update on the timing. So at the July policy committee meeting that Gretchen just reviewed, we gave a quick announcement. The first group startup meeting will be on Thursday, September 9 now at 1pm. this is just for those August panel contractors out of the North Hollywood office only so we will be in touch with them after today's panel meeting with next steps the calendar

invite for September 9 2021 at 1pm. I wanted to also start by acknowledging the GSM team. Thank you, Margarita Paccarelli, Karen Mann, Safdar Kandhro, Geraldine Giron, Hannah Rokni and Alayna Mollick, and our champion for work group, Diana Torres. Thank you, everybody, for all your hard work much appreciated. Our goals overall is to increase efficiencies for ETP contract monitoring, and maximizing ETP resources throughout the contract term. That's our broad board. That's what we're started off with in this whole pilot project. Our broad objective is to increase the value and impact of information provided to ETP contractors at the beginning of the contract term to increase the success of contract implementation for contractors in ETP. Those are the first two goals and objectives that we started with when we started developing this whole project. But I wanted to first give you a little background and context. So you could put some of this information into that context, starting with when we launched the overall project. In February, we presented information about this idea to executive staff and to all managers meeting, we got some positive feedback, and got the go ahead to move forward. So in April, we started forming the workgroup itself. I sent out a questionnaire to the different regional offices and to the different units that would potentially participate in this project, fiscal unit and the Cal-E-Force team. I'm hoping to get their participation in this workgroup. So we got the handful of people who I mentioned earlier, and we started developing the project. So baseline information will be a two hour virtual meeting focused on monitoring fiscal and Cal-E-Force information. So we're combining subject matter experts from the regional offices, the fiscal unit and the Cal-E-Force team to provide the most up to date, important, impactful information in one start up meeting. Now in July, we had that policy committee meeting gave a quick announcement, part of the process, letting all the stakeholders know about this change in the way that we'd be rolling out this startup meetings and transitioning into group startup meetings for this project. Now, here we are in August and we had an all staff meeting last week, presented much more detailed information about the implementation, the changes in our process flow for the regional offices, and just background on what we believe the impact would be, and, and overall our goals. So that was last week. Today here we are at the panel meeting, getting part of the process, educating the stakeholders about things that are going to be rolling out here in the future and get it let them get a sense of what we're trying to accomplish. And then next month in September, we will conduct that first group startup meeting, again, just for those North Hollywood contractors approved at this meeting today. The broad objectives, and I want to spend time on two of the seven objectives that are a little bit more specific. So we want to provide contractors with the tools they need earlier in the contract term that will help them build their own capacity to work more autonomously, and reduce the amount of technical assistance they need for contract analysts, fiscal analysts, and Kelly Force Command Center over to your contract. So ETP, as an agency, we've invested a lot of time and resources into building tools and guides. And this is a way for us to be a little bit more proactive and share some of that information at the group startup meetings themselves and over the two year contract term, to give them the tools they need to be successful, you know, manage their contract seamlessly and hopefully earn more of that funding. The second objective is to increase the consistency of ETPs communication, and messaging to contractors over a two year term. So really, we're going to try to do that in two different ways. The first is through bringing that collaboration of regional office staff, the fiscal unit, Cal-E-Force team, and sharing all that information in one group startup compared to one on one with just one individual contract analyst. So that consistent messaging instead of having, one multiple analysts across the state, giving their own presentation, covering around similar information, but not all the same, of course, this would be a way to have consistent messaging at each of one of those meetings. The second part is through the communication aspect of quarterly emails and using our tools that we have internally to share that information in a timely manner to make that information and resources that we have more impactful. So I wanted to highlight what the collaboration would be from the fiscal union aspect and the Cal-

E–Force team’s aspect. So the fiscal unit will provide technical guides focused on invoicing ETP payments, enrollments, preventing errors and fixing mistakes. So currently, fiscal is involved throughout the process, but not as, involved earlier in the process to help troubleshoot some issues that could come up that usually pop up later in the contracts. It's a way for us to be a little more proactive, share that information earlier in the contract term. The second is with the Cal-E–Force team, providing contractors with Cal-E–Force system information and resources, how to access to Cal-E–Force system where to access Cal-E–Force reference cards and videos, and all the How to guides set.

Acting Chairperson Roberts noted looking at North Hollywood, if we approve all of the ones from North Hollywood, there's 11 of them I would say probably 90% of them are repeat contractors. So are you handling repeat contractors versus new contractors differently on the startup meetings because I can tell you if I was a repeat contractor a lot of that information I already know and, I'd be doing other things?

Mr. Hernandez replied we're going to treat all contractors the same whether you're repeat, or a first time contractor, whether your MEC or single employer, a lot of the information we're going to be sharing with them is new information, especially if they might have just recently migrated into Cal-E–Force, or the people who are involved in the contract management are new to the process, just because the contractor is repeat, maybe the people involved handling the day to day operations are different. So we're taking the aspect is, you're new to ETP, this a new contract, we have new information, this important meeting for you to participate in.

Acting Chairperson Roberts also added there's not going to be any proprietary information regarding any kind of fiscal information from any of these companies to each other. Is that correct? And then the last one is that I would like get this is a pilot program, and we want to make sure that it does come. But if for some reason, if you could put out a survey to those 11, contractors how the meeting went, and any kind of questions or concerns they had about it, I'd appreciate that. Because I'd like to know how they feel about it.

Mr. Hernandez replied absolutely. At our staff meeting last week, everybody who participated received a survey, we want feedback from internal stakeholders. And then after each one of these meetings, we're going to have a survey sent out to the participants where they can provide feedback recommendation, ask questions, we'll take that feedback and make any changes and keep moving forward and present that information to the executive leadership team in our final presentation.

X. REVIEW AND ACTION ON PROPOSALS

Tab No. 7: North State Electrical Contractors, Inc.

Ms. Lazarewicz stated North State Electrical Contractors, Inc. They're asking for total ETP funding of \$188,600.

Ms. Newsom wanted the applicants to respond to where it appears that under the commercial skills curriculum, much of it is duplicative of apprenticeship programs, specifically a low voltage electrical apprenticeship program, and why they're not using an apprenticeship program to fulfill those training needs.

Ms. Kirk stated we do use an approved apprenticeship program but it's a very small portion of our employee base. Currently, right now we have nine apprentices and we pay them their training out of their package. The training that we do in house is more. We train all our guys the same way and we require their certified electricians, but, you know, we could have a one year or 10 year, you know, so for us, it's more of reinforcement refreshing. It's not a formal basic training, we expect them to be certified. But the apprenticeship program is in more for our prevailing wage jobs where we're required to have an apprentice on the job because they are paid a lot more.

Ms. Newsom stated it says under commercial skills that your field staff and training will be focused on electrical installation training topics includes electricity overview, equipment operation and switches, your commercial skills curriculum, as listed is very duplicative of the apprenticeship training program. And where these workers should be receiving their training. And then it would also move them to get the training over there. So then they can get their certifications as well, including California advanced lighting controls training program, so I would be supportive of this proposal by stripping out the commercial skills components, which should be covered under apprenticeship and then moving forward.

Acting Chairperson Roberts inquired how much of that is training dollars. Or could you supplement with something else? To fulfill the contract needs? Or do you need to have commercial skills in order to achieve 180,000? We're saying go ahead and train them, we're just not saying you're going to get funded for it. So can you do other supplemental training to fulfill the contract?

Ms. Kirk replied I'm sure we could, but I don't really have those facts and figures in front of me. If we if I have to meet with my, like I said, my staff and my consultant and figure that out. Because we're definitely having on the training side, and we got 200 employees, and we've grown tremendously. And so I would hope that we could fulfill that, but I couldn't give you an exact number right now.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated maybe we should pull this and then come back next panel meeting to discuss it further. When you have all your ducks in a row regarding this commercial skill training,

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. Smiles 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 to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

Tab No. 10: AppFolio, Inc.

Mr. Swier stated they are repeat contractor requesting \$429,410 to train 700 to retrainees, and 370 job creation trainees. This proposal covers locations in Southern California. Please note a correction on their page one for the percentage of managers and supervisors which is listed at 13% which

should be 19%. Additionally, the wage arrangements on page two and three indicated are actually higher than what's listed in the packet and correct wages will be added to the file upon project approval.

Mr. Swier stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Nick Duggan, Director(Learning & Development); Kim Edelman, Consultant.

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 AppFolio, Inc. in the amount of \$429,410. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal as moved.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

Tab No. 11: College Hospital, Inc.

Mr. Swier stated they are first time contractor, requesting \$442,520 to train 476 retrainees and five job creation trainees. In both LA and Orange County, the hospital is requesting a wage modification to the set wage from \$34.77 per hour to the set priority wage of \$26.08 per hour.

Mr. Swier stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Matt Lavalley, CFO, Bill Sacks, Consultant, Michelle Dalgarn, and Consultant.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated that you have these two college hospitals. And we talked about this in length around entities and affiliations. We really haven't got our hands wrapped around it yet, we'd have a really good grasp of it. But I thinking that you're coming through almost \$900,000 in these two contracts, is there a way that we could reduce them for the cap on College Hospital

Mr. Lavalley replied these are separate entities. There are three main hospitals under the same ownership.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Mr. Smiles moved and Ms. Bell seconded approval of the proposal submitted by College Hospital, Inc., with a reduction in the amount of 10%. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal as moved.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

Tab No. 12: Encompass Health Corporation

Mr. Swier stated this is a repeat contractor requesting \$409,584 this is to train 318 retrainees and is located throughout Southern California. They are requesting a wage modification to the set wages from \$34.77 per hour to the set priority wage of \$26.08. Please note this proposal was originally presented at the June panel meeting. After discussion by the panel on prior performance reported and scheduled to expire the for the five year reporting period in less than 30 days.

Mr. Swier stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Shawn Patzkwsky-Director of Tax Compliance; Leslie Moore- Hospital Educator; Tammy Bialek-Consultant.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Mr. Smiles moved and Ms. Hull seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Encompass Health Corporation in the amount of \$409,584. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal as moved.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

Tab No. 13: Infineon Technologies Americas Corp. dba Hexfet America.

Mr. Swier stated they are repeat contractor and requesting \$443,716 in funding to train 516 retrainees and five job creation trainees located throughout Southern California.

Mr. Swier stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Omekia Snider-Vice President, Tax; Glenn Jones-People/Leadership Dev Sr. Specialist; Bill Sacks-Consultant.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated one area of consideration is that you've had past projects and 80 to 90% completion rate, you do have a consultant and it would be great if you could get it up to 100%.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Mr. Tracy moved and Mr. Smiles seconded approval of the proposal submitted Infineon Technologies Americas Corp. dba Hexfet America in the amount of \$443,716. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal as moved.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

Tab No. 14: Trojan Battery Company, LLC

Mr. Swier stated they are repeat contractor requesting \$444,360 to train 383 trainees and 100 job creation trainees and they are located in LA County. Please note a correction on page five. This is underneath the development services which is listed as \$44,991. But the correct amount is \$39,992.

Mr. Swier stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Shelly Stratton, Senior HR Director, Judith Kriegsmann, President, JTS LLC.

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. Smiles seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Trojan Battery Company, LLC in the amount of \$444,360. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

Tab No. 15: Cal Creative Solutions, Inc. dba CCS Global Tech

Ms. Torres presented a proposal on behalf of Cal Creative Solutions, Inc. dba CCS Global Tech. They are a repeat ETB contractor and they are requesting a total of \$253,000 to train approximately 110 incumbent workers and various skills including productive lab. They while the company does not have a formal targeted Veterans Program, it encourages veterans to apply.

Ms. Torres stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Hitesh Jain, CFO, California Creative Solutions; Bill Sacks, VP, Operations, National Training Company, Inc.; Michelle Dalgarn, Director of Contracts, National Training Company, Inc.

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 Cal Creative Solutions, Inc. dba CCS Global Tech in the amount of \$253,000. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

Tab No. 16: CHCM Inc.

Ms. Torres presented a proposal on behalf of CHCM Inc. they are also a repeat contractor with ETP and they are requesting a total of \$476,928 to train 384 set frontline workers. CHCM doesn't have a formal Veterans hiring program. However, Veterans are encouraged to apply for jobs with the hospital and are given priority for career advancement. The Company also encourages existing employees to contact Veterans who may be interested in opportunities at the hospital.

Ms. Torres stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Alex Santiago - Director of Human Resources; Bill Sacks-Consultant.

Ms. Newsom stated just verify to move the wage ranges presented for tab 16 to be the same as the same occupation titles and wages presented in job one of tab 11.

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 with a reduction in the amount of 10%. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

Tab No. 17: O'Neill Beverages Co. LLC dba O'Neill Vintners and Distillers

Mr. Hoover presented a proposal on behalf of O'Neill Beverages Co. LLC dba O'Neill Vintners and Distillers .This will be O'Neill Beverages' second ETP Contract; the second in the last five years. The previous ETP training focused on upskilling and retaining employees. During that time, the Company grew from 242 to 330 employees. In this proposal, the Company will train newly-hired and incumbent employees on new equipment. Due to an increase in demand of its product, O'Neill Beverages is expecting to see a 21% growth in the next two years. To facilitate this growth, the Company has added new machinery and processes and will be expanding the workforce population while also expanding its facilities, adding a new 75,000 square-foot warehouse. The Company recently spent \$13 million on a new O'Neill Beverages Co. LLC dba O'Neill Vintners & Distillers.

Mr. Hoover stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced "Nancy Hyde- Vice President of Human Resources Palmira Licon- Recruitment Specialist Mike Snead- President (Sierra Consulting Services, Inc.)".

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Mr. Smiles moved and Mr. Morales seconded approval of the proposal submitted by O'Neill Beverages Co. LLC dba O'Neill Vintners and

Distillers in the amount of \$281,106. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve as moved.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

Tab No. 18: Airco Mechanical, Inc.

Ms. Lazarewicz presented a proposal on behalf of Airco they are repeat contractor requesting \$219,305. This is to train a total of 172 workers including 15 new employees. Training will take place at their locations in Sacramento and Alameda County. They specializes in heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems, plumbing systems, process piping, and environmental control systems. Customers include general contractors, hospitals, commercial offices and utility plants. Training will take place at Airco's locations in Sacramento and Alameda County. This will be Airco's second ETP Contract; the second in the last five years.

Ms. Lazarewicz stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Nicol Langley, Accounting Manager; Mike Snead, Consultant - Sierra Consulting Services.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Mr. Smiles moved and Ms. Newsom seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Airco Mechanical, Inc. Staff to adjust wages on Job 2. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

Tab No. 19: Gallo Cattle Company LP dba Joseph Gallo Farms

Ms. Lazarewicz presented a proposal on behalf Gallo Cattle Company LP dba Joseph Gallo Farms This is Gallo Cattle's third ETP Contract; the third in the last five years. The previous training focused on implementing new standards by becoming Safe Quality Food certified as well as increasing skills and cross-training staff in various topics. In this Contract, Gallo Cattle will provide training on new processes, product lines and equipment. To remain competitive domestically and in a growing international market, Gallo Cattle is expanding production with new product lines including new types of shredded cheeses and cheese flavor varieties. The Company is also expanding its production plants in order to utilize animal protein and feed in new products such as fitness shakes, protein bars, and supplements. New product lines will require training on processes and equipment such as Smart Lifts and Automated Palletizers to increase efficiency and speed of the manufacturing process.

Ms. Lazarewicz stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and

introduced Jennifer Cargill, Vice President of Human Resources; Joe Bauer, Training Coordinator; Beth Ingle, Consultant - BLI Co.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Ms. Bell moved and Ms. Hull seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Gallo Cattle Company LP dba Joseph Gallo Farms in the amount of \$349,416. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 8 to 0

Tab No. 20: JLS Environmental Services, Inc.

Ms. Lazarewicz **presented a proposal on behalf of** JLS Environmental Services, Inc. software and new coating and waterproofing procedures. The Company also became a member of the Lionsbridge Contractor Group (LCG) which required training for all staff on the requirements and processes of LCG. For this proposal, JLS will focus training on new Company expansions including asbestos and lead removal, building demolition, insurance claims, and new software. JLS recently received certification in asbestos and lead paint removal which allows the Company to provide complete services to its customers on structures built before 1978. JLS will provide asbestos and lead paint removal training to all Estimators, Project Managers, Lead Technicians and Technicians. The initial asbestos training is 40 hours per trainee and the annual recertification course is eight hours per trainee. Lead paint removal takes another 32 hours per trainee with an eight hour annual refresher course. In addition, JLS is investing in new equipment used for asbestos removal including Negative Air Machines, floor scrapers, and High Efficiency Particulate Air vacuums.

Ms. Lazarewicz stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Cigi Ramesbottom, Office/Human Resources Manager; Mike Snead, Consultant - 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 Ms. Hull seconded approval of the proposal submitted by JLS Environmental Services, Inc. in the amount of \$213,440. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

Tab No. 33: Modesto Industrial Electrical Co., Inc. dba Industrial Electrical Company

Ms. Lazarewicz presented a proposal on behalf of Modesto Industrial Electrical Co., Inc. dba Industrial Electrical Company **provides services in electrical contracting, advanced motor technology, field services, welder repair, generator sales and service, and small engine repair to commercial developers, building owners, and manufacturers throughout California. Training under this proposal will be for the Company's locations in Modesto and Fresno. This is Industrial Electrical Company's first ETP Contract.**

Ms. Lazarewicz stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Angelica Alba, Human Resources/Administrative Assistant; Amber Flynn, Human Resources Manager; Mike Snead, Consultant - Carrasco LP Innovative Tax Solutions.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Mr. Smiles moved and Mr. Dombrowski seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Modesto Industrial Electrical Co., Inc. dba Industrial Electrical Company in the amount of \$245,640. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

{10 minute recess}

REVIEW AND ACTION ON PROPOSALS MULTIPLE EMPLOYER CONTRACTS

Tab No. 21: Finishing Trades Institute DC 36 - Slauson, LLC

Mr. Swier stated Finishing Trades Institute DC 36 - Slauson, LLC is a repeat contractor requesting \$598,680 in funding to train 60 journey workers and 200 apprentice workers.

Mr. Swier stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced David Burtle, Director of Training; Steve Duscha, Consultant.

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. Smiles seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Finishing Trades Institute DC 36 - Slauson, LLC in the amount of \$598,680. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the

proposal.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

Tab No. 22: International Union of Elevator Constructors Local No. 18

Mr. Swier stated International Union of Elevator Constructors Local No. 18 they are repeat contractor requesting \$235,520 in funding to train approximately 259 apprentice worker.

Mr. Swier stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Tony Gazzaniga, Business Manager, IUEC Steve Duscha, and Consultant.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Mr. Tracy moved and Mr. Morales seconded approval of the proposal submitted by International Union of Elevator Constructors Local No. 18 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, 8 to 0.

Tab No. 23: Kern Community College District

Mr. Swier stated Kern Community College District KCCD is also focused on helping unemployed or underserved individuals and has been effectively providing placement services for these individuals (including job search, interview skills, resume preparation, and job fairs), education, skills training, work experience and job placement services for the past several years. Additionally, KCCD designed and implemented a logistic/distribution training program to provide these individuals skills related to warehouse procedures, redistribution of products, workflow, inventory control, and time management. The District works closely with One-Stop Centers, Workforce Investment Board (WIB), HireUP, the Kern County Homeless Collaborative, and the Employment Development Department (EDD).

Mr. Swier stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Dave Teasdale - Executive Director, Economic and Workforce Development Programs.

Acting Chairperson Roberts was looking at your past performance index and you currently have one that's about to close here. You have one that going to be 100% and your performance has been very good. I'm just wondering, going into the future, what it looks like with the COVID, I'm just going to ask you to maybe have some insight and wanted to know what employers are looking at to train new employees.

Mr. Teasdale replied that our employers are indicating that there's a demand for training and while this amounts can be very generous, I anticipate we'll probably get through it in less than two years, given the demand. The pandemic has underscored how important technology skills are and so there's a lot of investment in computer literacy and there's opportunity for people to gear back up as the economy starts to open back up plus the need for training very specific industrial hygiene topics, to be sure that the workplaces are safe, is also creating another demand for training.

Ms. Newsom asked If the applicant could tell me Is it possible to move the wage minimum to \$15 an hour up from \$14 for some of these positions, including clerical staff.

Mr. Teasdale replied it would be possible to do that the reason we did that is in the regulations and one of the things we're trying to support, we have a project called higher up, which is a homeless to job initiative for those folks, a minimum wage job is the first step out of homelessness membrane in the Central Valley wages are very expensive. So I did a quick math and the \$14.34 regulatory minimum on there is the equivalent to a \$20 an hour wage in San Diego and a \$26.75 wage in Santa Clara County, if you use the MIT living wage calculator, so we just wanted the most flexibility to get our folks in our project higher up homeless folks into a job and then progressing through that job as they continue to build their skills.

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. Smiles seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Kern Community College District in the amount of \$597,100. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

Tab No. 24: Studio Arts, Ltd.

Mr. Swier stated Studio Arts, Ltd. is a repeat contractor requesting \$590,400 of funding to train approximately 600 re trainees located throughout Southern California. Please know under active projects it currently a whole payment has been placed on this contract due to current training documentation issues and also underneath prior projects. The past two audit findings have been listed.

Mr. Swier stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Eric Huelsman - President; Art Morales - General Manager; Shish Aikat - Learning Manager.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated under your performance status, as well as the findings of your audit, I am not in a position to move this forward until we get some of these items cleared up. And apparently, there's been many issues over the course of years. Now until we get those cleared up, I'm not really in a position to move this forward. But I'm not the only one that makes these decisions,

so I'm going to pass it on to the rest of the panel to discuss as well.

Mr. Huelsman stated because we have a very broad spectrum of jobs in this particular area of entertainment. It goes anywhere from prop making, all the way out to editorial, and especially visual effects in animation. So I don't know how much we would be able to tell you that would be brief. But we'll certainly do our best to let everybody know what kind of training they'd be getting, especially the software training.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Mr. Smiles moved and Ms. Bell seconded denial of the proposal submitted by Studio Arts, Ltd. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to deny the proposal.

Motion carried, 0 to 8.

{Ms. Newsom left the zoom meeting}

Tab No. 25: San Diego Electrical Training Trust

Ms. Torres stated San Diego Electrical Training Trust is requesting a total funding amount of \$596,872. This includes support cost of \$41,452 and they are proposing to train and three different groups, journey workers for a total of 73 workers, 329 apprentices and 20 apprentices' veterans. Trusted as governed by the Board of Trustees and is a joint effort of International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers IBEW Local 569, and the National Electrical Contractors Association. The 422 plan trainees, including this proposal are all members of IBEW Local 569. And covered by separate collective bargaining agreements for two occupational titles of which our electrical wireman and sound technicians. The San new electrical training trust is committed to train veterans and to supporting job related training that helps veterans transition into California workforce. These electrical training trust is also committed to recruiting underrepresented groups. During COVID, the electrical training trust is providing 50% of training in person and at its training center and 50% via e learning. They do have current agreements, one of which is terminating in September 2, 2021 and on that occurred agreements they have equivalent trucked hours of \$749,880 which is 100% of the approved amount. They're more current agreement, which started in September of 2020. As the writing of this proposal had track potential earnings of \$15,049 which is about 4%. However, they are projecting 100% based on committed hours. The hours committed by the electrical training trust are reported not to be up to date within Cal-E-Force system due to Cal-E-Force uploading issues that HP is working out to help resolve together with the electrical training trust.

Ms. Torres stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Kevin Johnson, Training Director, and San Diego Electrical Training Trust (SDETT)

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Mr. Smiles moved and Mr. Morales seconded approval of the proposal submitted by San Diego Electrical Training Trust in the amount of \$596,872. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

{Ms. Newsom returns}

Tab No. 26: Southern California Resilient Floor & Decorative Covering Crafts JATC

Ms. Torres stated Southern California Resilient Floor & Decorative Covering Crafts JATC are also a repeat contractor. They're requesting a total of \$409,020 which is inclusive of a percent support cost of \$31,800. With the funding their proposal is to train 100 journey workers as well as 160 apprentices. The JTC was created in accordance with a collective bargaining agreement between painters and allied trades District Council number 36 of the International Union of painters and allied trades AFL CIO resilient for and decorative coverings local number 1247. Southern California Flooring JATC recruits Veterans in cooperation with Helmets to Hardhats, a national joint labor-management program that recognizes the link between skills acquired in military service and the building trades. Currently, there are four Veterans in the program and working to recruit more. For ease of administration, it is not requesting a separate Job Number for Veterans.

Ms. Torres stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Sean Padilla/ Coordinator; Steve Duscha/ Consultant.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Mr. Smiles moved and Ms. Hull seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Southern California Resilient Floor & Decorative Covering Crafts JATC in the amount of \$409,020. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

Tab No. 27: Brick Masons' Apprenticeship and Training Trust Fund

Mr. Meyer stated Brick Masons' Apprenticeship and Training Trust Fund is a repeat contractor requesting \$229,440 in funding to serve 70 apprentice and 60 journey workers.

Mr. Meyer stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Robert Collins - Apprenticeship Director; Steve Duscha – Consultant.

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. Tracy seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Brick Masons' Apprenticeship and Training Trust Fund in the amount of \$229,440. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 8 to 0

Tab No. 28: Apprentice & Journeymen Training Trust Fund of the Southern California Plumbing and Piping Industry

Mr. Hoover stated Apprentice & Journeymen Training Trust Fund of the Southern California Plumbing and Piping Industry. Which is a repeat contractor for the Southern California Pipe Trades District Council 16. They're requesting ETP funding amount of \$598,290 for an estimated number of trainees of 259 apprentices under job one. A&J Training Trust serves veterans and participates in veteran outreach and hiring activities, including Helmets to Hardhats. In addition, it has a program to connect with Marines at Camp Pendleton who are completing their military service. The training takes place at Camp Pendleton during the Marines' last 18 weeks of service. Once completed, trainees are entered as second-year apprentices into the trade. Some of these veterans are placed in jobs outside of California and may not be eligible for ETP funding. Therefore, a separate Veteran's Job Number is not requested.

Mr. Hoover stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Preston Riehl, CEO; Steve Duscha, Steve Duscha Advisories (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 Mr. Smiles seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Apprentice & Journeymen Training Trust Fund of the Southern California Plumbing and Piping Industry in the amount of \$598,290. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel

Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 8 to 0

Tab No. 29: Pipe Trades Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee of Santa Clara and San Benito Counties

Mr. Hoover stated Pipe Trades Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee of Santa Clara and San Benito Counties. This is also a repeat contractor for the represented by the Plumbers, United Association Local Union 393. The JATC was created in collective bargaining between Local 393 and management represented by the, South Bay Piping Industry and the Santa Clara Valley Contractors Association. This will be Pipe Trades JATC's eighth ETP Contract, and the sixth in the last five years. Pipe Trades JATC provides Apprentice and Journey worker training to all the pipe trades involved in commercial, industrial and residential plumbing. Courses are designed to provide Commercial Skills, Computer Skills, and OSHA 10/30 training with an emphasis on green technology. In this proposal, Pipe Trades JATC is committed to supporting job-related training that helps Veterans transition into California's workforce and anticipates to train 15 Veterans (Job Number 3). Pipe Trades recruits Veterans in cooperation with Helmets to Hardhats, which is a national joint labor-management program that recognizes the link between skills acquired in military service and the building trades.

Mr. Hoover stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced "Brian Murphy (Curriculum Coordinator), Cindy Amaral (Office Manager), Kelly Greer (Strategy Workplace Communications), John Brauer (CA Labor Federation), & Carl Cimino (JATC Training Director).

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Mr. Smiles moved and Ms. Newsom seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Pipe Trades Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee of Santa Clara and San Benito Counties in the amount of \$597,160. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 8 to 0

Tab No. 30: San Mateo County Electrical Apprenticeship and Training Trust

Mr. Hoover stated San Mateo County Electrical Apprenticeship and Training Trust is a repeat contractor and they're requesting the ETP funding amount of \$599,383 SMJATC is governed by a Board of Trustees comprised of four labor and four management representatives, and it is a joint effort of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW) Local 617 and the National Electrical Contractors Association (NECA). Training will be delivered to trainees at its facility in San

Carlos. This will be SMJATC's ninth ETP Contract; the seventh in the last five years. ETP funding will be used to train Journey workers, Apprentices, and Veteran Apprentices of whom are all members of IBEW Local 617. The union currently represents over 1,500 Electricians in San Mateo County. The JATC is dedicated to providing up-to-date industry skills training, while securing long-term, high-wage job opportunities for its members. ETP funding will allow SMJATC to expand and upgrade its training to meet the needs of local employers and property owners.

Mr. Hoover stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced "Stephan Schnell (Training Director), Kelly Greer (Strategy Workplace Communications), & John Brauer (CA Labor Federation)

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Mr. Smiles moved and Ms. Newsom seconded approval of the proposal submitted by San Mateo County Electrical Apprenticeship and Training Trust in the amount of \$599,383. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 8 to 0

Tab No. 31: SOMA AEC, Inc. dba Oxman College

Mr. Hoover stated SOMA AEC, Inc. dba Oxman College is a repeat contractor and the total ETP funding being requested is for \$596,304 to train an estimate number of trainees of 20 under Job One which is the Small Business retrainees, 20 under Job Number Two, which is HUA and then job number three is 100 priority retrainees and then they also have Job Number Four and is a private, post-secondary vocational school. The College provides training in computer programming, computer applications, continuous improvement, and healthcare to employers throughout California. ETP-funded training will be delivered at its approved Bureau of Private Postsecondary Education (BPPE) offices statewide. This project will be Oxman College's sixteenth ETP Contract, and its sixth in the last five years. This proposal continues Oxman's successful training program on Autodesk Revit software for architectural and engineering firms, as well as training in Medical Skills for long-term nursing facilities in the healthcare industry. Both industries served are designated as priorities and have strong job growth demands in careers with strong wage progression possibilities.

Mr. Hoover stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Michael Dvorkin, President; Lana Dvorkin, Administrator.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated there are three active projects and know one is just probably ready to be completed should be completed this month with the 100% earnings. You got a COVID project then your current project, we just funded you in December, and you're coming back eight months later. I know I got this clarification from the staff because a little concern that you would

come back so soon after you had a project already approved in December. We want to be equitable here and we've always funded Oxman College. But to come back so soon, I just don't know if that's equitable, I would want you to wait either until the first of next year, or at the end of this year. But that's just in if you contracted in March of one year, you could come back in July of that same year, if you had completed 70%. To me, that's not equitable. So I'm saying the same thing here, it's only eight months since your last, I would hope that you would consider coming back at a different time and actually just like to pull it today, and have them come back at either December or January of next year. And asked why did they come back so soon and what the point is for that.

Ms. Dvorkin stated our actual numbers in this agreement have completed training of 175 and we have around 80% of ours completed. That's why we came in as far as training, we have different groups of trainees.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated what I'm saying is do you think it's equitable to come back so soon a time, when we have other projects in our system that also need to be approved. That's all I'm saying is that we want to make sure that we're equitable among all of our constituents, and all of our stakeholders and it seems like we fund you over and over again.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Mr. Smiles moved and Ms. Newsom seconded denial of the proposal submitted by SOMA AEC, Inc. dba Oxman College and motion to table for a later date: Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to deny the proposal.

Motion carried, 0 to 8.

Tab No. 32: California Manufacturers and Technology Association

Ms. Lazarewicz stated California Manufacturers and Technology Association is a repeat contractor requesting \$599,968 to train a total of 1160 workers throughout the state of California.

Ms. Lazarewicz stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced Rob Sanger, Manager of Training.

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 California Manufacturers and Technology Association in

the amount of \$599,968. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 8 to 0

Tab No. 34: Sheet Metal Workers' Joint Apprenticeship and Training Trust Fund of Los Angeles

Mr. Meyer stated Sheet Metal Workers' Joint Apprenticeship and Training Trust Fund of Los Angeles is a repeat contractor requesting \$598,675 in funding to serve 311 apprentice sheet metal workers and Serves the Southern California counties of Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, Inyo, Mono, and Kern.

Mr. Meyer stated joining virtually to respond to questions the panel members may have and introduced David Garcia, Administrator.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Mr. Smiles moved and Ms. Hull seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Sheet Metal Workers' Joint Apprenticeship and Training Trust Fund of Los Angeles in the amount of \$598,675. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal.

Motion carried, 8 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.

Ms. Bell state today of the 30 contracts that we approved, what I find interesting and is 26 of those contracts have contractors, consultants helping them get to the finish line, complete the application. So that means four have to do it independently on their own. Of those 30, one contractor has seven contracts, two contractors have four. But if our goal is to make higher wages for our employees, my concern is how we're going to get the small business person, the grocery store person or the upholstery store person to the finish line. It's very challenging. It's becoming extremely challenging to climb the mountain to get the application completed. So I don't think we have the answer right now but I think we need to start thinking about what are we creating here and what do we want our end results to be. My end result is to get people trained at all level. Not because you're a corporation,

or you have this huge department hiring a consultant or doing it on their own to complete the application, but more so for the average person to get trained.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated this was kind of an unusual panel packet, because that if you recall, they only gave us a small time window to get all these applications in. And as I said earlier, they all came in, like within minutes of when it opened up at midnight. So the ones that had it all put together had consultants, obviously, were the first come first serve, is that the right approach is probably not. I'm hoping that they figure out a way to get the small businesses and people without consultants into the system. The only thing I will request is that in our 130, if you could put some justification in regarding the differences between wages between retraining and the new hires, if there is a big discrepancy that we don't have to mention it all the time, which we can read it, and then have a better understanding behind it.

XII. PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

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

Robert Meyer wanted to follow up on a couple of the earlier projects in the comments regarding veterans training, and the inclusion, I have reached out to the consultant and will work with those companies to articulate a more formalized response in terms of their veterans engagement, providing additional support and some connection for them. Where we can seek some additional alignment with the division of apprenticeship standards, and their guidelines, we can do that similar to how we did in June. So I'll work with that consultant in those companies on the concerns raised.

Acting Chairperson Roberts added maybe you can give suggestions on how they can recruit. But, you know, seeing that in the panel packets kind of was a little bit concerning. And that's even though that wasn't their intention. It's just what we saw.

Robert Meyer stated he would certainly agree. I think given the spectrum of the employers that were fortunate enough to work with, that, you know, sometimes just getting the connection to those conversations and those resources, I think within your department will have much more expanded reach in that area. And if we have that circumstance in the future, please direct them our way.

Phillip Herrera wanted to acknowledge the ETP startup group led by Kellen Hernandez. That's the kind of thinking we need where we look at efficiencies to save time, and of course, time is money. Now's the time to reevaluate the current application approval system and get the panel to wean itself away from this first come first served. There is a way to come up with some competitive criteria. I know this idea has been rejected, certainly by my friends, and by staff. So it's probably a good idea. But I'm not saying we have to have straight up in your face stuff but now's the time for us to adopt some panel criteria for applications. This will weed out the high consulting fees, the repeats too soon, the bad wages, the poor justification, you name it.

Steve Duscha stated he is was very heartened by the comments from the executive director and the actions the panel took today, which I think lay the strong groundwork for putting the \$65M augmentation for ETP into the core funding projects. I was involved in the lobbying efforts for the for the \$50M. And I know many of you were involved as well. I found nothing in my conversations with legislators and legislative staff. Nor did I find anything in the paper that was publicly submitted

to the legislature. Nor did I find anything in the budget act that was enacted by the legislature and signed by the governor that would encourage ETP to go off on new projects, new approaches, and new programs. The conversations I had, and others that I know others had were about how good ETP is how good the program has been for many, many years, and how there was an interest in sustaining the program as it has been in operation. So I'm glad that we're going to make a very strong effort to continue in that direction. And I think there is a very strong language in the ETP statute, allowing the augmentation, the \$65M to be put into the core funding without competitive bidding.

Acting Chairperson Roberts mentioned the help that to both Reg and his team, as well as Stewart Knox, which we're really fortunate to have back in the Department of Labor. He's on our side, he's a big proponent of ETP so between Stewart and Reg hopefully, everything will come to fruition

Robert Sanger stated the ETP startup group is going to be a great asset to be able to really spread the resources of ETP around and like how the ETP is working multifunctional, not just in single offices, but between offices. So I think that's going to be really important as all these new projects are moving forward.

Juliana Kirby stated for those who are seeking resources to access veteran pipelines, I would encourage you to go talk to your local workforce investment board and partner with them as they are very tied into all kinds of different veterans recruiting groups. The additional criteria layered on top of these applications to get away from the first come first serve. There's already a lot of complexity to it. There's already priority industries and focuses on Veterans and high wages and occupations and things like that it's just would make it even so much more cumbersome. the reason you're seeing multiple projects from the same consultant come in on the same panel meeting is because of the administrative shut downs of the program, and opening and closing of the programs and having everybody submit all at once just keep the flow open, stop shutting down the program and creating these blips in backlog. These large backlogs are a tape, it does take months to get through that pre application review. And even though I'm a consultant and I do convene with my consultant, partners regularly, we do lament about how hard this is for employers to do this on their own. We don't take joy in the complexity of this program, for our own benefit, and we do feel that it should be made more accessible for employers to do directly. Based on the new cut off is what exactly is going to be the benchmark for being dumped out of the system again, when we just were dumped out and then had to redo it in May. Are you going to be dumped out? If you are in your seven day window to submit your application? Are you dumped out if you've submitted your application, but it's not approved? Are you dumped out because your pre app has been in since May but haven't heard anything? If staff is getting ready to do this, you must know exactly what your benchmark is going to be for who you're going to dump out. And we would like to know that because it's not just us to have to do a lot of rework, we still have to go back to the employers and refresh their information and explain yet another delay. So we would like to have as much clarity around that as possible

XIII. MEETING ADJOURNMENT

Acting Chairperson Roberts adjourned the meeting at 1:10 p.m.