



Employment Training Panel

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
EMPLOYMENT TRAINING PANEL**

Zoom Virtual Meeting  
December 11, 2020

**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  
Legal Counsel

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
EMPLOYMENT TRAINING PANEL**

Zoom Virtual Meeting  
December 11, 2020

**I. PUBLIC PANEL MEETING CALL TO ORDER**

Acting Chairperson Janice Roberts called the meeting to order at 9:32 a.m.

**II. ROLL CALL**

Present

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

Executive Staff

Reg Javier, Executive Director  
Peter Cooper, Assistant Director  
Michael Cable, Legal Counsel

**III. AGENDA**

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

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

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 approval of the Meeting Minutes with the amendment that Ms. Newsom noted on page 7; for Hall Ambulance Services, Inc. that no EMTs deserve to be making less than \$15 an hour. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

**V. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

Mr. Javier welcomed the Panel Members, Applicants, and Stakeholders and reported that today's meeting is approximately \$8.1M with \$40,005 in delegation orders, for a total of \$8.1M.

Mr. Javier recognized the following persons in attendance: Diana Torres, San Diego Regional Office Manager; Ryan Swier, North Hollywood Regional Office Manager; Jana Lazarewicz, Sacramento Regional Office Manager, and Heather Miguel, Program Projects Unit Manager.

Mr. Javier reported that they have been working on ways to clarify the way that wages are addressed and presented in the panel proposals. First, the final post retention wage column of the training plan table has been clarified to no longer default to the ETP required minimum wage, or rather, will show the lowest actual paid post retention wage per job number. The actual paid post retention wage will also appear in chart one, and is the wage that contractors will be held to in order to successfully complete the retention period for their contracts. The wage range by occupation table has also been clarified to show that wage ranges presented here are the actual paid post retention wages that will appear in the contracts. The contract language has been similarly updated to reflect all these changes. The hope is that these changes and there are more coming will help provide a clear picture of what is being proposed. Then as the panel approve applications, staff will be able to ensure that each project's contract, performance metrics and outcomes are all aligned with what had been proposed and accepted. As the panel continues to determine what factors to consider when deciding whether or not to fund a project. The need to ensure that they get what they bought becomes really clear, especially during times of leaner funding, or when demand is greater than the available funding.

Mr. Javier displayed a graph that shows the progression.

## **VI. REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR**

Mr. Cooper reported today's panel meeting is approximately \$15.8M plus \$166,221 in delegation orders for a total \$15.9M.

Regarding Core Funds for this Fiscal Year:

If all FY 20/21 proposals are funded today, the panel will have approved just over \$50.5M in 200 projects to date.

ETP will have approximately \$29.5M for the remainder of the 20/21 Fiscal year with a demand of \$120.4M.

Under 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 we have approved a total of 17 delegations.

Regarding 20/21 program funding:

To date we have had approximately 743 projects submitted, with a value just over \$120.4M.

Regarding Demand and Allocations:

We are within our allocations now, but may need to revisit them in the future.

In Regional Offices and AAU:

Single Employer Contracts requests: \$81.2M (\$30M original allocation)

MEC requests: \$14.3M demand (\$20M originally)  
Small Business: \$19.4M demand (\$5M originally)  
Critical Proposals: \$0 demand (\$5M originally)  
Apprenticeships: \$5.5M in demand (\$20M originally)  
Overall demand is currently \$120.4M, with \$29.5M left for fiscal year 20/21

Number of projects for 20/21 in AAU and applications received by the RO's:  
Total number of projects in the RO: 78  
Total number of projects in AAU: 665  
Currently a total of 743

Mr. Cooper provided clarification on what is Covid Response and shared how ETP created this program in March to provide current contract holders with a variety of flexibilities because of the pandemic. ETP limited this to employers that are in industries considered "essential businesses" by the Governor's Office. Such as healthcare, manufacturing, etc. Mr. Cooper also reported what is the Pilot which the Panel created in May to rapidly help employers hire new workers and rehire ones that had been laid off with funding, capped at \$200,000 per contract. ETP limited this to employers that are in industries that support the health and well-being of Californians, including the food supply chain. There are many, but not all, businesses and industries that are eligible under both programs. This Covid Pilot Allocation of \$30M was derived by permitting up to 50% of some of the funds from other allocations – MEC, Single Employer, and Critical Proposal. This was part of program design approved by the panel. The goals of managing the funds this way was to spread the pain equally. Since the COVID Pilot application period is ending at the end of this month, we believe we have enough in that allocation. ETP has \$10.8M in the application process. The real concern is with the overall demand and supply numbers. We'll be around tapped out on everything except critic proposals. Regarding apprenticeship, although the demand shows we have \$2M more than needed for the supply, staff are working on some additional applications and we will have sufficient demand for the allocation.

Acting Chairperson Roberts inquired what the pre app demand is.

Mr. Cooper then asked Willie Atkinson to provide the answer to the question.

Mr. Atkinson explained the way they figure out the demand is looking at the projected number of trainees that the contractor has submitted in their pre application. Then they use a funding number that they come up with and multiply that that's how they come up with the projected demand.

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

Legal Counsel Michael Cable clarified the motion to approve the Consent Calendar by noting the exceptions to the Consent Calendar, which include items 1, 7, 8, 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22 and 23; that were pulled from Consent Calendar, as they will be reviewed individually today by panel in order.

**ACTION:** Mr. Smiles moved and Ms. Bell seconded approval of the Consent Calendar with the exceptions noted by Legal Counsel. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

## **VII. REPORT OF THE CAL-E-FORCE ROLL OUT**

Tara Armstrong gave an update on Migration – ETP staff and many of our customers have been busy with Migration and Training – so far we have complete migration of 29 contracts with no transactional data activity 37 contracts with activity which are the BETA Single Employer Group- this was our initial tests – they were successful with no breaks in the system so will begin the stress testing moving in single employers. So next to come will be single employers that are approved today and this December panel, and going to move in all single contracts that have no transactional data. Then MECs Training and Materials have also been provided and excited to work with our customers on this platform.

A. in CalEForce all uploads will be done in real-time, in legacy anything over 500 records had to upload overnight/the next day- enhancement

B. in Legacy the entire upload will only work if there are ZERO format errors – where as In CalEForce we allowing for uploads to pull it apart and accept the correct ones and only return a REPORT for incorrectly formatted uploads.

C. Upload times has changes due to these enhancements. For uploads UNDER 500 the average time changed from immediate to average of 9 minutes. For uploads OVER 500 the average time changed from next day to less than 30 minutes. Also we have built in a process where the user does not have to stay idle while the upload is going, the user is free to move around the system or leave the system and when complete - will receive an email – this info is also avail on our website.

NAICS data Lookup feature– with our Salesforce platform, we have added a new a NAICS data lookup, this allows our stakeholders to enter a 6-digit NAICS Industry Code and our system will tell you information such as ETP Priority Industry status, ETP COVID Response status.

To Come: Our team is still working hard to develop the Application and Pre-Application prototype as well as rest of ETP Contracts to Migrate, specifically the BETA MEC Group and moving all the MEC Contracts. Stress-test it I do want to thank all our customers for attending training and embracing the new system. And providing feedback. If there any question, please don't hesitate to email us at our command center. [ETPCalEForce@etp.ca.gov](mailto:ETPCalEForce@etp.ca.gov).

## **VIII. POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING REPORT TO PANEL**

Ms. Newsom reported the Zoom Policy Committee Meeting on Thursday, October 29, 2020, covered a variety of topics and discussion about the following items:

Ms. Newsom reported they had a quick update on Assembly Bill 1457, which was vetoed. This would have had ETP partnered with multiple organizations to create a statewide network of training centers. It was vetoed due to the duplicative efforts of the bill itself and the lack of designated funding. Phil Herrera gave a presentation on electronic record keeping this was a follow up to his earlier presentation on the same topic. Mr. Herrera explained how learning management systems also known as LMS are becoming the norm for many companies. He reviewed some of the recent changes that ETP made to the ways they accept electronic record keeping and brought some suggestions for further consideration. These items will be explored at future policy committee meetings.

Ms. Newsom then reported the policy committee next looked at additional ways ETP can serve veterans by reviewing the veteran's guidelines and by brainstorming some additional services they were able to offer to this population. Well, not all the ideas were accepted, stakeholders will see a few changes to the information they request and applications and also display and panel proposals

regarding the veteran population, and ETP's Economic Development Unit will be increasing and enhancing the types of referrals they can provide to companies wishing to serve veterans more thoroughly. The largest topic of discussion a concern at the policy committee meeting was on the topic of wages and it was addressed in three main items. One, using the actual wages being paid to trainees as the contractual wage rather than using the ETP required minimum wage on the contractual wage; Two, wage progression; and Three, revisions that materially changed the ETP contracts pertaining to wages. The discussion on the use of actual wages as the contract wage was well received by committee members and stakeholders. Beginning with the December panel projects will show the actual wage that will be the contractual wage.

Ms. Newsom then reported additional edits to both the applications and the panel proposals will be instituted and finalized in the coming months. The discussion on wage progression was a lot more complicated. With the policy committee members generally in favor of having wage progression information available, while stakeholders pointed out the logistical challenges and obtaining this information, especially for the MEC's revisions that materially change the contracts also generated a lot of discussion. The issue of wages as a whole will continue to appear at future policy committee meetings. The next policy committee meeting will be on Thursday, December 17, at 1pm via Zoom. If anyone has any topics they'd like considered for future Committee meeting agendas, please email them to Lis Testa at [Elisabeth.Testa@etp.ca.gov](mailto:Elisabeth.Testa@etp.ca.gov).

## **IX. UPDATE ON MORATORIUM ON AMENDMENTS THAT INCREASE FUNDING**

Ms. Testa presented an update and a PowerPoint presentation on the Moratorium on Amendments that Increase Funding. ETP allows revision requests to increase the total funding awarded to an existing ETP contract. In any given year, ETP will see approximately 20 of these amendment requests, which usually total between \$2-3M in funding. Given that ETP is currently experiencing massive demand for our program simultaneously with a decrease in our total funding available, we have been searching for ways to maximize our funding, especially as the larger economy continues to be heavily impacted by the COVID pandemic.

We are at a point where current demand for funding, in terms of preliminary applications currently in AAU and the Field Office's queues, exceeds the funding that remains available for this FY. When looking at how funds need to be distributed over the remainder of the FY, there is no likelihood of funding being available for amendments that increase contract value. Therefore, staff would like Panel's approval to cease accepting amendments that increase funding for the remainder of this FY.

Ms. Testa then reported this can preserve an additional \$1-2M available of our total budget to use for additional contracts this FY. This will also help in reducing the backlog of Preliminary Applications currently in the Applications Assessment Unit. This moratorium on funding increase amendments can be reviewed along with the other funding priorities (ie: project caps, allocations, etc) for next FY in spring, 2021.

Contracts are entered into through the mutual agreement of both parties, in this case, ETP and the contractor. Amendments, including funding increase amendments, can therefore also only occur through the agreement of both parties; meaning: the contractor has no entitlement to an amendment. Given this fact, and our current funding situation and wider economic landscape, staff feels this is a pragmatic step that can help us to manage our funds for the remainder of the fiscal year to the greatest benefit of all.

Staff is requesting a moratorium be placed on amendments that increase funding for the remainder of FY 20-21, effective for projects appearing at the January, 2021 Panel meeting and onwards.

Ms. Testa asked the Panel if there were any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

**ACTION:** Ms. Newsom moved and Ms. Bell seconded approval of the moratorium on amendments as it stands. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

## **X. EXTENSION OF COVID RESPONSE PLAN PRESENTATION**

Ms. Testa presented a PowerPoint presentation addressing the Extension of COVID Response Plan. In March of this year, as the COVID pandemic began to seriously impact our economy, ETP launched the COVID Response Plan. This plan provides a series of revisions that customers may request to help ease complications that arose in trying to adjust to the new requirements caused by the pandemic, especially around electronic recordkeeping requirements and other important contract elements. The Response Plan also provided a list of contractors who would be eligible for expedited processing during eligibility and development. These included small businesses, MECs, and companies who have an EDD assigned NAICS code that falls within a set of industries that the Governor has declared as essential.

In May, with the pandemic still widespread, ETP amended the Response Plan to add some additional benefits for customers, and also launched the ETP COVID Pilot, which is a program aimed at incentivizing hiring in both Single Employers and MECs in the health care and food supply chain industries, to help ease the strain of the pandemic on our communities. Currently, both the COVID Response Plan and the COVID Pilot are set to expire on December 31, 2020.

Since the pandemic is still very much active, with no vaccine as yet widely available, staff would like to extend the COVID Response Plan through June 30, 2021, the end of the current fiscal year, with an option to again extend the program at that time if it is still needed. However, staff is not requesting to also extend the COVID Pilot. We currently have enough Preliminary Applications in house to more than consume the remaining funding available for this FY. Therefore, we do not have additional funding available to continue the COVID Pilot past the end of the calendar year.

To clarify: if Panel approves this extension, then any revision request submitted under the COVID Response Plan must be received by COB on 6/30/2021 in order to be processed. Similarly, any Preliminary Application under consideration for expedited processing under the COVID Response Plan must also be received by COB 6/30/2021 in order to be processed as such. COVID Pilot Preliminary Applications must be received by the original deadline of COB 12/31/2020.

Staff is requesting that the COVID Response Plan be extended, as outlined above, to June 30, 2021, with an option to extend again at that time if necessary

Ms. Testa asked the Panel if there were any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

**ACTION:** Mr. Smiles moved and Ms. Bell seconded approval of the extension of the COVID response plan, and not to extend the COVID pilot plan. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

Acting Chairperson Roberts provided a history lesson regarding where all these funds come from and that the money actually comes from the Employment Training Tax, which is part of the payroll system of their employers and employees. And so when they don't have employers or employees, their money gets severely compromised. And so this is what's happened. So over the last 30 years with ETP had major swings in the funding streams, depending on what's going on with the economy. Over the last five years, it has been a very lucrative program, we've been very fortunate to be the premier economic development incentive for California.

Acting Chairperson Roberts then reported they look at the panel packets very closely, and want to be fair and equitable with all employers, wanting to look at each one on its own merits and its own opportunities. And did make some recommendations to the staff and give them a lot of credit, considering they have unquestionably talked to their subcontractors and their employers to say, don't be surprised when they come to the panel asking for this value of money, that it won't be right sized and they said, that's fine, we'll come anyway. And want to make sure that they understand that that could be factor in their decision making. It's the time to look at what are some other things that they can do to reduce some of these funding. Now, there are other alternative funding streams, ETP can't be their sole source of funding, they have a tax credit right now out there called the mainstream tax credit that can help small businesses up to \$1,000 per employee, there are other tax incentives that they could look at, or they can train on their own dollar. That is also something they can do, they certainly don't want to do away with training, but they can use their own resources, these are not entitlements, they're not guaranteed, any funding is a gift, it's a gift, it's not something that they should count on. So don't be surprised if they make recommendations to cut several of the projects during this panel meeting.

Ms. Newsom stated the presentation they received earlier today from staff really puts them to task to start having to make these tough decisions and maybe they have some additional conversations at the policy committee of how do they merit their values and what they want to see come from these contracts with good wages, good jobs, good training, with what's presented before them today? Because as Mr. Cooper noted, today, just meeting the minimum, that's not it's not going to be good enough any longer and so how do they evaluate that or is it like a bid criteria metric that they see in the private sector or what does it look like, but they need to, they need to start focusing on that.

## **XI. REVIEW AND ACTION ON PROPOSALS**

### **CONSENT CALENDAR CONTRACTS**

#### **Tab No. 1: ABC Home Health Care LLC dba Bridge Home Health and Hospice, LLC**

Ms. Torres presented a proposal on behalf ABC Home Health Care LLC dba Bridge Home Health and Hospice, LLC is a Repeat Contractor. Total ETP funding being requested is for the amount of \$200,000. Their last agreement ended in March of 2019 with a 17% performance rate at approximately \$58,000. This funding is a COVID pilot, and they are requesting to train 100 job



creation trainees. And they also are including 12 affiliates, as part of this proposal, in which they will train across the board 100 trainees.

Ms. Torres stated that there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Andrea Goodwin, VP Human Resources: William Parker, Administrative Subcontractor.

Ms. Newsom stated she had concerns about past performance and rewarding poor past performance with doubling up of previous amounts. I would like to see this right size because I don't think it has been so far and times have changed.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated this can't be an excuse that they can just throw in bad performance into these COVID pilots thinking that it's a different program and it's now acceptable, it still isn't acceptable. There has to be some sort of right sizing going on and made a suggestion to right size it to \$60,000, and instead of 100 new employees would be 30.

Ms. Goodwin stated that essentially they failed in their first attempt at ETP funding, but are a much different company now compared to 2017. Shortly before their first project, they were spun off and pretty much left to sink or swim and they lost all of their HR staff and had to outsource the department. For many months their survival was at stake but they just did not have the internal resources to maintain compliance for ETP success, which they of course, deeply regret. They have made remarkable progress as a business. Been recognized by Inc. magazine as the fastest growing home health company in the United States, and also the fastest growing home health company in Southern California. They have 120 openings right now for full time staff and they have hired 375 employees in the last six months. The HR department has expanded from one that was outsourced to now a staff before that will utilize 12 training directors at each of their individual facilities to collect all of their ETP documentation, they will only need to document 400 hours of training for 100% performance and in the prior project under difficult circumstances, they did exceed that by 744%. So they do understand any reticence to their grants or requests. But would it be possible to start maybe with a smaller amount of funding and upon documentation of those hours, be allowed to request the balance.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated that everyone that we've right size in the past, because of past performance, they come up with the same kind of concerns or kind of comments and appreciate all of that, it's just that there has to be some accountability don't want everyone to think that having this COVID-19 pilot that it's an easy way to get in and kind of mitigate any kind of bad past performance that you've had and don't believe that they could go ahead and add anything to that.

Ms. Testa stated they are allowed to have a COVID pilot project and then a regular project at the same time. So they could have two projects at the same time, but not to COVID pilot projects.

Ms. Newsom stated that the proof needs to be in the performance, as we've already stated.

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 ABC Home Health Care LLC dba Bridge Home Health and Hospice, LLC's proposal in a reduced amount of \$60,000. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present

voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

**Tab No. 7: Best Formulations, Inc.**

Mr. Swier presented a proposal on behalf of Best Formulations, Inc. which is a repeat contractor and requesting \$198,950 in ETP funding. For this core funded project with both retrainees and job creation.

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 Best Formulations, Inc.'s proposal in the amount of \$198,950. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

**Tab No. 8: Best Formulations, Inc. (COVID-19)**

Mr. Swier presented a proposal on behalf of Best Formulations, Inc. (COVID-19) because they go hand in hand and is the COVID pilot project for the same company for \$200,000 as well. They don't have the company representatives on the left hand side but they do have their screen names. They did use their best effort to try to get all the consent calendar representatives online.

Mr. Swier stated that there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Denise Zamora and Barbara Stafford.

Ms. Newsom expressed concern regarding these two proposals because these two proposals are very much married to each other one retrainees, job creation, and the other one is for COVID, rapid response. And so it's taking what they had received previously, an approximate amount of \$100,000, and then quadrupling it to a total amount of \$400,000. And looking at both of the proposals, the training is very similar. In both tab seven, and eight, if not duplicative, and want to make sure like That they are actually training different employees, for each of the projects and the programs.

Acting Chairperson Roberts noted the COVID pilot can be the same employees, the new employees as in a standalone project. However, they can't just fill out two rosters for the same training thing, this one goes to the COVID. And this one goes to the regular project, it has to be a whole new set of training curriculum. So when they do the four hour training for the COVID, then if they're the same employees under the other the new standalone project, they have to have different training a different training curriculum. And so what we're doing is we're just expanding, expanding the four hours of training, really, four hours of training really isn't enough. So if they wanted to do additional training, under the new project, they could so. She didn't really think too heavily about these two that is when combined them together, they never even paying close to the cap, even though they were much higher than their original amount that they had on their last contract. But there are some other ones that are in this panel that have exceeded the maximum cap based on the two programs, but this one in itself hadn't.

Ms. Stafford the VP of people experience replied they are correct, this is two different programs that we're looking at. Some of the biggest challenges is trying to continually managing to grow, even during this COVID time, but trying to find people has been such a challenge, because people just don't want to work, they want to stay safe in regards to COVID and safety has been their number one priority. It's a different plan when they come to the development of their employees, they have managed to keep 89% retention rate and to continue to grow this past year.

Ms. Newsom stated speaking of wages, in their first proposal, the retrainees proposal for production level two training, they have their starting wage at \$16.55. And then their second proposal under the COVID pilot, their starting wage is \$15 an hour for the same position production level two, how soon would their wages progress from \$15 to the \$16.55 with this training,

Ms. Stafford added it depends on how quickly they learn the equipment and wish it was something simple to learn, but it isn't and some of them, depending on their efficiency will tell them how quickly they give them a bump. What realized when they have people who learn quickly and develop quickly, they want to bump up their salary quickly, so they can retain them. Because they have a lot of competitors and if they are not actively looking at their salary, they lose them quickly.

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 Best Formulations, Inc.'s proposal in the amount of \$200,000. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

#### **Tab No. 10: Brea Chamber of Commerce**

Ms. Torres introduced Brea Chamber of Commerce which is a first time ETP contractor, they are requesting \$199,053. They are also a multiple employer contract and did want to point out to the panel that they just recently received some information on this that the panel should be aware of one from the third party representative. And that is that under the list of participating employers, which demonstrates the demand for the proposal, there is under the list is Alps heating and Air Conditioning. Their understanding is no longer participating. In addition to that, they also received information that K Hill Contractors, which notes here they were previously provided with information that they did not have union representation. However, they now know that they do have union representation. However, they do not have a union letter support for them.

Ms. Torres stated that there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Heidi Gallegos, President/CEO and Larry Mandell, Administrative Subcontractor.

Ms. Newsom asked who the union representation is because some questions goes into current construction curriculum.

Ms. Torres stated my apologies for that is that they just heard that this morning. So I did not have time to research with regards to it. So consequently they have some demand questions here with regard to about \$125,000 that we're substantiation for demand are no longer part of that core group of consideration.

Acting Chairperson Roberts inquired if there has been any new list of participating employers.

Ms. Torres replied that was just provided this morning from staff and they haven't been provided with any what they call, backfill for those that are no longer participating as at this moment.

Mr. Mandell stated when he received the requests this morning about the contractors and provided the information to Diane, I also added two or three additional companies coming in. They weren't on the 100B at the time that I submitted it. So stay tuned all which is a union contractor. I do have the letters. They came on board about three weeks ago.

Ms. Newsom stated this jumped out because it's also construction curriculum too and when you're training carpenters, laborers, masons plumbers, and technicians. And it looks to be some of it is located outside of the realm of Brea, maybe it's not a hands on kind of training, and maybe it is. But just don't feel internally that its best practice for a Chamber Of Commerce to be providing this kind of construction that can be provided by apprenticeship programs. And that is provided by apprenticeship programs, and or community colleges, where the trainee is either going through the apprenticeship program or a community college and receiving this training, and also receiving certifications or college credits that they're then going to be able to use and I know that they included a sentence in here on page four of six that Brea Chamber represents that construction training will not include any training which parallels or competes with any current apprenticeship program. But then look at the curriculum that's being proposed, and if they approved today, this is very duplicative of all apprenticeship programs that have received funding pertaining to the manufacturing skills section of their proposal. Things that jumped out at me automatically I know that there are other trades that are doing this, including apprenticeship programs for the carpenters, the laborers, the Masons, and also bricklayers, plumbers and pipefitters, bricklaying terminology, brick paving techniques, cement blocks, and bricks and electrical systems in theory, forklift and aerial training. These are all things that are done by apprenticeship programs. And we're going through these tough times, now taking a much closer look at proposals and seeing things that they know, maybe they passed previously, when the times were good. And now that we're on lockdown in more than one way, for funding right now looking at things with a closer look.

Mr. Mandell inquired if the training that is being provided is being provided by the participating employer, for their own employees, it is a much more efficient manner, because they are number one being trained specifically on what the employer needs. But it's also much more cost efficient because they keep the money internally. Rather than having to pay a third party to provide the same training.

Ms. Newsom stated she will continue to always look with a lens of these proposals with what is best for the trainee and the worker, and what the trainee and the worker are getting out of the program, not just the contractor and the employer. I feel very strongly that when workers and management are in alignment together, times are good for everybody. And not seeing that with this. And I feel that it is a best practice in the industry, that construction training be done via apprenticeship and Community College and that results in certifications and a better benefit to the worker themselves. So I am not comfortable with this proposal, including all of this construction curriculum.

Mr. Mandell inquired if for every construction, every nine union construction company that comes before the panel, are they even as a single employer, and are they ready? Are they going to recommend that unless they do Community College and union apprenticeship training they won't be approved?

Ms. Newsom stated that is not what I stated, there are plenty of union and non-union apprenticeship programs that also receive funding from them and it is a best practice that construction curriculum be performed via apprenticeship, whether it be union or non-union.

Ms. Gallegos stated when they spoke a little bit about why some of the businesses are not within Brea. They do have larger employers here in town, as well as the outside community and through the state of California. And really business knows no boundaries. And so they will sometimes have larger employers that have business interests here in the north orange county region. And so hence why they might be a member of the chamber or they might have contracts with the County of Orange or the city of Brea and hence why they would have that interest in them. Again, its business knows no boundaries, and hence where they might see folks that are not out of gray and proper.

Ms. Newsom replied but I still have concerns about the relationship between the contractors that are outside of their jurisdiction like they know how that goes.

Acting Chairperson Roberts made a motion to approve it because it's a first time applicant, I not aware of, not that detailed around apprenticeship, non-apprenticeship type of training programs, I want to give them the opportunity to train in these type of categories.

Ms. Newsom requested to make a different motion to approve this proposal, but removing job number one, which includes the carpenters, laborers, masons plumbers to new track technicians. And so it would be approval for job number two that includes the therapist and the clinical supervisors as well as job number three, which includes encounters.

Legal Counsel Michael Cable inquired for clarification, are they saying that the first initial motion did not get a second? So that is off the table? And now there's a new motion.

Acting Chairperson Roberts replied yes. I didn't get a second on my motion so Ms. Newsom made a second motion to pull job number one and that would be for about half of the funding.

Ms. Torres noted that would reduce the agreement for their information of by approximately \$108,000.

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 by eliminating Job Number One, and approving Job Number Two and Job Number Three of Brea Chamber of Commerce's proposal, which would reduce the agreement amount to approximately \$108,000. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

#### **Tab No. 11: Butte Glenn Community College District (COVID-19)**

Ms. Lazarewicz introduced Butte Glenn Community College District (COVID-19). They are a repeat multiple employer contract and they are asking for \$200,000.

Ms. Lazarewicz stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Annie Rafferty.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated this project will be the third concurrent project and is just about to close out but still this is a point that I wanted to make is that it's not okay to keep coming through year after year during these times. So I want them to think about it when they keep building on the caps that they mean their caps are this they know, you've reached the cap on every one of their projects. And in the past have not been a problem, their performance has been great. But the idea is now they have to look at everyone, they know, saying wait a minute, is this just being greedy, can they go ahead and they know, train on their own, they can't keep counting on ETP as their full source of training. It is more of a discussion. And I also wanted to let them know that all of their participating employers are all saying that they're 100 plus business. So is there no small businesses that you're interacting with.

Ms. Rafferty explained as highlighted, they have had multiple contracts that have passed over periods of terms they did end are at 19. And that is a matter of finalizing, they know, payments and records and processing. But that has been fully completed and processed at 100%. For some time now, the ETP 20 contract that was recently approved, while the panel packet reflects a small percentage of uploads, they do have 4,333.5 hours that have been applied to that source 12%. And 49% of that contract is also reflecting their local skilled nursing facilities that are training CNA projects that are in motion, and being delivered on schedule as projected. And so that's where the some of the crossover. As they also know, both of those projects ET19 and ET20 had critical nature due to post campfire impacts. And so the relative nature of these employers, while they're large employers in the COVID project, one of those is representation of local smaller facilities that are represented by Rockport, which is a larger organization. But the primary focus on their COVID-19 project is locally. Fit Sun is the priority of those that are included. They are a local organization that is an apparel manufacturer, and they've converted their operations to be making masks. They've added a third shift and they're and they've in the new hires that are reflected in there are direct to garment operations, and mechanics that are new hires to support the increased volume of managing that production. And they do work with small businesses, the small businesses are primarily reflected in their 8020 contract and traditionally in their 8019, because we're northern rural California Butte and Glen County. Mainly everybody's less than 100 employees.

Acting Chairperson Roberts then stated but this one here, the new hire pilot program, those are all going to be large businesses that you're going to source or how's that working.

Ms. Rafferty explained Fit Sun has recently become a large business, which is in response to COVID in the production of masks. So they have reached over the 100 employees. And Cal Olive has a small group of about 10 people there. They're also local, and they're one of their larger employers because they've added a third shift, and then making olive oil. The other. The other companies are skilled nursing facilities. And those skilled nursing facilities are part of a larger organization. So it's a special project. Some of their smaller companies that they tried to work with, and didn't meet the qualifications of the COVID-19. Because, they know, one company was a healthcare in particular, and they did a shared reduction and workforce and staff, they didn't lay anybody off, and they didn't have any new hires. But they had some significant impacts to their organization that they were requesting to be part of this project. So as they can see in the plan, we're mindful about who we're considering to be part of the COVID-19 and to provide training in response to the impacts these companies have had.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked but how many of those businesses that they have are new businesses? Are they the same old bucket of businesses that they go to year after year? Are they going through the same group of same people over and over again, because it's easier, or are they reaching out beyond that, for marketing to new employers?

Ms. Rafferty explained they bring on so many different new employers and respond to worker shortage needs. Specifically with the CNA project. They have they started with one CNA organization to validate the process. And they have now added four additional facilities on their ET20 contract. They are all new clients. In the manufacturing space. While they have some traditional employers that they can serve, that would be primary.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked them to be respectful of the ETP funding and think of maybe other alternatives that they can get funding for 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. Hull seconded approval of the Butte Glenn Community College District's proposal in the amount of \$200,000. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

#### **Tab No. 17: Fowler Packing Company, Inc. (COVID-19)**

Ms. Lazarewicz introduced Fowler Packing Company, Inc. (COVID-19) and stated they're requesting \$200,000 to train 100 new employees. They are a repeat contractor.

Ms. Lazarewicz stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Brett Zall and Jacqueline Rios.

Ms. Newsom had pulled this one because I thought I needed to be right sized down to 100,000 based off of past performance

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated also they always have a lot of justification as to why they didn't perform. I don't know how many times that I have said around the training infrastructure does not seem to support the training dollars. I've said that many times, they have a CEO or an HR person is going to be solely responsible for these projects. I always see it in the justification later on why they don't perform. I'm just saying they can put the justification all they want. But if they don't perform, they don't perform. And we've given every opportunity to do that. I also agreed to fund up to \$100,000 as well.

Ms. Rios explained yes, I do understand where you're coming from. Brett and I are part of the new HR team so they are taking over this project, and they will definitely take accountability for any previous, shortcomings from the program. They are a grower, shipper, packer, and been one of the few companies that were fortunate enough to be growing in this really difficult time. So each season are adding new employees, they have expanded, COVID procedures just above and beyond what they can possibly think of above what the requirements were even back in March. Constantly thinking about how we're going to keep their employees safe and this environment, just with an

operation of this scale it does take funding to train, implement, and just everything that they need to do make sure everybody's safe.

Acting Chairperson Roberts thanked them for that consideration and for agreeing to any kind of right sizing that they done and sorry that they had to take the brunt of past performance for other employees, but again, and being HR, who knows maybe next month, you'll work for another company? That's why I worry that they don't have more infrastructure. It's just not two HR people that are handling this, that there can be maybe some more infrastructure involved in supporting this project.

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 Fowler Packing Company, Inc.'s proposal in the reduced amount of \$100,000. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

**Tab No. 18: Greater San Fernando Valley Chamber of Commerce (COVID-19)**

Mr. Swier presented a proposal for Greater San Fernando Valley Chamber of Commerce (COVID-19) is requesting \$200,000 to train 100 retrainees.

Mr. Swier stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Nancy Hoffman Vanyek and Deborah Imonti.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated it's a Chamber Of Commerce, and they have had past performance, which is fine. According to their notes here on the 130, it looks like you're going to get 100% of their two projects that they have concurrently. So you've got two projects concurrently, this will be their third concurrent project. Again, to me, you've come through and they keep coming through and did want to say that they were one of the one Chamber of Commerce that I did notice that they had at least 50% of small business in their projects. I thought that was that you're reaching out to the small business in their community, and appreciate that.

Ms. Newsom asked them if they'd like to elaborate a little bit more about participants of their MECs that are outside of San Fernando Valley that they have listed and how that training will be conducted.

Ms. Hoffman Vanyek explained that yes, since the start of COVID, they really became businesses first responder. This is not the only program that they offer, they have actually partnered with a small business majority and offered different types of webinars and training to businesses, as well as with the SBA and the SBDC. This is just one component and completely understand the concern of them coming back regularly. Because they are Regional Chamber, they cover a wide area. And they do market to their members who also refer them to other organizations. But at the beginning of COVID, they started partnering with chambers all across Southern California, they have weekly events. And so a lot of the businesses here about what we're doing through their weekly events that they have regionally, they have events, with chambers of commerce all the way down the San Diego area, Riverside County, just around their area in the Los Angeles region. So they do have a really far reach. And that's how we're marketing the program just through a lot of these events, as well as



their standard way of following up with people that are in different businesses that meet the requirements.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated this is actually the first opportunity this COVID-19 pilot that we're allowing next to come forward for new hires. So I want to make sure that they appreciate them coming forward to bring new hires back into the population, and that they're a part of that arm and it's just not the single employer.

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. Smiles seconded approval of Greater San Fernando Valley Chamber of Commerce's proposal in the amount of \$200,000. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

**Tab No. 20: Kern Community College District (COVID-19)**

Mr. Swier introduced Kern Community College District (COVID-19) which is requesting \$200,000 in ETP Funding and the estimated number of trainees to be trained is 100. Underneath the current project, the actual contract amount is \$678,514. A term yet the difference of November 4, 2019 to November 3, 2021.

Mr. Swier stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced David Teasdale.

Acting Chairperson Roberts noted that that looking at their participating employers, they have no small businesses that are identified. They're all very large businesses and want to make a note of that and then also, asked for them to also explain why they only got 62% of the dollar amount that was approved? And how does the panel know that they got everything in order for this COVID project?

Mr. Teasdale thanked them and stated a part of the way they use it is to support a project they have in Kern County called Project Higher Up, a collaboration with the current Homeless Collaboration and nonprofit organizations down here at Bakersfield College to help people out of homelessness. I think that's an excellent idea, because it's a way to help people out of homelessness, with their training program, are working with the local Labor Development Authority, and are using the COVID-19 funds as part of an incentive program to get their businesses to take an opportunity and hire some formerly homeless people coming out of their training program, and so they have this project funded by another project, but they all have these contracts that you have noticed they are part of this cooperation and have expressed interest in extending their hiring, they have many hiring needs. As you know, they have much food production plants here in the Central Valley.

Acting Chairperson Roberts noted but going back to the 62%, was that something that they said is not a done deal, is that you're still sourcing their employers to get that up, up higher than 60%?

Mr. Teasdale stated they have 15 employers currently training in the contract and they have training ongoing and that's just a matter of getting rosters and getting them input into the tracking system. They anticipate more demand in their contract and they have funding for by the training end date, which would be August 4 in their case.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if it will be 100%

Mr. Teasdale stated it all depending on retention and it may end up being 98% when people fall off the contract.

Acting Chairperson Bell asked do they source small businesses at all

Mr. Teasdale stated they have some small businesses they actually have certification statements for 32 companies. And they have found that small businesses have been really impacted. Being able to even free up staff to be able to participate in training that that is a focus for them moving forward, is finding a way to make it more accessible. The difference here in the COVID pilot is has to do with the NAICS codes that are eligible. But even in their core contract, their small businesses have had to cut back on training more than their larger businesses.

Acting Chairperson Bell asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Bell asked for a motion.

ACTION: Ms. Newsom moved and Ms. Hull seconded approval of Kern Community College District's proposal in the amount of \$200,000. Acting Chairperson Bell called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

**Tab No. 21: KND Real Estate 40, LLC dba Kindred Paramount (COVID-19)**

Mr. Swier introduced KND Real Estate 40, LLC dba Kindred Paramount (COVID-19) which is requesting \$200,000 in ETP Funding and the estimated number of trainees to be trained is 100. They also have a core funded project for KND Real as well on tab 41.

Mr. Swier stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Mark Apodaca, CEO; Daniel Morgan, Education Director; Larry Mandell, Administrative Subcontractor.

Ms. Newsom flagged it to have this discussion with them about exceeding caps when they combine kind of things together and the amount of money and then things that jumped out at me too, are the wages. So for the first one that we're looking at right now. And with the COVID Rapid Response, the Registered Nurse has a base starting wage of \$25. And then for the second one, it's \$37. And I know that there's a difference between HUA and whatnot that is a drastic difference in wages.

Acting Chairperson Roberts was actually going to right size the tab 41 to make sure it doesn't go over the cap and looking at that one but not so much this one but understand that the wages seem very different.

Ms. Newsom stated the current tab 21, which is the COVID one, the Registered Nurse has a wage range of \$25.01 up to \$56 per 30 trainees, and then under tab 41, they're very intimately related. The registered nurse under tab 41 has a starting wage of \$37 going up to \$70. And it's for employees in the same facility 177 bed unit and don't understand the difference of those wages.

Mr. Mandell responded in the COVID pilot, we're dealing with brand new nurses so the less experienced and until they get their experience, they will increase in what they're earning.

Ms. Newsom asked how long does that take.

Mr. Mandell responded depending on the training they do.

Mr. Morgan stated it's to add flexibility based off of the market that they have. But typically, they also have another pay structure that they use to start on LVN and that they typically have a different step by step system, if they will, that they use based off of their clinical role and that's how they do it.

Ms. Newsom added she would approve this proposal under tab 21. If they officially moved the wages for the RNs from \$25.01 to \$56 to \$37 to \$70.

Ms. Bell asked how about the technicians.

Ms. Newsom clarified for the record Tab 21 and 41 will have the same wage ranges for the RNs and the technicians and moving 21 to the 41 wages just to add further clarification.

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 KND Real Estate 40, LLC dba Kindred Paramount's proposal with the stated clarification that the RN wage range will be \$37.00 - \$70.00, and the Technician wage range will be \$28.88 - \$52.66. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

## **Tab No. 22: Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce (COVID-19)**

Mr. Swier introduced the Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce (COVID-19) which is requesting \$200,000 in ETP Funding is saying it's a COVID-19 but there should be a multiple employer contract and note that this curriculum has the same occupations in Job One as Tab 10.

Mr. Swier stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Ajmaa Heggie, Controller; Larry Mandell, Administrative Subcontractor

Mr. Mandell responded with regard to in the way they put together the number of trainees and the job numbers. While as they can see from the 100B, there are many more employees within these companies. The goal was to spread it around among them so they could have included more employees in the training for the different companies, but they limited it to it. Secondly, with regard

to job number one, not all of these people are construction workers. I see that Even the administration, the production workers, this is for a manufacturer of cabinets and other materials, but they're vertical in their operations so they do the design, they do the production, and then they install their cabinets.

Ms. Newsom was looking for guidance as to remove from job number one, the installers, laborers foremen, and production or two remove from their curriculum, the construction and commercial skills training.

Mr. Swier stated they can also offer that be taken back to for a redesign and then offer the training plan and then return to a future panel.

Mr. Mandell asked if they can come back into 2020 wages, the biggest issue comes is in the health care.

Ms. Newsom added that doesn't sit well with her and based off this application, specifically, and how the construction, it's also combined with manufacturing, thinks it needs to go back to be reworked, so that the construction curriculum can be removed, and the numbers can be adjusted, and then it can come back to panels for further consideration.

Acting Chairperson Roberts wanted to make sure that they will fall under the current December 31 deadline that they won't be subject to not being able to fund it, because they didn't meet that timeframe.

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 the Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce's proposal be withdrawn; that they work with Staff to revise it; and to bring a revised proposal back at a later date. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

### **Tab No. 23: Managed Career Solutions SPC (COVID-19)**

Mr. Swier introduced the Managed Career Solutions SPC (COVID-19) which is requesting \$200,000 in ETP Funding and the estimated number of trainees to be trained is 100.

Mr. Swier stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Phillip Starr, Executive Director

Ms. Newsom stated this jumped out that their wage ranges for three very different occupation titles are all the same. There wasn't, demonstrated wage progression or even a difference between a certified nurse assistant and loss prevention security representative or a retail clerk and it was very lackluster.

Mr. Starr stated in terms of the wages those generally are the starting wages in those occupations, we're looking at working with underserved, very underserved participants and veterans, many of whom are homeless or with the disability or both.

Ms. Newsom asked if they could elaborate about the effect of this training on the trainees and as they come off of the streets and being homeless or having these additional barriers, this training means what to them. How did they progress through their program? Do they receive any kind of certifications or things that they can use in the long term for their careers?

Mr. Starr stated the individuals in these programs are assessed on they work with their partners through the One Stop career Center's they have to make sure they have all the supportive services they need, then put into trainings that lead to certifications on this Certified Nursing assisting.

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 Managed Career Solutions SPC's proposal in the amount of \$200,000. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

Acting Chairperson Roberts then requested everyone take a seven minute break

**Tab No. 38: Best Buy Health Inc. dba GreatCall**

Ms. Torres introduced a proposal from Best Buy Health Inc. dba GreatCall which they are requesting total funding amount of \$331,200. This only includes a job one incumbent retraining expected to train 360 individuals. Best Buy Health Inc. incorporated is headquartered in San Diego and maintains inbound customer base Sales and Service Center in Carlsbad, which will be participating in this proposal. The company does not actively recruit for veterans However, there are veterans on staff training will be provided via e learning and class lab delivery methods and they will also utilize alternative record keeping due to COVID-19.

Ms. Torres stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Renan Quiamboa, Director of Training; Michelle Cotter or Michelle Rychener Administrative Subcontractor.

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. Smiles seconded for approval of Best Buy Health Inc. dba GreatCall's proposal in the amount of \$331,200. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted against the motion.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

**Tab No. 39: Love 2 Learn Consulting, LLC (COVID-19)**

Ms. Torres introduced a proposal from Love 2 Learn Consulting, LLC (COVID-19) which is a repeat contractor with ETP and they are requesting a total of \$200,000 to train 100 job creation trainees.

While they do not have a dedicated Recruitment Program for veterans, the company is committed to hiring and retraining veterans due to COVID-19. They will also be using an alternative record keeping, they do have a current agreement which ends in May of 2021. So far, they have tracked eligible hours of 86% approved amount, and they project to reach 100% of the \$118,560 in the current agreement.

Ms. Torres stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Destini Kulik, COO; June Moetului; Larry Mandell, Administrative Subcontractor

Ms. Newsom noted the reason they are pulled into the regular single employer contracts was because there's seems to be an anomaly with the amount of current employees versus what they're asking to hire. She wanted to reduce the number of new employees, because currently they've got 92 current employees, and they want to hire 100 new employees.

Ms. Moetului stated they serve individuals with special needs. Typically, those with autism spectrum disorder, and their staff go in home to provide these services. They also have clinic based services and are doing a lot of telehealth services. They are open to all applicants who meet the minimum requirement, and they really hire based on current need and future need

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked to explain where you're going to get all these sources, all these people, all these 100 people, that's double their population, how you're going to support them. How are they going to support them and benefits, infrastructure admin support.

Ms. Moetului stated they do source a high number of resumes daily. So there are the staff out there that can provide the service and then they have been a much larger company. But when COVID hit their services are dependent on the needs of other people. So their service ability, ability to provide those services went down drastically.

Mr. Mandell stated looking at with the 90 employees, those are the full time 35 hours or more. There's a substantial number of employees that, for example, school teachers that come in in the afternoon, people that work between 20 and 30 hours per week, partially because it is such a difficult job that as mentioned earlier, there's burnout but that they these are the hours that they want to work. And so they meet the COVID pilot minimum number of hours and exceeded and that's where a lot of the employees that they see wind up going into.

Ms. Bell stated she got on their website, and looked under their career section and recruiting for behavior, interventionists internship. So it does not fall into the therapist and hurt consultant area, but with a different name and does that mean they are going to hire 100 people, or going to hire 100 of the behavior therapist which would be the therapist and the parent's consultants?

Ms. Moetului stated yes, behavior therapist and parent consultants are also into the behavioral interventions category, and the behavior therapist provide the direct one to one training to the client only. They can tell a family what they've done at the end of session, but they can't train a parent. So there's additional training to behavior and interventionists, so they can then call them parent consultants.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated because the COVID-19 projects are supposed to be taking people off of unemployment or from the furloughed employees that are currently working and giving them a job and benefits. But you're saying that the people that they hire are already employed, that they're doing other jobs, and you're just hiring them.

Ms. Moetului stated might be a misnomer. They do hire people who may have additional jobs, but they're not the majority. That's a minimum that they offer \$17.50 an hour, it depends on level of experience. And if there are any additional credentials, they do offer higher hourly wages than that and just so their turnover is similar to the entire ABA industry

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked have they looked at other alternative sourcing through that Main street program where it's less than 100 employees, they can get some tax benefits of \$1,000 for every new hire that they fire. I don't know if I can support 100. I don't know what the rest of the day I can't. But they know, I can support 50. And if they want to come back on a regular single employer or small business contract, that's fine. But right now, it doesn't make sense to me to dole out an extra \$100,000 to a company I'm not completely comfortable with.

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. Smiles seconded approval of Love 2 Learn Consulting, LLC's proposal in the reduced amount of \$100,000. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

#### **Tab No. 40: Reborn Cabinets (Critical Proposal)**

Ms. Torres introduced Reborn Cabinets (Critical Proposal) they are a repeat contractor, and they are requesting \$599,472. They are primarily training in job to 285 job creation and 96 incumbent workers. Reborn Cabinet, is designated as a critical proposal recommended by the Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development. Although there is no dedicated veterans job number Reborn Cabinet became affiliated with the army partnership for youth Success Program in the past several years. This program is a strategic partnership between the Army employers and the public sector agencies to provide employment opportunities to army veterans. Reborn recently hosted a reception for this program to provide targeted recruitment opportunities. Training will be delivered via class lab, as well as productive lab on site and for the installers. They will be utilizing an alternative record keeping is a result of COVID 19.

Ms. Torres stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Vince Nardo, President; Joann Bellenkes, Director of Training; Rocio Leon, Administrative Subcontractor.

Acting Chairperson Roberts noted it is a critical proposal But I am going to be looking at every one of these proposals that come from maximum cap. So what ways that they can reduce this and so one way I thought they could reduce it is that this project is a critical proposals based on the all the new hires. You've got 285 new hires, I don't want to touch that category. But I'd like to eliminate the retraining part of this this project, which would be about \$75,000 reduction. And I thought that was pretty generous as they go forward with some of these other projects, you're going to see a bunch, much broader cut, much better reduction then that. But because this was a critical proposal, wanted to give them the benefit of the doubt and they have all those new hires in this project.

Rocio Leon from CMTC been working with Reborn Cabinets for several years now and they've been a tremendous company to partner with, they are doing a huge growth at this actually doesn't represent 100% of all of the jobs they are adding over the course of the next 12 months. So they wanted to come in with conservative numbers on the hires. And these are high paying jobs. On the retrainees side, the focus is for employees that aren't their incumbent workers.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated she still wanted to make the recommendation to reduce the funding by at least \$75,000.

Mr. Dombrowski wanted to say how appreciative I am of everything you're trying to do here, given the limited source of funds, and same with ETP staff and the rest of the panel. Obviously, we're pretty judicious in the critical proposals that their office gives. So, if that is the motion way forward,

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

**ACTION:** Mr. Morales moved and Mr. Smiles seconded approval of Reborn Cabinets' proposal in the reduced amount of \$524,472.00. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0

**Tab No. 41: KND Real Estate 40, LLC dba Kindred Paramount**

Mr. Swier introduced a proposal from KND Real Estate 40, LLC dba Kindred Paramount which is requesting \$456,320. Their first time proposed contractor requesting \$456,320 in ETP funding. This proposal will cover 301 retrainees and job creation trading these combined at all locations and Paramount California. Additionally, Kindred has a COVID pilot project that was approved earlier under tab 21.

Mr. Swier stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Mark Apodaca, CEO; Larry Mandell, Administrative Subcontractor

Acting Chairperson Roberts made a recommendation to cut this proposal by \$60,000. And the reason being is that they came through with the \$200,000 project already. So that put them at almost \$60,000 and above the cap between the two projects. And I understand earlier in the year, they said they could run concurrent projects. And they do have caps available but didn't say that they actually got to approve both of the caps. So I would like to reduce it by \$60,000.

Mr. Swier stated can they have it to be reduced up to \$60,000 not to exceed \$60,000? Because when they change the chart, they can't make it exactly \$60,000 based off at the reimbursement rate and the number of trade needs. Just as long as they see their cap

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 KND Real Estate 40, LLC dba Employment Training Panel



Kindred Paramount's proposal, with the exception that total funding be reduced approximately \$60,000.00 in order to ensure that Tab 21 and Tab 41 herein do not exceed ETP's project caps. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

**Tab No. 42: CalPlant 1, LLC (Critical Proposal)**

Ms. Lazarewicz introduced a proposal from CalPlant 1, LLC (Critical Proposal) is requesting \$287,040 in ETP funding to train a total of 135 workers including 33 new employees. Training will take place at their location in Willows and this is CalPlant first ETP project.

Ms. Lazarewicz stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Jody Samons-CalPlant Consultant; Jerry Uhland-CEO & Founder

Acting Chairperson Roberts noted it's a critical proposal and its very solid its first time only, and they just look good. The only question is when I see a CEO is the person that responsible for the project, I get a little bit worried, but then realize that they don't have that many employees. So the CEO could also be somebody that also packs product as well, they probably do a lot of jobs.

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 CalPlant 1, LLC's proposal in the amount of \$287,040. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

**Tab No. 43: Swan Consulting, Inc. (COVID-19)**

Ms. Lazarewicz introduced a proposal from Swan Consulting, Inc. (COVID-19) they're requesting \$150,000 total funding to train 75 new employees. Training will take place at their three locations in Clovis and Fresno. This is Swan Consulting first ETP project.

Ms. Lazarewicz stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Aaron Tucker-Chief Administrative Officer; Keith Brama-Subcontractor (Propel Consulting Group).

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated regarding number of current employees versus what they're requesting, a little bit concerned as to how they're going to double their infrastructure again, in a matter of a year or so it's real hard for me to believe that this could happen. I would want to get some more explanation about that.

Mr. Tucker explained that they were at about pushing 100 employees at the time that COVID hit

and the effect on their company, post COVID. When they proceeded to reopen were at about 45 employees for about 40 clients that they retained and they almost had about 100 clients in service as well, at the time of COVID. Since then, they are now at 70 employees, with their company, and they have are currently in taking current clientele as well as clients that are being going through the intake process is about 62. And so that's in about the last four or so months. And so, they are on track for getting back to their pre COVID numbers, they are seeing good growth, they are seeing a good demand for their services.

Acting Chairperson Roberts went on to ask can they verify that the turnover rate is 10%. But it seems like lost 40%? So, is it that they just didn't want count that because of its COVID related? They wondering why their turnover rates only 10%. But they said they had 100 employees that started COVID But now they only have 60. Can they wait?

Mr. Tucker explained in the beginning when COVID initially hit, they saw a substantial drop of obviously employees and clients. In the past month, for example, their turnover rate, had only two employees to BTS that resigned with their company, one of which was because they moved. So their turnover, as things have settled since COVID. The initial turnover was challenging, but their experience since then has been has been very low. And they see it normalizing.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated all these jobs, you're bringing all these new employees in, but they're just going under four hour training that is just under the COVID bundle. So you're just training mostly and proper sanitation practices for this four hours of training, is that correct?

Mr. Tucker explained they also have training regarding proper social distancing and spacing. They limit numbers in their various rooms and they also train them on what's appropriate given each room, how to properly space and distance from each other. They know who can be in certain rooms based on specific assignments.

Acting Chairperson Roberts made the recommendation to cut the number of employers and employees based on what in the past, but to reduce it to 50.

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 for approval of Swan Consulting, Inc.'s proposal in the reduced amount of \$100,000; lowering the estimated number of trainees from 75 to 50. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

**Tab No. 44: Columbus Manufacturing, Inc.**

Ms. Lazarewicz introduced a proposal from Columbus Manufacturing, Inc. they are repeat contractor requesting \$276,345 to train a total of 445 workers. Training will take place at their two

facilities in Hayward.

Ms. Lazarewicz stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced James Herger-Director of HR Operations; Denise Martinez-Subcontractor (RSM US LLP).

Mr. Herger thanked them for their consideration and shared that Columbus Manufacturing is very proud essential worker who has recently attained new clients such as Trader Joe's, and able to expand beyond their traditional salami focused presentation and they look forward to additional training opportunities and successfully carrying those out.

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 for approval of Columbus Manufacturing, Inc.'s proposal in the amount of \$276,345. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

**Tab No. 45: Envoy, Inc. (RESPOND/Critical Proposal)**

Ms. Lazarewicz introduced a proposal from Envoy, Inc. (RESPOND/Critical Proposal) Requesting \$517,500 to train a total of 200 workers, including veterans and 80 new employees. Training will take place at their headquarters in San Francisco and this is their first ETP project.

Ms. Lazarewicz stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Sergio Prada-Director of Financial Planning; Jill Meeuwssen-Subcontractor (Synergy Management Consultant, LLC).

Ms. Bell echoed her fellow chairman's concerns whenever there is a new contract, and just making sure that the employer is aware of to reach out whenever they feel like they need to ETP staff support. Their goal is to make them successful and they want them to be successful and come back and again.

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 for approval of Envoy, Inc.'s proposal in the amount of \$517,500. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

**Tab No. 46: Building Skills Partnership**

Mr. Swier introduced a proposal from Building Skills Partnership which is a repeat contractor requesting \$599,697 to train 1,169 retrainees statewide. This is a set multiple barriers project with a request for wage modification to use the collective bargaining wage which starts at \$15 per hour. Additionally, trainees receive in between five to \$7 in health benefits which are not being added to the ETP minimum wages, please note a correction on page 72, the development administrator, California Labor Federation, which is not located in Orangeville, but rather in Oakland, California.

Mr. Swier stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Laura Medina, COO; Luis Sandoval Executive Director; David Huerta, President, SEIU-USWW; Andrew Gross-Gaitan, Research Director, SEIU-USWW; Kelly Greer, CEO, Strategy Workplace Communications; Nica Tanaka, Project Coordinator, CA Labor Federation; John Brauer, Executive Director, CA Labor Federation

Ms. Newsom asked the applicant to talk please to the training that is received by the trainee and how they progress in wages and their careers.

Mr. Gross-Gaitan replied the conversation about trying to recognize the importance of the disinfection and consumer confidence, ensure that they're certified training, and ensure that there are wage incentives attached to it are all happening in the context of the governor's Task Force reopening and in the context of their collective bargaining.

Mr. Brauer added this labor management model has actually helped raise over the last several decades the standards of pay and working conditions within the industry. They notice the proposal is taking place within five different counties of the six that they do work in, it has significant investment already from property managers and building owners. And this builds off of that it creates both new opportunities within the industry for folks to either work a different shift or become a supervisor, but the bargaining that the union has with the Property Management Association and building owners, those are good jobs that folks can have a family sustaining wage and an income on when they when they factor in the health care.

Ms. Medina stated that they are trying to raise the standards and really the difference in training that can make within the industry. But in particular, I wanted to cite a story where they were able to offer their vocational ESL courses that also concern customer service. And so they did it at Facebook campus in Northern California. And after the workers there completed their course, they were given a differential of 50 cents wage increase. And this was very specific to the site. But they do see this across the state, depending on the employer, depending on the client.

Acting Chairperson Roberts added they are having to reduce their funding and there's just no doubt about it. Going over the last five years, they pulled in more than \$3M worth of ETP funds to do training. And that's a lot of money more than other employers get probably for lower wages and most Yes, I'm thinking that you've pretty much exhausted a lot of the funding already not saying that I'm going to not approve this project, but I'm certainly going to think about reducing the project. She is going to suggest that they cut this by 25%, maybe \$150,000 and would like to reduce it to 450.

Ms. Newsom added in this moment of time where they are in pandemic and how the COVID virus is everywhere and unseen. And I see a very similar connection with this workforce of as much as COVID is unseen, and they don't know where it is. This workforces also largely unseen and unheard. And what happens where they depend on this work force to keep them safe, while they are unseen. And they are on the front lines, they are essential critical workers, they have had deaths in their ranks. And we're relying on them to keep them safe. And they need to be trained to the best possible ways that they can. Specifically with infectious disease certification program.

Ms. Bell stated \$15 is low for essential workers, frontline folks, as well. So my question to you, is that how much do they get, or do they get more? And asked if there is hazard pay

Mr. Sandoval would say that 15 is a minimum, degree, it's worksite by worksite, to some degree.

Mr. Gross-Gaitan replied yes, they have been pushing for hazard pay in a number of locations across the state, the only locations that the only location in the state where the client won paying for the janitorial contract agreed to fund hazard pay is the Sacramento International Airport, where they agreed to a \$3 hazard pay provision. Hazard pay is certainly going to be high on our list of proposals, but at the moment, it's only happening in those rare cases where it's, there's been a confirmed exposure and they're doing decontamination.

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 for approval of Building Skills Partnership's proposal in the reduced amount of \$500,000. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

#### **Tab No. 47: California Manufacturing Technology Consulting**

Mr. Swier introduced a proposal from California Manufacturing Technology Consulting which is a repeat contractor is requesting \$599,694 to train 340 retrainees and 422 Small Business retrainees statewide. Is a repeat contractor requesting \$599,694 to train 1,169 retrainees statewide. This is a set multiple barriers project with a request for wage modification to use the collective bargaining wage which starts at \$15 per hour. Additionally, trainees receive in between five to \$7 in health benefits which are not being added to the ETP minimum wages, please note a correction on page 72, the development administrator, California Labor Federation, which is not located in Orangeville, but rather in Oakland, California.

Mr. Swier stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Cheryl Slobodian, Strategic Partnership; Patrick Billiter, CFO; Rocio Leon, Manager of Training & Strategic Partnerships

Acting Chairperson Roberts noted they've been a great partner with ETP over the years and we appreciate them bringing a lot of projects forward. But again, they're up \$6 million worth of dollars

over the last five years that's a lot of dollars and will request the same amount that I'm going to request to cut it 25%.

Mr. Smiles agreed.

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. Smiles seconded for approval request of California Manufacturing Technology Consulting's proposal in the reduced amount of \$449,770.50. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

**Tab No. 48: Foundation for the South Orange County Community College District**

Ms. Torres introduced a proposal from Foundation for the South Orange County Community College District They are requesting a total agreement amount of \$399,000 they had initially requested in their application. The full cap for this fiscal year, however, did work with staff to reduce it to \$399,000 given that they are a first time ETP multiple employer contractor. South Orange County Community College District is a multi-campus district. They in their training plan, they propose to train approximately 370 incumbent workers from priority industry employers and approximately 42 incumbent workers from non-priority industry employers.

Ms. Torres also stated ETP training plan does not include a veteran's component. However, many employers in the College of service areas hire veterans due to the proximity to Camp Pendleton, within compete and many customized training programs and may be included as part of the employees of the participating employers. The core group of participating employers consist of small and large businesses. The majority of the employers, as I noted are in the priority industries and just want to point out that this is a community college however anybody participating students enrolled in the ETP funding program will not be charged tuition fees or any of the costs associated with training, the representation will be made a condition of the agreement.

Ms. Torres stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Saddleback College: Israel Dominguez, director of Economic & Workforce; Jon Fox, Administrative Subcontractor; Sandra Sisco.

Ms. Newsom wanted some clarification that this is a foundation for the South Orange County Community College District and foundation versus a community college itself. This is a community college, correct.

Ms. Torres replied that is correct and you'll see this and many proposals were with the community colleges and they can certainly speak to this more is those there is an arm that is established, designed and which they can receive funding and budget in that way. But it's still under the whole umbrella of the Community College District.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked looking at your employers or participating employers, you've got some large employers in there, including Amazon. So a lot of big employers, and hoping that maybe they could reach out to some are smaller employers, in your area. So that's the only question and do appreciate for right sizing or staff helping you right size it at being that your first time and knowing about our funding as well.

Mr. Dominguez wanted to thank the ETP staff that assisted with this proposal. They were very helpful instrumental. We are going to reach out to some small employers as well, we have to on this project listed. We do focus on priority industry sectors as well. We've been delivering and transfer the one question earlier, we are Community College District. I work for Saddleback College, which is one of the colleges within the district. So the train will be delivered and administered through our Community College. We have been delivering a customized training to area employers and regional employers over the past five years, we've been doing this successfully. We leveraged numerous other sources to deliver training, we direct invoice employers for training as well. So we have quite a bit of experience and this realm of training, so we'll be able to deliver upon the train that we're listing.

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 for approval of Foundation for the South Orange County Community College District's proposal in the amount of \$399,990. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

#### **Tab No. 47 (Revisited): California Manufacturing Technology Consulting**

Mr. Swier stated that CMTC contacted him, and that Cheryl had her hand up and wasn't able to speak on their proposal. Can we go back to Cheryl so she can speak in front of the panel?

Acting Chairperson Roberts apologized for any error and stated we'll go back to tab number 47, where we reduced the funding by 25%.

Ms. Slobodian understands the challenge that the panel has in front of them. But feel obligated to advocate for small manufacturers. CMTC provides direct on site customized training to small manufacturers. And in our current contract, which is completing, we have 54 small manufacturers that are in training 72 of those companies are under 25 employees, and 11 of those are under 10. So we are we're training small manufacturers, you know that multi-employer contracts are great reap way to outreach to those small manufacturers. And that's just in UTC and in the money we've been requesting. It impacts the small manufacturers that we serve statewide. And again, these are not center based training. These are customized training matrices, and implementations developed for small manufacturers, many of them have pivoted, to manufacture pp. So they have lines changing over they have a multitude things that need to be addressed and their employees need to be trained. So I would really request that you reconsider and look at the fact that we're more than willing to train 100% small manufacturers, it's usually 75 to 80 percent of small manufacturers, but

this really is just a cut. We're representing those small manufacturers that need the training.

Acting Chairperson Roberts forgot to mention it but you do actually administer to quite a few small, small employers. Which I really appreciate. However, you know, you have come through many, many times with a lot of funding. And I just wanted to make sure that in the future, you know, with these times not to say that we won't be upping our caps in the next three to five years, but just saying right now, this is a time where we have to kind of tighten our belts, unfortunately, you will have to tighten your belt as well. I wish that we had talked about this earlier, and it could have happened before you came to the panel. But right now I'm looking at everyone that's reaching their cap to talk about reducing their funds. So I do appreciate you reaching out to the small employers \$125,000 is just a drop in the bucket compared to all the funding that you received over the years, I mean, \$6 million dollars, is a lot of dollars. So I'm just wanted to make a note of that. And that, you're just going to have to step back a minute and think, there are other employers in California that need these funds as well. And there's small business, we got a lot of small business people that are in the queue, as well that also want the funds and they've been locked out because we got people coming through for these maximum cap.

Ms. Slobodian would request that the panel consider that are cut not be on our single on our multi-employer contract. But that the new COVID 19 pilot that we were we were awarded be rescind that. And that that let be the cut. Because we really, really focus on assisting the small manufacturers that are in such need right now. And I think that that would be a priority for us over the COVID-19.

Acting Chairperson Roberts then asked are you saying that you have a CMTC COVID project coming through or it's already come through.

Ms. Slobodian replied it just went through but as a result of issues related to the document sign, the contract hasn't been executed. So we haven't been able to officially start.

Acting Chairperson Roberts then asked so are you saying we approve this CMTC COVID project on the on the October meeting?

Legal Counsel Michael Cable inquired for clarification because it sounds like we're kind of revisited back to tab 47. And we're having some public comment, because we didn't have that opportunity before the panel made its decision. What I'm hearing now, though, it sounds like there needs to be a further discussion regarding development and issues regarding this proposal. It sounds like this may be another situation in which you'd be best to make a motion to table this for further discussion and bring this matter back at the next panel meeting.

Acting Chairperson Roberts doesn't know if it's going to make a difference what they're saying and her goal is that they have we approved a COVID-19 project back in October. It hasn't been executed yet. I imagine it was for \$200,000. So they would say they rather have this one for 599 versus a \$200,000 if we're going to make a cut, but I don't know how to go about that since we've already approved it. So that's why I'm asking that it seems a little bit odd to me. I don't know if we could even do it.

Legal Counsel Michael Cable stated it seems like there's issues and he can't confirm any of the facts that we're talking about. That's why my suggestion since it doesn't seem like we're going to



have sufficient information in order to make a solid motion regarding Tab 47. At this moment, it seems to me that perhaps this might be one in which we table so we could sort out those issues and perhaps bring it back. If they do want to not enter into the contract.

Ms. Slobodian appreciates the panel's position, and then it is a unique request. And I do understand that it will not eliminate the concern in January when we returned. I just felt obligated to advocate because this is a just CMTC. It's hundreds of small manufacturers that access through this MEC. And on that are small businesses. And I we accept the proposals vote, and withdraw my request.

Ms. Leon was going to echo much of what Cheryl already said, which is that we are completely cognizant of the fact that these are very, very tough times. But with that in mind, and with the fact that the panel is continuing to focus on the small manufacturer as a priority. And given that that is our primary focus, we were of the mind that we wanted to be able to continue to provide as expanded an opportunity to help those small companies as possible. But in our current contract, we have trained 72 small employers that 72 small companies that either would not have been able to take advantage of ETP or that would have come forward for a single employer contract and that 72 applications that would have been developed by ETP staff so it relieves the pressure off of ETP staff.

Acting Chairperson Roberts would like to keep considering to reduce the funding even though all those comments were made, and notes that they do have another \$200,000 project in the works for new hires.

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. Smiles seconded for confirmation of previous action that California Manufacturing Technology Consulting's proposal be approved in the reduced amount of \$449,770.50. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

#### **Tab No. 49: Murrieta Chamber of Commerce**

Ms. Torres introduced a proposal from Murrieta Chamber of Commerce they are a repeat multiple employer contractor. They're requesting a total of \$599,440 that is inclusive of a percent of support cost to train approximately 508 incumbent workers under priority of rate. This is Murrieta Chamber of Commerce, fifth ETP project and the third the last five years. In addition, Murrieta Chamber of Commerce has requested \$200,000 ETP funding for the COVID pilot, also in this December agenda, and they are not the same training population given that the other one was solely for job creation. The core group of employers consists of single employer statewide and represents 100% requested funding. All participating employers are categorized as priority industry companies. Although this project is not included veterans component, the chamber is participating employer's population may potentially include veterans. In addition, the chamber has a military affairs committee, and they work closely with local organizations that focus on veteran needs with a focus on three main areas. Although the participating employers may be located in a high unemployment

area, the chamber is not seeking a wage modification. Their current agreement does end November of 2021. However, they have potential earnings of already of \$710,000, which represents 95% of the funding.

Ms. Torres stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Patrick Ellis, President/CEO; Deborah Imonti, Administrative Subcontractor.

Acting Chairperson Roberts then added looking at the full amount, the full cap, they came through with another and this month, they came through with a \$200,000 project. So as far as I'm concerned, they're \$200,000 over the cap. So between the two projects, even though they're separate entities once a new hire component, and one isn't, but still goes to the same Chamber of Commerce and am requesting to reduce the funding of this by \$200,000.

Mr. Ellis wanted to ask that they reconsider the reduction like everyone else does. But I want to stress obviously the important of the max right now. Obviously, we know small businesses and how much they have just been hammered and had to bear the brunt of what is going on this year. Their standard contract has seven out of the 10 companies are small businesses of less than 100 employees. Our largest business is 250 employees in San Clemente These are all small businesses that desperately need assistance right now, I was lucky enough to be elected to the newly chair for the Riverside County Workforce Development Board. The exposure and outreach that we've had with getting in front of small businesses has been tremendous. And to cut towards the smallest of the small businesses right now would be just devastating. even at the at the full amount we're talking, this is an allocation of sick less than \$60,000 per company, which is basically \$118 per worker in their contract.

Acting Chairperson Roberts then asked is there any other alternative source of funding, how about private donations or any other kind of funding that you can have? ETP, can't be their sole source of funding for these next, and that's what you're stating in these narratives is that we want all the money because we have all these small businesses. But I'm sorry to say that you know, what happened? We didn't have any TV program. I mean, you wouldn't do any training for any of your clients or constituents don't know, oh, I'm just trying to figure out there's got to be another means of support.

Mr. Ellis then began to state that he would completely 100% of view here. We are out. researching for grants, we work with a lot of our local large businesses who are providing donations to our 501C3, where we then go out and provide training and support for small businesses that are really devastated right now and totally 100% agree with you but we're talking about less than \$60,000, per business here and these are the ones that have the ability to bring in more people and train them to get to that next level and make sure that we're still looking out for a middle class citizens.

Acting Chairperson Roberts then we don't have the funding, we don't have the funding we wish we could support you, like we have in the past, you know, giving you everything that you asked for, unfortunately, we've got a new world here. Every year you come back, and next year, you're going to come back and if you come back for the full cap, even if it's a new cap, you're still going to have to make modifications to you know, how many small businesses you're going to support.

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. Smiles seconded for approval Murrieta Chamber of Commerce's proposal in the reduced amount of \$399,440. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted against the motion.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

**Tab No. 50: California Workforce Association**

Ms. Lazarewicz presented a proposal on behalf of California Workforce Association they are a repeat contractor requesting \$599,837 to train a total of 423 workers including Allied Health Care Workers. Training will take place throughout California.

Ms. Lazarewicz stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Brandon Anderson-Operations Director; Steve Duscha-Subcontractor (Steve Duscha Advisories)

Ms. Newsom inquired over the cover sheet at the proposal and it states that this is not a priority industry, but looking to staff, this is a priority industry, correct?

Ms. Lazarewicz replied that she believes they're serving both priority and non-priority participating employers. So that is an error. Both of those should have been marked.

Acting Chairperson Roberts then asked to make the same recommendation of reducing the amount because of past contracts. You can look at the last five years, its \$3 million dollars of contracts. So I would like to reduce this one as well. They don't have a COVID project, as I recall.

Ms. Newsom would just include as a suggestion to the applicants that they take a look at removing from their application, the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History Foundation, which is a non-priority industry.

Mr. Anderson stated they certainly heard you loud and clear on the concerns and need to reassess where funds are put given the current situation with COVID. And very glad to take a look at our proposal. I would like to request that our team, go back and take a look at our proposed job numbers and associated funds. We have various employers across various industries and I think it'll be something that we can handle and bring back to the panel.

Mr. Duscha stated they're ready to take their medicine like everybody else and appreciate that. So far, you're giving the same medicine to everybody and that's important to us. We also would state that, I know that there are a number of us out in my part of the world, who very much would like to work with you and with the staff to develop some policies that would apply universally, and that we would all know in advance we're going to be applied so that we could have shorter panel meetings and take away this special pleading by each of us who we all know that we're special. But we're really not special anyway. We understand the problem. We'd like to work with you to fix it in a policy way instead of a contract by contract way.

Acting Chairperson Roberts then it's easier for the staff to make the decision with the employer and the contractor versus coming to the panel. I mean, we don't want to be the heavy and make all these cuts are the reductions. It's really not what we want to do. It's very painful for us, believe me. I mean, I don't take this lightly. I do want to see the funds go out, you know, accordingly. So it is very, very hard on all of us to make these decisions and I'd rather have it up to, you know, collaboration with the staff and the employer to make those decisions versus us.

Acting Chairperson Roberts said she is considering that a reduction of \$450,000 and then they can make their decision on what job number they want to look at and then also Ms. Newsom recommendation that they don't fund the non-priority industry.

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 for approval of California Workforce Association's proposal in the reduced amount of \$450,000. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

**Tab No. 51: SOMA AEC, Inc. dba Oxman College**

Ms. Lazarewicz presented a proposal on behalf of this is a proposal from SOMA AEC, Inc. dba Oxman College. They are a repeat contractor requesting \$597,288 to train 163 workers, including 30 new allied health care workers. Training will take place throughout California

Ms. Lazarewicz stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Lana Dvorkin-Administrator; Michael Dvorkin-President.

Acting Chairperson Roberts then rather keep the job creation initiative in place. But other than that, I'm would like just to reduce it 150,000 based on their past, they know, funding that they've received. And, again, like I said, next time they come through, hopefully, we'll have a system in place where the money has already been reduced before it comes before the panel

Ms. Dvorkin expressed they do realize this current restriction. We did complete our previous contract with 100%. And agreeing with the reduction.

Ms. Dvorkin shared that Staff helped them to create this but want you to know that, their contract high wage job or in compares to any contractor who has a cap 599 and can commit that everybody in our contract will receive \$25. So this is for your consideration for the deduction and you can increase for \$25. He accepted HUA but that is only 18 people, majority people 85, which is \$25, you can increase Job Number Four to \$25 also. So, in this case 90% basically will be high paying job.

Acting Chairperson Roberts shared she loves to hear increasing in job numbers as far as wages, do know that you do have a higher cost per trainee than most other contracts. But you know, if you increased your wages, there's some consideration on that.

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 for approval of SOMA AEC, Inc. dba Oxman College's proposal in the reduced amount of \$447,288. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

Mr. Javier stated that you made comment around the job creation piece and inquired if that is part of your motion or not.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated no, it's just that I want to make sure that if he's going to, we're going to reduce it that they don't take out that portion of the of their job number.

**Tab No. 52: Alameda County Electrical Industry Apprenticeship and Training Trust**

Ms. Miguel introduced a proposal from Alameda County Electrical Industry Apprenticeship and Training Trust. They are a repeat contractor and today they are requesting \$379,430 to serve 22 journey workers 130 apprentices and 15 veteran apprentices. Training will be provided at the trust Training Center in San Leandro.

Ms. Miguel stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Jason Bates, Training Director; Nica Tanaka CA Labor Fed, Kelly Greer, Strategy Workplace Communications

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 for approval of Alameda County Electrical Industry Apprenticeship and Training Trust's proposal in the amount of \$379,430. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

{Ms. Hull recused herself from the next proposal.}

**Tab No. 53: Glaziers, Architectural Metal and Glass Workers Local Union No. 636**

Ms. Miguel introduced a proposal from Glaziers, Architectural Metal and Glass Workers Local Union No. 636. They are a first time contractor requesting \$343,888 in funding to serve approximately 142 apprentices and 50 journey workers. Training will be provided in San Bernardino

Ms. Miguel stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Tawny Castro, Training Director; Steve Duscha

Ms. Newson appreciates the high wages, the curriculum and the great career that is being provided to so many folks. But their number of women in their program is very lacking at 2.8% and really want they to focus on this next year as they if they come back again, and getting more women in their training program.

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 for approval of Glaziers, Architectural Metal and Glass Workers Local Union No. 636's proposal in the amount of \$343,888. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 5 to 0.

{Ms. Hull returns}

**Tab No. 54: Heat and Frost Insulators and Asbestos Workers Joint Apprenticeship Trust Fund**

Ms. Miguel introduced a proposal from Heat and Frost Insulators and Asbestos Workers Joint Apprenticeship Trust Fund. They are a repeat contractor requesting \$429,290 to serve approximately 127 apprentices, 78 journey workers and 15 pre apprentices. Training will be provided at the training facility in Ontario.

Ms. Miguel stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Lupe Moreno, Administrator; Steve Duscha, Steve Duscha Advisories.

Ms. Newsom stated higher than average number of women in their training program at 11.8%. Please continue that progress to get to 20% at least.

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 for approval of Heat and Frost Insulators and Asbestos Workers Joint Apprenticeship Trust Fund's proposal in the amount of \$429,290. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

**Tab No. 55: Orange County Electrical Joint Apprenticeship and Training Trust Fund**

Ms. Miguel introduced a proposal from Orange County Electrical Joint Apprenticeship and Training Trust Fund. They are a repeat contractor requesting \$377,168 to serve 20 journey workers 189 apprentices and 20 veteran apprentices training will be provided in Orange County.

Ms. Miguel stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Jerome Thomas, Training Director; Nica Tanaka CA Labor Fed; Kelly Greer, Strategy Workplace Communications

Ms. Newsom stated lower ends of the spectrum for a number of women participating in their program at seven which is 3.6% of their program, please focus next year on inviting more women into their training program.

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 for approval of Orange County Electrical Joint Apprenticeship and Training Trust Fund in the amount of \$377,168. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

**Tab No. 56: Sacramento Area Electrical Workers Joint Apprenticeship and Training Trust**

Ms. Miguel introduced a proposal from Sacramento Area Electrical Workers Joint Apprenticeship and Training Trust. They are a repeat contractor, requesting \$354,835 in funding to serve 10 journey workers 185 apprentices and 15 veteran apprentices.

Ms. Miguel stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Matt Nootenboom, Director; Nica Tanaka CA Labor Fed; Kelly Greer, Strategy Workplace Communications.

Ms. Newsom stated 23 women out of 211.5%, please continue their progress on achieving 20%.

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 the approval of \$354,835 for Sacramento Area Electrical Workers Joint Apprenticeship and Training Trust. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

**Tab No. 57: San Mateo County Electrical Apprenticeship and Training Trust**

Ms. Miguel introduced a proposal from San Mateo County Electrical Apprenticeship and Training Trust. They are a repeat contractor, requesting \$362,425 in funding to serve 10 journey workers 185 apprentices and 15 veteran apprentices.

Ms. Miguel stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Kathleen Barber, Training Director; Nica Tanaka CA Labor Fed; Kelly Greer, Strategy Workplace Communications.

Ms. Newsom stated 25 women out of 200 apprentices is 12.5%. You are at the top of the range, but still always do better. Thank you for that. But please share your stories with the other trades on how to get more women admitted.

Ms. Barber stated one of the things that is making our apprenticeship be able to move forward is this funding though we do not include it in our budget, it should never be included in a budget. But because of it, we've been able to provide computers and accessory materials so that the students can do the online coursework.

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 the approval of \$362,425 for San Mateo County Electrical Apprenticeship and Training Trust. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

**Tab No. 58: Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Apprenticeship and Journeymen Training Fund**

Ms. Miguel introduced a proposal from Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Apprenticeship and Journeymen Training Fund. They are a repeat contractor requesting 200 \$222,312 in funding to serve 20 journey workers 76 apprentices and 10 veteran apprentices as well as nine pre apprentices. Training will be provided in San Diego and imperial counties.

Ms. Miguel stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Lorenzo Miles, Training Director; Nica Tanaka CA Labor Fed; Kelly Greer, Strategy Workplace Communications.

Ms. Newsom stated four out of 86 apprentices are women, which is a 4.5 4.7%. I know you guys can do better. I also am very familiar with your building trades sisters program, which is relatively new, I wish much success, especially with the outreach that is being conducted by your current member

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 the approval of \$222,312 for Sheet Metal and Air Conditioning Apprenticeship and Journeymen Training Fund. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

**Tab No. 59: Southern California Floor Covering Apprentice Trust Fund**

Ms. Miguel introduced a proposal from Southern California Floor Covering Apprentice Trust Fund. They are repeat, requesting \$278,800 in funding to serve approximately 41 journey workers and 115 apprentices. Training will be provided in Santa Fe springs and locations throughout Los Angeles and San Diego counties.

Ms. Miguel stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Sean Padilla, Program Coordinator; Steve Duscha, Steve Duscha Advisories.

Ms. Newsom stated just one woman in your program out of over 100 apprentices you're not even at 1% you guys got to do better and you got to tell me what you're going to do better this upcoming year to admit more women into your training program and does not want to see the same proposal come back next year with less than 1% of your apprentices are women

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 the approval of \$278,800 for Southern California Floor Covering Apprentice Trust Fund. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried, 8 to 0.

**Tab No. 60: U.A. Local 342 Joint Apprenticeship and Training Trust**

Ms. Miguel introduced a proposal from U.A. Local 342 Joint Apprenticeship and Training Trust. They are a repeat contractor, requesting \$427,774 in funding to serve 10 journey workers 185 apprentices and 15 veteran apprentices.

Ms. Miguel stated there are representatives here to answer any question that the panel members may have and introduced Al Garcia, Training Director; Steve Duscha, Steve Duscha Advisories.

Ms. Newsom stated 23 women out of 211.5%, please continue their progress on achieving 20%.

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 the approval of \$427,774 for U.A. Local 342 Joint Apprenticeship and Training Trust. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative.

Motion carried 8 to 0.

**XII. OPPORTUNITY FOR PANEL MEMBERS TO REQUEST AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE PANEL MEETINGS**

Acting Chairperson Roberts wanted to put on the agenda regarding wages and we're going to be talking about tax reimbursement rates. It's been brought up many times but about the Privacy Act around social security numbers. And is there any way that we can look at handling differently than we had in the past, and maybe the last four digits are employee ID.

**XIII. PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

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

None were given.

**XIV. MEETING ADJOURNMENT**

Acting Chairperson Roberts adjourned the meeting at 11:42 a.m.