



Employment Training Panel

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
EMPLOYMENT TRAINING PANEL**

Zoom Virtual Meeting  
October 1, 2021

**Panel Members**

Janice Roberts  
Acting Chairperson

Gloria Bell  
Member

Chris Dombrowski  
*Ex-Officio* Member

Ernesto Morales  
Member

Gretchen Newsom  
Member

Rick Smiles  
Member

Douglas Tracy  
Member

Madison Hull  
Member

**Executive Staff**

Reg Javier  
Executive Director

Peter Cooper  
Assistant Director

Michael Cable  
Staff Attorney

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
**EMPLOYMENT TRAINING PANEL**  
Zoom Virtual Meeting  
October 1, 2021

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

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

**II. ROLL CALL**

Present

Janice Roberts  
Gloria Bell  
Chris Dombrowski  
Gretchen Newsom  
Madison Hull  
Rick Smiles

Absent

Douglas Tracy  
Ernesto Morales

Executive Staff

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

**III. AGENDA**

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

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

Motion carried, 6 to 0.

**IV. MINUTES**

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel Members reviewed the Meeting Minutes from the last Panel Meeting and stated that there might be a correction to the Meeting Minutes from the last Panel Meeting.

ACTION: Ms. Newsom moved and Mr. Smiles seconded the approval of the Meeting Minutes from the last panel meeting with a correction on page 25 of 34, under Item 25, the motion carried 7-0 not 8-0. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative for approval of the Meeting Minutes as corrected from the last panel meeting.

Motion carried, 6 to 0.

## **V. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

Mr. Javier welcomed the Panel Members, Applicants, and Stakeholders and recognized the following managers in attendance who will be presenting today's proposals: Chris Hoover, Foster City Manager, San Francisco Bay Area Regional Office, Manager; Diana Torres, Southern California District Manager; Ryan Swier, North Hollywood Regional Office Manager; and Jana Lazarewicz, Sacramento Regional Office Manager.

Mr. Javier stated that at today's Panel, there will be roughly \$8 million in 22 projects, which includes one Delegation Order.

Mr. Javier stated that at the last Panel Meeting, it was reported that ETP had been working on plans around the new monies that came to ETP via the state budget process and working on gaining statutory authority over those funds. That would mean ETP could use its current contracting processes versus having to put the money out via an RFP process. However, ETP has been planning an RFP in case it was unsuccessful in gaining the authorities sought.

To recap ETP's current status, Mr. Javier explained that ETP's Staff Attorney, Michael Cable, drafted a legal opinion on ETP's ability to classify the new monies, the general fund monies as what we call our "alternative funding", which gives the authority that we were looking for. Then, Mr. Gutierrez took that legal opinion to EDD's legal team, asked for their concurrence on our opinion, and they concurred. Next we took the opinion to the Labor Agency's Legal Counsel, Mark Pilotin, to get their concurrence, which we did with the support of Stuart Knox, Undersecretary of Labor. Now, due to receiving the Labor Agency's concurrence, ETP is allowed to use existing processes with the new monies. This means, we no longer have to run an RFP on any of the new monies and ETP will continue to use its current contracting processes to get this money out quickly. In order to exercise this authority, the code says that the Panel must adopt guidelines for each of the funding streams. So Peter, Heather, and Ryan will be presenting on those guidelines later on in the agenda. Essentially, once all the guidelines are approved, we can immediately augment our funding buckets, by basically taking the general fund monies, putting them into the funding bucket, and start funding projects as soon as the next Panel Meeting. Our intent is to start funding most projects with the general fund monies, so that we can get contracts out as quick as possible.

Mr. Javier explained that at the last meeting he discussed ETP's core funding budget and how it was built on projections of the Employment Training Tax collections for last year. For obvious reasons, those projections were very low. However, the budget turned out to be higher than what was reflected in those projections - as much as \$20-25 million higher. So now ETP is doing two things. First, we're working with Agency to submit a BCP, a Budget Change Proposal, to increase our appropriations this year. ETP has a spending ceiling every year, and essentially we are now requesting an increase to our spending authority so that we would be able to increase our contracting capacity and put more money out into contracts this year. But we are facing a problem with timing. There is a chance ETP's BCP may not make it through the legislature in time to have it take effect for this fiscal year. Therefore, Staff is enacting a secondary plan at the same time, which is that our fiscal team is working through a series of drills in hopes that it can move resources around in a way that will allow an increase in contracting capacity within ETP's current budget framework. Hopefully, Staff will be able to add more monies to the core funding buckets in a few months. Staff will continue to update Shareholders as things progress.

Next Mr. Javier reported on ETP's new online application which launched the day before. Unfortunately, new tech launches often experience glitches at the start. Within minutes of the new application experiencing glitches, Tara and the development team were already working diligently

to resolve the issues, which they did. Staff appreciates applicants being patient during this time, because once past the initial glitches during the first hour of the day, the rest of the day ran smoothly. The Command Center was available all day to provide technical assistance and support to new applicants by answering questions and helping people get through their application process. But in the afternoon, they were no longer receiving calls because the application was running smoothly.

Mr. Javier expressed gratitude to the Cal-E-Force online application rollout team. Over the past couple months, they've increased the level of communication, trying to keep everybody informed. They've held multiple listening sessions and trainings, taking into account all the considerations and concerns they heard and using those to modify their processes, modify communication, increase the number of trainings, add new trainings, and new registration items. They did a great job and had created a successful rollout.

Mr. Javier shared that all Staff has been working very hard at making improvements to streamline the application process, not just the application itself, but the entirety of the process from the front door all the way to the Panel. One issue in that process is the first-in, first-out methodology of processing applications, which is one of the reasons why the Panel Packet looked a bit skewed recently. It had to do with how the application window opened up back in May, but Staff has addressed that and from here on out, you'll see Panel Packets much more balanced and after you approve the guidelines today, it is likely you'll see Panel Packets literally double because we'll be opening the floodgates and all these applications are going to be flowing through to the Panel. But we still need to take a look at that process and figure out how to make it work better so that we can honor what the Panel wants to see in terms of applications and create some type of filtering mechanism. So, Staff is creating a workgroup to figure out a better way of prioritizing applications that go to Panel for approval. We want this workgroup to explore practices from across the country, discuss options, and really help develop a recommendation that could replace the first-in, first-out methodology or at the very minimum, modify it so that it honors all the things that the Panel has been asking to see in all of these proposals. Staff will then take that recommendation to the Panel via the Policy Committee for consideration.

Mr. Javier explained that the intent is for this workgroup to be made out of a couple Panel members, some staff, and then some of our stakeholders and contractors. Michael Cable, Staff Attorney, has begun a dive deep into the rules and regulations to figure out how many Panel members can actually participate in this workgroup without violating quorum issues or other regulations. So any Panel Members who might be interested in participating in this workgroup should send Willie Atkinson an email stating your interest. The same thing goes for our stakeholder and contracting community as well. Those who would like to participate in this workgroup, please send Willie Atkinson an email. Willie and Peter will be coordinating all the logistics around the workgroup, but will not be leading the workgroup. We're likely to bring in an outside facilitator to facilitate the dialogue, the discussions, and the decision making for the group. We don't want the group to be too large, but we also want the group to be large enough to have a good mix of folks participating that represent a broad array of perspectives, approaches, experience, knowledge, so that the recommendation that comes out of the group would honor that. Now to turn it over to our Chief Deputy Director, Jaime Gutierrez to do the budget report.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked what the timing on getting the emails to Willie, regarding their interest in being on this workgroup.

Mr. Javier suggested that interested parties should send Willie an email within the next couple of weeks, then we can begin to comprise the workgroup. Then once we figure out the appropriate number of members, the entire list will be honed down to a good mix of folks that will be participating and begin communicating with them.

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

Mr. Gutierrez welcomed Panel Members and Stakeholders and provided a summary of the Employment Training Panel's funding.

### **Regarding Funding:**

As Director Javier stated, today's Panel Meeting is for approximately \$8 million. If all the proposals scheduled for this Panel Meeting are funded today, the Panel will be approving 22 projects. That includes one project for \$70,380 in Delegation Orders. Delegation Orders are Proposals capped at \$75K and approved under delegated authority by the Director on a continuous flow basis. Since the last Panel Meeting, we have approved one Delegation Order. Prior to yesterday's application implementation we received approximately 527 pre-applications, with an estimated value of just over \$70M. Of those, 61 applications are in development with the Regional Offices. As of 9:30 a.m. today, we had 139 applications submitted through the new online system

### **Regarding GF Funding and increased contracting capacity:**

Mr. Gutierrez shared that with the approval of the Expansion Funds and California Community College Guidance in this Panel Meeting, an additional \$55.5M in contracting capacity and a total contracting capacity of \$100.5M will be provided. We also have PFL (\$1M) and Social Entrepreneurs for Economic Development (SEED) (\$18M) funds that are separate but will require Panel approval in the future.

### **Regarding Demand and Allocations:**

Mr. Gutierrez also shared that ETP is currently within the allocations of \$51.3M in demand for Single Employer Contracts, \$6.4M in demand for Multiple Employer Contractors (MEC) requests, \$6.9M in demand for Small Business, \$10.4M in demand for Apprenticeships, and \$0 in demand for Critical Proposals.

Mr. Gutierrez asked for a motion to approve the Consent Calendar.

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

Ms. Newsom requested to have further discussion on Tab No. 5 North State Electrical Contractors.

Mr. Javier stated that he believes they are also pulling Tab 2 Central Valley Roofers and Waterproofers from the Agenda completely.

Ms. Torres shared that there is a correction under Tab 1 California Fire Stop that their development fees should be \$10,000.

Acting Chairperson Roberts confirmed that Tab 2 is pulled and asked if there was a representative present to discuss the Panel's questions regarding Tab 5 North State Electrical Contractors.

Ms. Newsom asked the applicant why they have not paired with an apprenticeship when much of the work they conduct is related to construction and low voltage electrical work.

Jason Alexander, NSECI, explained that a lot of their training that involves audio visual technologies and energy systems are done independently of an apprenticeship program due to their manufacturer trainings and new product trainings which they don't really get in the classroom setting of a mentorship training.

Ms. Newsom asked about an occupation they have identified as Field Crew. She asked how many of those members are doing electrical work and are electricians or power professionals. Ms. Newsom pointed out that NSECI stated in their application that trainees require 140 hours of hands-on training due to the complexity of electrical installations and repairs, which seems to imply that they are electricians. Ms. Newsom asked how they are working with the workers to make sure they are on the path to becoming state certified journey-level sound persons with their training.

Mr. Alexander answered that it is all done by hands-on learning and in-house training from certified journeymen or general foremen superintendents. They are state-certified electrical trainings and get both classroom and field training, including 32 hours of education per year through an apprenticeship program. Mr. Alexander stated that 10% of their field is an apprenticeship program through WECA.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any more questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Mr. Smiles moved for and Ms. Bell seconded the approval of the Consent Calendar, with the removal of Tab 2 and correction to Tab 1 as noted. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative for approval of the Consent Calendar as moved.

Motion carried, 6 to 0.

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

Peter Cooper reported that ETP now has a new spending authority that allows us to use the regular ETP process for applications and for spending the general fund dollars. The general fund dollars will give ETP additional contracting capacity of \$55.5M, but the Guidelines for use of the funds must pass before those funds can be used.

Mr. Cooper thanked Staff who worked hard to streamline these Guidelines and the application so that it will mirror the core program. This will move the funds out faster and make the process easy for applicants. Thanks to Diana Torres, Heather Miguel, Courtney Hoyt, Ryan Swier, Lis Testa, Jaime Gutierrez, Mario Maslac, Jennifer Lima, and Mike Cable.

Mr. Cooper reported that on September 15, 2021, a Policy Committee was held that focused on Guidelines for the Expansion Funds and the CCC Funds. The Guidelines have already been vetted by the Policy Committee and ETP Executive Staff; and Staff has made a few changes to the Guidelines in response to the Policy Committee's recommendations. Ryan Swier and Heather Miguel will report on the Policy Guidelines for these funds and ask for your input and approval later this morning. Also, later this morning, Lis Testa will give an update on the SEED and PFL programs.

Mr. Cooper stated that regarding the Community College and Expansion Funds, ETP is positioned to get these funds out very quickly and augment the funds in our core. Applicants

for these funds will use the same new Cal-E-Force application that went live yesterday. So, there will only be one application process regardless of funding source.

Mr. Cooper reported that since we want to get these new funds out as fast as possible, starting with the November Panel, all contracts will be funded out of the General Funds until that pot of money is used up. Then we will revert back to using the ETF.

## **VIII. REPORT ON CAL-E-FORCE ROLLOUT**

Tara Armstrong gave a presentation on the launch of ETP's new system, Cal-E-Force. Regarding preparation, Ms. Armstrong reported that her team did nine webinars starting from Business Operations Sessions, Demonstrations, Training Sessions, and New Applicant-Only Sessions. The team did Application FAQs on the ETP website, Offline Templates (so people could gather necessary information before applications went live), Reference Materials (step-by-step procedures), and Stakeholder Email Blasts. Ms. Armstrong reported that these webinars reached 260 individual attendee logins and the team responded to over 550 questions.

Ms. Armstrong shared their rollout approach, which included live support via Zoom help desk, call-in lines for questions, and a live Command Center for emails. All these support systems were staffed by people from operations and eligibility staff to marketing and technical staff.

Ms. Armstrong reported that the new system went live on Wednesday, September 29, 2021, just for registration to allow people to authenticate. At the very beginning of the day, there were two issues - one was a system link issues which caused a 35 minute delay for everyone, but the developer and ETP's system admins were ready to work to resolve the issue immediately. The second issue was that there were three fields that had a character limit issue, which was also resolved within the hour.

Ms. Armstrong provided statistics that as of Thursday, September 30, 2021, at 5 p.m., 107 applications had been submitted and 115 applications were in-progress. Ms. Armstrong reported that the live Zoom Command Center will remain open because that is currently the best resource to help customers. There will also be New Applicant Engagement and Terminology adjustment sessions and consideration of how ETP can make use of new technology at the first level of Eligibility Review and Pre-Information to Applicant.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked what is the difference between an "in-progress" and "submitted" application.

Ms. Armstrong responded that "in-progress" or "in draft" means that the applicant is still working on the application and have not submitted it yet. Staff can see when the applicant begins entering the first piece of data, so the marketing team can reach out to those customers and ask how they are progressing or if they have any questions and provide support.

Acting Chairperson Roberts inquired about the follow up for those applicants who experienced the character limit issue during the launch.

Ms. Armstrong stated that Staff instructed those applicants to enter whatever they could within the field limitation and that Staff will work with the development analysts to add any additional information they may need later during development. But the issue wouldn't stop their applications from going through or compromise the applicant's place in line.

## **IX. REPORT OF STAFF ATTORNEY**

Staff Attorney Michael Cable shared that since the original Legislation Memo was provided to the Panel, there has been a revised version which was also submitted and made available on the ETP website because there has been so many changes. Mr. Cable pointed out Chapter 165, AB 361 on page 2 of 10 that concerns open meetings. This bill was signed by the Governor and extends the executive order allowing ETP to have these Panel Meetings using electronics, such as Zoom. It should be noted that the bill is only effective until January 31, 2022. However, another bill is expected to be coming at some time in the future, which will likely be more comprehensive.

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

Ms. Newsom reported the ETP's Policy Committee met Wednesday, September 15, 2021 via Zoom. As mentioned earlier, Executive Director Reg Javier gave a funding update, discussing the current ETF allocation, a possible increase to that allocation, and the new alternative Expansion and California Community College funds, which will not be released through a Solicitation for Proposals process as was previously announced, but rather, will be handled through normal ETP contracting processes with some additional elements, as required by the founding Legislation for these funds.

Ms. Newsom reported Ryan Swier, North Hollywood Regional Office Manager, reviewed the new alternative California Community College Funds Guidelines, explaining some required elements for this funding that differ from our normal program.

Heather Miguel, Program Projects Unit Manager, reviewed the new alternative Expansion Funds guidelines. You will hear more about these two funding streams in a few moments.

Ms. Newsom then reported if anyone has a potential agenda topic for future Committee meetings, please email your suggestions, ideas or comments please email [Elisabeth.Testa@etp.ca.gov](mailto:Elisabeth.Testa@etp.ca.gov).

## **XI. DISCUSSION OF EXPANSION FUNDS GUIDELINES**

Heather Miguel, Manager of the Program Projects Unit, presented on the Expansion Fund Guidelines. The intention of these Guidelines is to closely mirror ETP's current contracting methods, while meeting the intent of the funding. These funds were awarded to ETP in SB 129 and consist of \$50 million in general fund dollars. With administrative costs taken into account, ETP will have approximately \$42.5 million in program funding to distribute. This funding was previously referred to as "Earn and Learn," so moving forward it will be called Expansion Funds and is available for expenditure or encumbrance until June 30, 2024.

Ms. Miguel shared that the Panel should expect to see projects at the November 2021 Panel Meeting for this Expansion Funding. Additionally, since these funds are general fund dollars and not coming from the Employment Training Fund, they are considered an alternative funding source. As such, ETP is required to create guidelines to support and implement the funding.

Ms. Miguel explained that while the Guidelines lay out some differences from the ETP core program, the overall goal is to align this funding as closely as possible to the ETP performance-based funding model. In addition, this funding aligns with ETP's mission to attract and retain businesses in California, including small businesses, and provide workers with secure jobs, good wages, and opportunities for advancement. In addition, these Guidelines will be consistent with the Panel's desire to expand funding to organizations that are relevant to the needs of the current



workforce through equity, inclusivity, and future-oriented programs. This includes working with business, labor, and government partners and supporting high-road employers, licensing, and certifications and reaching those impacted by Covid-19.

Ms. Miguel shared ETP's requirement that it report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee at two points: November 30, 2022, and then November 30, 2024. Listed under the Overview section in the Guidelines are the data elements that must be collected and reported, which mostly include data elements already being collected by ETP.

Ms. Miguel reiterated that these funds will be distributed in conjunction with ETP's core program and will follow the same standards, and if an exception is not stated under these Guidelines, then the core program policies and procedures will apply to these contracts. Further, with the Expansion Funds, Staff's assertion is that these monies will be allocated within the core program formula funding distribution to single and multiple employer contractors.

Ms. Miguel explained that the contract amount may be amended up to the program cap. Since this is one-time funding that must be spent or it will be lost, ETP must be able to amend contracts, up to the current cap, if a contractor is performing well. This flexibility assists the Agency in ensuring that the funds can be expanded or encumbered by the June 30, 2024 deadline.

Regarding Contractor Eligibility, Ms. Miguel explained that contractors will be able to apply for both core program dollars and Expansion Funds in a given fiscal year. However, the trainees from those two contracts may not receive training in both contracts at the same time. In ETP's core program, most contractors must pay the employment training tax in order to be eligible to enter into a training contract. However, the Expansion Funds do not require that an eligible contractor pay into this tax, which actually opens eligibility to contractors that ETP does not typically fund in our core program including nonprofit and public entities. All other ETP eligibility requirements apply.

Regarding Training Eligibility, Ms. Miguel explained that under ETP's current Job Creation policies, trainees are required to be placed into net new jobs. This requirement is removed for this funding in order to allow employers to utilize backfilled positions to count as Job Creation training. Ms. Miguel explained that Incidental Placement rules are reserved for MECs who placed trainees with entities that are not normally eligible for ETP funding and are typically capped at 20% of the training population, which usually includes nonprofits and public entities. However, since these entities are eligible for a contract under the expansion funding, the Incidental Placement Rules will not apply here to MECs.

Regarding Wage, ETP standard wage by county will apply for this funding, and SET wages will not apply.

Ms. Miguel explained that in order to meet some of the Legislative reporting requirements, ETP must collect the wage at the start of training to accurately gather information on participant wage gain. This will also be included in the terms and conditions of the contract for any of the Expansion Fund contractors. Regarding trainee wage verification, there is a possibility that people may not be able to verify trainees wages via its standard processes, if that is the case, the Guidelines provide that Staff may request payroll information from the contractor.

Regarding Record Keeping, Ms. Miguel stated that all training hours must be reported in ETP systems within 90 days of the delivery of training for two reasons: 1) it allows ETP staff to keep a close eye on contract performance to ensure overall program success because this funding must be spent within a limited amount of time, and 2) it ensures that ETP is able to report the most up-to-date information when required to report to the Legislature.

Ms. Miguel confirmed that all of these contracts will be subject to ETP standard monitoring and auditing processes, and if not otherwise specified in these Guidelines, ETP program standards apply.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if there will be alternative record keeping options available, like the ones in use now in some of the Covid projects. Ms. Miguel explained that ETP does allow for alternative record keeping and will recommend to contractors who are going to request alternative record keeping to discuss with their development or monitoring analyst, so that during development, it can be added to the proposal that comes before Panel.

Acting Chairperson Roberts also asked if these Guidelines are flexible regarding priority, non-priority, and NAICS code eligibility. Ms. Miguel explained that the Guidelines are more flexible around some of the eligibility so some of those nonprofit and government entities will be eligible to apply, but ETP standard core program policies around priority industries will remain in place for this funding.

Ms. Newsom expressed gratitude for these new, broader Guidelines for use of the new monies, but reiterated that the Panel still wants to see really high quality proposals come before them.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any more questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

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

Motion carried, 6 to 0.

## **XII. DISCUSSION OF CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE FUNDS GUIDELINES**

Ryan Swier, Manager of the North Hollywood Regional Office, presented on the California Community College Funds Guidelines. Mr. Swier stated that he worked with key stakeholders, including the Chancellor's office, consortium members, the Community College Contract Education Units, and ETP Executive Staff. These funds were approved in SB 129 consisting of \$15 million in general funds. With administrative costs taken into account, ETP will have approximately \$13 million in program funding to distribute. This funding is available for encumbrance or expenditure until June 30, 2024.

Mr. Swier explained that the Guidelines for the Community College Funds are the same as the Expansion Funds, with two exceptions. Under Approved Amount on the second page, these Guidelines state that MEC program project caps do not apply. The reason for this is to ensure that these funds are fully utilized and all funding is contracted out to the colleges that apply. Staff will be right-sizing these projects based off the prior performance and the overall contractor's needs.

Mr. Swier stated that if these Guidelines are approved at today's Panel, ETP will open up the applications for a three-week window and close it on Friday, October 22, 2021, at 5:00 p.m. All funding proposals under these projected funds will go to the December 2021 (or possibly January 2022) Panel to fund out the entire \$13 million, which is planned to be exhausted all at once.

Mr. Swier explained that the other difference in Guidelines is under Contractor Eligibility, which states here that the contractor must be a California Community Contract Education Unit and be funded as a MEC. There will be no single employers under these funds.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

**ACTION:** Mr. Smiles moved for and Ms. Hull seconded approval of the California Community College Funds Guidelines. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative for approval of the California Community College Funds Guidelines.

Motion carried, 6 to 0.

### **XIII. UPDATE ON PFL SB AND SEED GRANTS**

Lis Testa gave a report on the existing grants. The Paid Family Leave Small Business (PFL SB) Grant provides \$1M in General Fund dollars every year to ETP to assist small businesses who are affected by employees who are leave utilizing the PFL program to either bond with a new child or care for a sick family member. Those affected small businesses who have lost that employee for an extended period of time are eligible to receive a \$500 micro-grant which will hopefully help them offset the costs of training or hiring other employees to temporarily cover the duties of the employees who are out on the PFL.

Ms. Testa reported that in fiscal year 20/21, there were two awardees and their contracts have been fully executed, with a quarter of a million dollars so far having been distributed to them. These two awardees joined together to create a website application portal ([www.CaliforniaPaidFamilyLeaveAlliance.com](http://www.CaliforniaPaidFamilyLeaveAlliance.com)), they created flyers about the PFL SB grant in both English and Spanish, they have delivered six live presentation webinars to 100 small businesses, and many more marketing and education activities, including issuing 5 micro-grants to-date.

Ms. Testa reported that in fiscal year 21/22, ETP has received the million dollars for this year's PFL grant from the general fund and will be releasing a Solicitation for Proposals in October. Details will be announced on the ETP website and a stakeholder notification will also be sent announcing the opening of the application period.

Ms. Testa explained that the eligible population of small businesses for the micro-grants is very small because those small businesses have to have less than 10 employees. Staff is in the process of and have begun working on trying to create a referral network that will help get the eligible small businesses connected to the actual grant awardees. Staff is doing this by using company data from EDD's Labor Market Information Division and also their PFL Division to try to help identify eligible small businesses and hopefully this will help funnel the eligible small businesses to these grant awardees so that they can apply for and receive their \$500 micro-grants.

Ms. Testa shared that Chris Hoover, San Francisco Regional Office Manager, has assumed management duties of this grant so he is now ETP's main PFL SB grant contact.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if there was \$1M granted last year and only a quarter of a million was awarded, what happened to the other \$750,000?

Ms. Testa explained that the way the funding is set up, there are multiple funding controls in place. The funds are dispersed in installments of 25% of their funding at a time, the first of which was dispersed right at the beginning of the grant so they would have enough money to make the web portal, make the flyers, and get their programs up and running. Once they have selected 25% of their total micro-grantees, then they can request another 25% of the funding.

Ms. Testa explained the second control is that ETP can take funds back if they have not performed as planned, which is in their contracts. If that happens, ETP has the ability to shift the funds from the non-performing awardee to either a new awardee or someone who is performing better.

Acting Chairperson Roberts inquired about raising the \$500 amount to \$1,000 to incentivize or another way of making this program more successful. Ms. Testa explained that they are looking into that and other issues. Acting Chairperson Roberts suggested that Staff look into changing this if ETP will continue to receive a \$1M grant every year.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any further questions. There were none.

Ms. Testa explained that the second grant, the Social Entrepreneurs for Economic Development (SEED) Grant, supports the entrepreneurship of immigrant and limited English proficient individuals through two grant programs: the Entrepreneurship Program, which provides entrepreneurial training, micro-grants, and technical assistance to aid in the formation of new small businesses; and the Demonstration Project, which provides entrepreneurial training, micro-grants, and technical assistance to aid in the formation of new worker-owned cooperatives.

Ms. Testa reported that for fiscal year 20/21, ETP received \$10M in general fund dollars through an inter-agency agreement with the California Workforce Development Board to run the grant program. A solicitation for proposals was launched in mid-January 2021. ETP received 51 applications and chose 9 final awardees whose contracts have been fully executed; 8 Entrepreneurship Program awardees and 1 Demonstration Project awardee. ETP has also launched a Community of Learning and Practice for all grant awardees and their partners to network together to share hints, tips, and strategies.

Ms. Testa reported that of the \$10M, \$2,162,500 has been distributed to-date. The SEED Grant has similar fund disbursement as the PFL SB Grant does, so they don't get all of their money up front, they have to meet certain benchmarks in order to continue to get funding and, like the PFL SB Grant, if they are not performing, the funds that they have not spend can be recalled.

Ms. Testa shared that today, the SEED awardees have done a lot of preliminary work done to establish their grant programs, including hiring personnel, developing training curriculum and training materials, and creating all of their outreach materials. They have conducted outreach to 328,900 people in 20 different languages. They have hired people they needed, they've set up their technical assistance contracts, set up their fund distribution systems, developed the applications to be used for their micro-grants, and have been conducting outreach.

Ms. Testa explained that the legislation for SEED requires that ETP have an independent evaluator and the search for that independent evaluator will launch within the next few months.

For an update on this fiscal year, Ms. Testa shared that the Legislature has allocated an additional \$20M to the SEED Grant which will go to the California Workforce Development Board. The Board

has requested ETP to continue running the SEED Grants, so Staff is in the process of working on a second inter-agency agreement. Once the inter-agency agreement has been executed, it will only give ETP permission to receive the money, it does not give ETP permission to spend the money. ETP will have to also apply for spending authority for that additional \$20M. And ETP is waiting for a legal determination to see if the SEED funding must go out through a competitive grant request for proposal process or not.

Ms. Testa shared that Jana Lazarewicz, Sacramento Regional Office Manager, has assumed management duties of this grant so she is now ETP's main SEED Grant contact.

Acting Chairperson Roberts inquired about how the nine awardees were chosen and how the next awardees will be chosen.

Ms. Testa explained that everyone who applied was eligible. Each application was scored on multiple levels, then the nine highest scoring applications were awarded.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if awardees can reapply before they've used their funds for the next set of SEED grants. Ms. Testa responded that that had not been set up yet. But if any of the current awardees are performing really well, there would be the option to give them extra funding so that they could continue to perform really well.

Acting Chairperson Roberts inquired about the administration fees. Ms. Testa shared that for the Entrepreneurship Program, which is the largest chunk of the SEED Grant and those are the people that are starting new small businesses, 75% of their money has to go towards micro-grants to form new businesses. So, 25% of the funding to use for everything else, like hiring people, printing things, getting technical assistance contracts, getting fund distribution things set up, training, and the like. So, they receive the 25% up front because they have to develop a whole curriculum and they have to get everything ready. Any remaining funds that they request will be only for the micro-grants, they're not getting any more admin money.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if ETP is getting any funds from this to help with their administration costs. Ms. Testa explained that from the first \$10M, ETP got \$350,000 as a 3.5% admin fee, which is low. For the \$20M, Staff is expecting to have a higher amount for admin, closer to 10 or 15% for ETP, so that would be anywhere from another \$2 - \$3 million for ETP. Ms. Testa shared that Staff is trying to get the grants into a grants management system as part of or attached to Cal-E-Force, which also has a cost involved, so those extra admin dollars would be very beneficial for us. Ms. Testa also shared that PFL and the STEPS grant were pro bono, but the SEED grant is not.

Ms. Newsom stated that for repeat contractors, she would want to see the success of those programs previously, and success here means the number of individuals that have enrolled and completed their training, the number of grants that have been given, and what the impact has been for that.

Ms. Testa stated that grantees would have to show high performance on their current grant in order to get any additional funding. Ms. Testa also shared that the grant awardees were awarded vastly different sizes of awards, the smallest being \$150,000 and the highest being around \$4M.

Acting Chairperson Roberts stated that she was a little disappointed in the imbalance of this Panel Packet, and thinks it may be due to the first-in, first-out in the May submittal process. Acting Chairperson Roberts pointed out that all the Single Employers in this Panel came from one subcontractor who was able to get all this information in May. Acting Chairperson Roberts stated

that she didn't like that he is getting a 10% cut on the development fees from each one of these small businesses, some of which are coming in for the first time, and the subcontractor was using the exact same template for all of them. Acting Chairperson Roberts stated she believed all those development fees were not warranted in this situation. ETP Staff and staff attorney are looking into how the development fees and registration fees could be combined.

Acting Chairperson Roberts also shared her concern about the amount of hours that were inputted into the apprenticeship programs and shared that some contractors and subcontractors reported that they did not have any guidelines regarding what hours were needed to be inputted. Acting Chairperson Roberts stated that what the Panel Members see is that it has been a year since they approved a contract and they are showing no hours, no performance, just a projection. The other MEC in the packet was able to get all their hours in, so Acting Chairperson Roberts wondered if they should make exceptions for apprenticeship programs or if apprenticeships need to also enter some type of hours in to give the Panel some legitimacy to their performance.

Mr. Cable added that Staff is reviewing language for the guidelines that are being prepared, specifically the 90-day data entry requirement. Mr. Cable suggested that some best practices there might be folded into ETP's regular program contracts. Staff is currently looking at the issue.

#### **XIV. REVIEW AND ACTION ON PROPOSALS SINGLE EMPLOYER CONTRACTS**

##### **Tab No. 8: Iron Mechanical, Inc.**

Ms. Lazarewicz presented a proposal on behalf of Iron Mechanical, Inc., who is requesting \$249,780 to train 307 workers, including 50 new employees and 15 veterans. Training will take place at their locations in Buena Park and Sacramento.

Ms. Lazarewicz stated that there are representatives here to answer any question that the Panel Members may have and introduced Judy Gomes, Controller; Jed Risse, CEO; and Mike Snead, Consultant, Carrazco Innovative Tax Solutions.

Ms. Newsom asked why Iron Mechanical is not performing their curriculum and training in conjunction with an apprenticeship program, since this is construction related.

Mr. Risse responded that they do have an apprenticeship program and the training they do is general contractor jobsite-specific, so it's not training that is normally taught in a classroom. They are also members of two state-approved training programs for apprentices. Mr. Risse confirmed that none of the trainees in this application are apprentices, but they do have apprentices.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any more questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

**ACTION:** Ms. Bell moved and Mr. Smiles seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Iron Mechanical, Inc. in the amount of \$249,780. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal submitted by Iron Mechanical, Inc. in the amount of \$249,780.

Motion carried, 6 to 0.

## **XV. REVIEW AND ACTION ON PROPOSALS MULTIPLE EMPLOYER CONTRACTS**

### **Tab No. 9: Laborers Training, Retraining and Apprenticeship Trust of Southern California (The Laborers School)**

Mr. Swier presented a proposal on behalf of the Laborers Training, Retraining and Apprenticeship Trust of Southern California (The Laborers School). They are a Repeat Contractor requesting \$596,610 to train 103 journeyworkers and 346 apprentices, 20 of which are under a veterans job number. All training will be located in Southern California. Please note that the development of this project is under active projects, they do have two open contracts and another one under prior contracts that are all under 42% of the hours tracked for potential contractor earnings. However, the contractor is estimating final earnings of 100% based off the training currently committed to employers on all three agreements.

Mr. Swier stated that there are representatives here to answer any question that the Panel Members may have and introduced Sarah Gordon, Administration; Lisa Beccera, Executive Assistant; Betty Alvarado, Bookkeeping; and Kelly Greer, Consultant.

Ms. Newsom asked the applicant to address some of the concerns that were raised by Madam Chair earlier as to tracking their progress and submitting hours for their current and outstanding contracts. Acting Chairperson Roberts reiterated that to the Panel, it appears that they have three open contracts with no information and no projections.

Kelly Greer explained that the information in the Panel Packets was slightly outdated and they actually have 72% of the information uploaded for one project, 37% information uploaded for their second project, and for both of those projects they have over 100% in their database. Ms. Greer stated that the issue is that ETP's system of invoicing prevents inputting trainees into a new project until they have 100% completed their previous project, which slows them down from being added into the second project. However, Ms. Greer stated that she appreciates ETP's way of doing this because it allows them to make sure they are not double enrolling trainees into both projects, but it does create less ability to actually show performance. Ms. Greer stated that in the past, they have asked ETP staff if it would be possible to show their database records, so that they can at least show performance, and she would like to ask the Panel and ETP staff to reconsider that as an option. Ms. Greer also noted that she appreciates how the new system makes sure that when payments are made, 100% of it has been earned so that no money will have to be returned, but that also slows down their ability to upload hours.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if it wouldn't be wise to just wait until those apprenticeship projects are closed out before they reapply because she is seeing them applying before even a year is up. Acting Chairperson Roberts stated that she has seen Ms. Greer's projects coming in within 9 months, just to get the application in, but may not have finished training yet. Staff holds other MECS accountable for getting all their trainees through before they reapply, so Acting Chairperson Roberts asked why Ms. Greer's projects should be treated any differently.

Ms. Greer explained that most apprenticeship programs run on an academic year, starting in August and finishing in June or July. Ms. Greer shared that all of the ETP funding is used up in that one academic year, but it takes them a long time to collect the retention information. For example, they might finish in June, then it takes them a month or two to get the work hours from the third party that keeps track of all the apprenticeship work hours, which means they would get those hours in August. Then it takes two weeks to a month for them to process all that information. So, by the time it gets to ETP, it's now been five months since the training date has ended and they can't invoice for both the training and the close-out, they must do them one at a time. Ms. Greer stated that if they were to wait for a contract to completely close out, it would mean that those trainings that started in August, would not be able to be funded. Ms. Greer suggested

creating a diagram to further explain to the Panel the timing of apprenticeship training and why they must use the timeline that they do.

Ms. Newsom asked if Ms. Greer could include in the diagram the nuance of the new apprenticeship cohorts coming on and then the new apprentices as they advance through in their curriculum, because apprenticeships are multi-year similar to college.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if Ms. Greer was shorthanded and why they are not able to get the paperwork in so that the Panel can see some data.

Ms. Greer responded that they are not shorthanded and that her group submitted 39 of the 107 applications that were submitted.

Sara Gordon, SoCal Laborers, suggested that to the chart Kelly is creating, that she should include their past performances so Panel Members can see that they have a very good track record of using all the funds that they receive.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any more questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Ms. Newsom moved and Ms. Hull seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Laborers Training, Retraining and Apprenticeship Trust of Southern California in the amount of \$596,610. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal submitted by Laborers Training, Retraining and Apprenticeship Trust of Southern California in the amount of \$596,610.

Motion carried, 6 to 0.

**Tab No. 10: Local Union 250 of the Southern California Pipe Trades District Council No. 16 of the United Association**

Mr. Swier presented a proposal on behalf of the Local Union 250 of the Southern California Pipe Trades District Council No. 16 of the United Association. They are a Repeat Contractor requesting \$598,290 to train 259 apprentices, all located in Southern California. Their current active contract has been tracked for 50% of the approved amount, however the contract projects final earnings of 100% based off training currently committed to employers and in process through September of 2021.

Mr. Swier stated that there are representatives here to answer any question that the Panel Members may have and introduced David Payne-Fitter, Training Coordinator and Steve Duscha, Consultant.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Mr. Smiles moved and Ms. Bell seconded approval of the proposal submitted by Local Union 250 of the Southern California Pipe Trades District Council No. 16 of the United Association in the amount of \$598,290. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal



submitted by Local Union 250 of the Southern California Pipe Trades District Council No. 16 of the United Association in the amount of \$598,290.

Motion carried, 6 to 0.

**Tab No. 11: Los Angeles and Orange Counties Air Conditioning and Refrigeration JJATC**

Mr. Swier presented a proposal on behalf of the Local Union 250 of the Southern California Pipe Trades District Council No. 16 of the United Association. They are a Repeat Contractor requesting \$598,770 to train 223 apprentices, 52 journeyworkers, and 20 Retraitees all located in Southern California. Their current active contract shows no hours tracked in the ETP system, however, they expect to have hours tracked by September 17, 2021. Please note, the Contractor states that the data upload hours has been delayed due to processing of its last contract, however, overall they expect 100% of potential earnings once hours are tracked.

Mr. Swier stated that there are representatives here to answer any question that the Panel Members may have and introduced Simon Cote, Director of Training and Steve Duscha, Consultant.

Ms. Newsom asked if this Local 250 project is different from the Tab 10 Local 250 project.

Simon Cote explained that one project is a steamfitter, plumber, pipefitter local and the other is a refrigeration HVAC service local.

Steve Duscha added that the information on the 130 is out of date and they have uploaded 86% of the training hours.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any more questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Ms. Newsom moved and Ms. Bell seconded approval of the proposal submitted Los Angeles and Orange Counties Air Conditioning and Refrigeration JJATC in the amount of \$598,770. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal submitted by Los Angeles and Orange Counties Air Conditioning and Refrigeration JJATC in the amount of \$598,770.

Motion carried, 6 to 0.

**Tab No. 12: Tri-Counties Sheet Metal Workers JATC**

Mr. Swier presented a proposal on behalf of the Tri-Counties Sheet Metal Workers JATC. They are a Repeat Contractor requesting \$212,572 to train 9 journeyworkers and 53 apprenticeship trainees, 5 of which are located under a veterans job number. Training will take place in Ventura and Santa Maria.

Mr. Swier stated that there are representatives here to answer any question that the Panel Members may have and introduced Brian Hill, Training Coordinator – Tri-Counties; Andree Cameron, Office Manager- Tri-Counties; John Brauer, Director – California Labor Federation; Kelly Greer, Consultant – Strategy Workplace Communications.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

**ACTION:** Ms. Hull moved and Ms. Newsom seconded approval of the proposal submitted Tri-Counties Sheet Metal Workers JATC in the amount of \$212,572. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal submitted by Tri-Counties Sheet Metal Workers JATC in the amount of \$212,572.

Motion carried, 6 to 0.

**Tab No. 13: Glaziers, Architectural Metal and Glass Workers Local Union No. 636**

Ms. Torres presented a proposal on behalf of the Glaziers, Architectural Metal and Glass Workers Local Union No. 636. They are a Repeat Contractor requesting \$484,400 to train approximately 200 apprentices and 70 journeyworkers. Glazier's Local works with Helmets to Hardhats to actively market to veterans and they do not have a separate job number for veterans, however, they do plan to have veterans participate in this project. Currently, there are 8 veterans in their program. They have been approved to use a learning management system and with regard to their active project that they started in December 2020, they currently have 52% of training hours completed.

Ms. Torres stated that there are representatives here to answer any question that the Panel Members may have and introduced Mike Galstaun, Coordinator and Steve Duscha, Consultant.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

**ACTION:** Mr. Smiles moved and Ms. Bell seconded approval of the proposal submitted Glaziers, Architectural Metal and Glass Workers Local Union No. 636 in the amount of \$484,400. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal submitted by Glaziers, Architectural Metal and Glass Workers Local Union No. 636 in the amount of \$484,400.

Motion carried, 6 to 0.

**Tab No. 14: N.E.C.A./I.B.E.W. Inland Training Fund**

Ms. Torres presented a proposal on behalf of the N.E.C.A./I.B.E.W. Inland Training Fund. This is supported by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 440 and Local 477. They are requesting \$596,494 to train approximately 15 journeyworkers and 304 apprentices from Local 440, Local 477, as well as a veterans job numbers for both. This proposal includes expected participation of 13 ventured apprentices, they work with Helmets to Hardhats to actively recruit veteran applicants, and they actively recruit woman through a partnership with Women in Non-Traditional Employment Roles which prepares them for careers in the construction industry. The Contractor also works with bootcamps at local high schools and their Local 440 has hired a resource development staff member who was responsible for participation and Career Day events, as well as connecting with individual entities who can help increase women recruitment.

Ms. Torres explained, with regard to their active project, they have tracked the equivalent of earnings of 100% of their approved amount for a project that has had approximately 12 months and expected to term in August 2022.

Ms. Torres stated that there are representatives here to answer any question that the Panel Members may have and introduced Rick Purper, Training Director and Kelly Greer, Consultant.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Mr. Smiles moved and Ms. Bell seconded approval of the proposal submitted N.E.C.A./I.B.E.W. Inland Training Fund in the amount of \$596,494. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal submitted by N.E.C.A./I.B.E.W. Inland Training Fund in the amount of \$596,494.

Motion carried, 6 to 0.

#### **Tab No. 15: United Association Local Union 342**

Ms. Torres presented a proposal on behalf of the United Association Local Union 342. This is supported by the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of Plumbing and Pipe Fitting of the United States and Canada Local 342. They are requesting \$599,251 to train approximately 72 journeyworkers and 263 apprentices. The UA Local 342 recruits veterans and works with Helmets to Hardhats and Veterans in Piping ("VIP Program") and currently have veterans who are direct results of this recruitment. They do not have a separate veterans job number, but are actively recruiting veterans. UA Local 342 also actively recruits, hires, and incentivizes women to join the apprenticeship program and partners with local organizations such as the Oakland Chapter of Tradeswomen and Rising Sun Center for Opportunity. It also sponsors delegates to 10 National Women in Construction events. Regarding their current active projects, one is scheduled to complete in December 2022 and there are no hours shown yet, however, Staff did receive information from their administrator a few days ago. Their other project has the equivalent of 100% of the agreement amount.

Ms. Torres stated that there are representatives here to answer any question that the Panel Members may have and introduced Al Garcia, Kim Acosta, and Steve Duscha.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Mr. Smiles moved and Ms. Newsom seconded approval of the proposal submitted United Association Local Union 342 in the amount of \$599,251. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal submitted by United Association Local Union 342 Fund in the amount of \$599,251.

Motion carried, 6 to 0.

**Tab No. 16: Bay Area Counties Roofing and Waterproofing Industry Apprenticeship Training Fund**

Mr. Hoover presented a proposal on behalf of the Bay Area Counties Roofing and Waterproofing Industry Apprenticeship Training Fund. They are supported by the United Union of Roofers, Waterproofers, and Allied Workers Local 40, 81, and 95. This is a Priority Industry and Repeat Contractor requesting \$599,820 to train approximately 30 trainees under Job 1 for journeyworkers and 252 trainees under Job 2 for apprentices. Training will be delivered at the Bay Area Roofers training facility in Livermore. This will be the Bay Area Roofers 7<sup>th</sup> ETP contract and its 5<sup>th</sup> in the last five years. Even though the Bay Area Roofers are committed to training veterans, the JATC is not including a veteran job number in this project at this time for ease of project administration. Bay Area Roofers participates in Helmets to Hardhats and gives veterans accelerated admission to its apprenticeship program.

Mr. Hoover stated that there are representatives here to answer any question that the Panel Members may have and introduced Dan Smith, Director of Training and Steve Duscha, Consultant.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Ms. Newsom moved and Mr. Smiles seconded approval of the proposal submitted Bay Area Counties Roofing and Waterproofing Industry Apprenticeship Training Fund in the amount of \$599,820. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal submitted by Bay Area Counties Roofing and Waterproofing Industry Apprenticeship Training Fund in the amount of \$599,820.

Motion carried, 6 to 0.

**Tab No. 17: Northern California Elevator Industry Joint Apprenticeship Training Committee Trust Fund**

Mr. Hoover presented a proposal on behalf of the Northern California Elevator Industry Joint Apprenticeship Training Committee Trust Fund. They are supported by the International Union of Elevator Constructors Local Union No. 8. This is a Priority Industry and Repeat Contractor requesting \$599,872 to train approximately 67 trainees under Job 1 for journeyworkers and 254 trainees under Job 2 for apprentices. Training will be delivered at NorCal Elevator JATC's headquarters in San Francisco or one of its leased facilities in Martinez, Sacramento, Santa Clara, or Marin. This will be the NorCal Elevator JATC's 4<sup>th</sup> ETP contract and its 4<sup>th</sup> in the last five years. Even though the NorCal Elevator JATC is committed to training veterans, the JATC is not including a veteran job number in this project at this time for ease of project administration. Bay Area Roofers participates in Helmets to Hardhats and gives veterans accelerated admission to its apprenticeship program.

Mr. Hoover stated that there are representatives here to answer any question that the Panel Members may have and introduced Joel Roberts, National Elevator Industry Educational Program Area Coordinator and Steve Duscha, Consultant.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Mr. Smiles moved and Ms. Hull seconded approval of the proposal submitted Northern California Elevator Industry Joint Apprenticeship Training Committee Trust Fund in the amount of \$599,872. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal submitted by Northern California Elevator Industry Joint Apprenticeship Training Committee Trust Fund in the amount of \$599,872.

Motion carried, 6 to 0.

**Tab No. 18: Pipe Trades Apprentice and Journeymen Training Trust Fund for San Mateo County**

Mr. Hoover presented a proposal on behalf of the Pipe Trades Apprentice and Journeymen Training Trust Fund for San Mateo County. They are supported by the United Association Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipefitting Industry of the United States and Canada UA Local No. 467. This is a Priority Industry and Repeat Contractor requesting \$588,468 to train approximately 10 trainees under Job 1 for journeymen, 147 under Job 2 for apprentices, and 3 under Job 3 for veteran apprentices. Training will be delivered at their training center in Burlingame. This will be the JATC's 6<sup>th</sup> ETP contract and its 6<sup>th</sup> in the last five years. Pipe Trades AJTTF for San Mateo is committed to including 3 apprentices that are veterans and to support job-related training that helps veterans transition into California's workforce. This AJTTF recruits veterans in cooperation with Helmets to Hardhats. The Panel has established other incentives for training California veterans, including making available higher support costs to reach these participants for this project.

Mr. Hoover stated that there are representatives here to answer any question that the Panel Members may have and introduced Stephan Schnell, Director of Training; Kelly Greer, Director, Strategy Workplace Communications; and John Brauer, Director, WED, Cal Labor Federation.

Acting Chairperson Roberts inquired why their prior project only shows 73% when it was projected to be 100%, close out was three months ago, and retention was seven months ago. Ms. Greer responded that there is a lag between when they write the applications and they get posted. Ms. Greer shared that previously, they would provide updates on performance to Staff and they would be added to the presentations at the Panel Meetings, but that hasn't been happening recently. Ms. Greer explained that at retention, they have to wait about one to two months for the third party to give them those work hours because they're collecting them from all of the employers that are signatories with this JATC. They will get those hours toward the end of August, then it takes anywhere from two weeks to a month and a half to get that all entered into the ETP system because they have to double check and make sure that we're not double dipping or using people's hours from a previous contract. Then after that is submitted to ETP's fiscal unit, they are only allowed to invoice for the training part. Ms. Greer explained that in the past, they were allowed to invoice for the training part and the closeout. So, now they get them in in September, then have to wait one to three months for ETP staff to process that training invoice. Then after Staff processes that training invoice, they can then submit the invoice for closeout which will take from one to two months before to go through. Acting Chairperson Roberts said she is looking forward to the diagram that Ms. Greer will be creating to illustrate the timing of apprenticeships to share with the Panel.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any more questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

**ACTION:** Ms. Newsom moved and Mr. Smiles seconded approval of the proposal submitted Pipe Trades Apprentice and Journeymen Training Trust Fund for San Mateo County in the amount of \$588,468. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal submitted by Pipe Trades Apprentice and Journeymen Training Trust Fund for San Mateo County in the amount of \$588,468.

Motion carried, 6 to 0.

#### **Tab No. 19: Redwood Empire Electrical Joint Apprenticeship Trust**

Mr. Hoover presented a proposal on behalf of the Redwood Empire Electrical Joint Apprenticeship Trust. They are supported by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 551. This is a Priority Industry and Repeat Contractor requesting \$348,380 to train approximately 85 trainees under Job 1 for apprentices and 5 trainees under Job 2 veteran apprentices. Training will be delivered at the Redwood Empire Electrical Training Center in Santa Rosa. This will be the Redwood Empire Electrical's 2<sup>nd</sup> ETP contract and its 2<sup>nd</sup> in the last five years. Redwood Empire Electrical recruits veterans in cooperation with Helmets to Hardhats. The Panel has established other incentives for training California veterans, including making available higher support costs to reach these participants for this project.

Mr. Hoover stated that there are representatives here to answer any question that the Panel Members may have and introduced Rob Barsi, Training Director 9; Kelly Greer, Director, Strategy Workplace Communications; and John Brauer, Director, WED, Cal Labor Federation.

Ms. Newsom pointed out that their application states that they've graduated 350,000 apprentices to journey-level status and asked if that was all from just their Local chapter. Mr. Barsi responded that number of graduates comes from IBEW as a whole. Mr. Barsi explained that their JATC has been doing this for 41 years and they have an average of 12 per year.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any more questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

**ACTION:** Mr. Smiles moved and Ms. Hull seconded approval of the proposal submitted Redwood Empire Electrical Joint Apprenticeship Trust in the amount of \$348,380. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal submitted by Redwood Empire Electrical Joint Apprenticeship Trust in the amount of \$348,380.

Motion carried, 6 to 0.

#### **Tab No. 20: Central Valley – Mother Lode Plumbers, Pipe, and Refrigeration Fitters Joint Apprenticeship Training Committee**

Ms. Lazarewicz presented a proposal on behalf of the Central Valley – Mother Lode Plumbers, Pipe, and Refrigeration Fitters Joint Apprenticeship Training Committee. They are requesting \$293,970 to train journeyworkers, apprentices, and veteran apprentices. Central Valley – Mother Lode operates in San Joaquin and Stanislaus Counties.

Ms. Lazarewicz stated that there are representatives here to answer any question that the Panel Members may have and introduced Greg Vincelet, Training Director; Kelly Greer, Strategy Workplace; and John Brauer, Cal Labor Federation.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any more questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Ms. Hull moved and Ms. Newsom seconded approval of the proposal submitted Central Valley - Mother Lode Plumbers, Pipe, and Refrigeration Fitters Joint Apprenticeship Training Committee in the amount of \$293,970. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal submitted by Central Valley - Mother Lode Plumbers, Pipe, and Refrigeration Fitters Joint Apprenticeship Training Committee in the amount of \$293,970.

Motion carried, 6 to 0.

#### **Tab No. 21: Greater San Fernando Valley Chamber of Commerce**

Ms. Lazarewicz presented a proposal on behalf of the Greater San Fernando Valley Chamber of Commerce. They are a Repeat Contractor requesting \$599,428 to train 554 workers throughout the State of California. The Chamber provides a variety of business services and programs targeted to help small, large, micro, women, veterans, and minority-owned businesses.

Ms. Lazarewicz stated that there are representatives here to answer any question that the Panel Members may have and introduced Nancy Hoffman Vanyek, CEO and Deborah Imonti, Consultant.

Acting Chairperson Roberts thanked them for having a contract within one year and being able to get all their information in.

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked if the Panel had any more questions.

Hearing none, Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for a motion.

ACTION: Mr. Smiles moved and Ms. Newsom seconded approval of the proposal submitted Greater San Fernando Valley Chamber of Commerce in the amount of \$599,428. Acting Chairperson Roberts called for a vote, and all Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to approve the proposal submitted by Greater San Fernando Valley Chamber of Commerce in the amount of \$599,428.

Motion carried, 6 to 0.

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

Acting Chairperson Roberts asked for panel members to comment on agenda items for future panel meetings.

Ms. Bell stated she had a question regarding today's projects. Ms. Bell pointed out that of the 14 presented today, 100% of them are consultant driven. Ms. Bell inquired that of the new applications that came in, how many have consultants versus businesses submitting applications on their own.

Ms. Armstrong shared that of the 140 MEC projects that came in, 6 did not have a subcontractor and 41 Single Employer contracts did not have a subcontractor. Ms. Armstrong also shared that her team worked with a lot of first-time applicants during their training sessions and hope to simplify the process in the future so that fewer contractors will need subcontractors.

## **XVII. PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

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

Mr. Duscha shared that he had been skeptical of the Guidelines on Agenda today as they had been presented at the Policy Committee Meeting, but now understands how they are going to work and very much supports the Guidelines as the Panel has adopted them. Mr. Duscha also wanted to share his support for setting up a work group to figure out something better than the first-in, first-out model for applications.

Mr. Brauer stated that about five years ago, he shared a document with the Panel, that he would like to re-share, which makes some suggestions around the specifics of the apprenticeship model regarding work schedules and training schedules. He would like to bring that document back for discussion.

Ms. Greer thanked Staff for doing such a great job with setting up the new system. Ms. Greer said the training was well organized and clearly presented and the site itself was easy to navigate and easy to fill out. Ms. Greer thanked Staff for all their hard work.

Mr. Eldon Davidson added that he agreed with Mr. Duscha and thinks that instead of first-in, first-out, the process should be based on performance.

## **XVIII. MEETING ADJOURNMENT**

Acting Chairperson Roberts adjourned the meeting at 11:56 a.m.