



**STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
EMPLOYMENT TRAINING PANEL**

**Friday, April 24, 2026**

**Panel Members**

Rebecca Bettencourt  
Chair

Dee Dee Myers  
*Ex-Officio* Member

Rick Smiles  
Member

Gretchen Newsom  
Member

Doug Tracy  
Member

Emily Desai  
Member

Jennifer Fothergill  
Member

Mike Greenlee  
Member

**Executive Staff**

Jessica Grimes  
Executive Director

Kumani Armstrong  
Assistant Director/Chief Counsel

Peter Cooper  
Assistant Director/Senior Advisor

Laura Campbell  
Chief Deputy Director

Tara Armstrong  
Deputy Director of Technical Branch

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
EMPLOYMENT TRAINING PANEL  
CalEPA Coastal Room  
1001 I Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
Friday, April 24, 2026**

**CALL TO ORDER BY CHAIR BETTENCOURT**

Chair Bettencourt called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

**ROLL CALL**

Present:

Rebecca Bettencourt  
Rick Smiles  
Gretchen Newsom  
Jennifer Fothergill  
Emily Desai  
Mike Greenlee

Not Present:

Douglas Tracy

Executive Staff Present:

Jessica Grimes, Executive Director  
Kumani Armstrong, Assistant Director/Chief Counsel  
Peter Cooper, Assistant Director/Senior Advisor  
Laura Campbell, Chief Deputy Director  
Tara Armstrong, Deputy Director of Technical Branch  
Jana Lazarewicz, Chief of Program Operations

**ACTION TO APPROVE APRIL PANEL MEETING AGENDA**

The April Panel Meeting Agenda was reviewed.

**ACTION:** Member Newsom moved to approve the March Panel Meeting Agenda with a request that Tab 7 (Greater San Fernando Valley Chamber of Commerce) be moved to the end of the meeting. Member Smiles Seconded. All Panel Members present voted in the affirmative for approval as moved.

Motion carried by roll call vote, 6 to 0.

Rebecca Bettencourt – aye  
Rick Smiles – aye  
Gretchen Newsom – aye  
Jennifer Fothergill – aye

Emily Desai – aye  
Mike Greenlee – aye

## **ACTION TO APPROVE MARCH 2026 PANEL MEETING MINUTES**

The March 2026 Panel Meeting Minutes included in the Panel Packet were reviewed.

**ACTION:** Member Newsom moved to approve the March 2026 Panel Meeting Minutes. Member Smiles Seconded. All Panel Members present voted in the affirmative for approval as moved.

Motion carried by roll call vote, 6 to 0.

Rebecca Bettencourt – aye  
Rick Smiles – aye  
Gretchen Newsom – aye  
Jennifer Fothergill – aye  
Emily Desai – aye  
Mike Greenlee – aye

## **EXECUTIVE REPORT**

Good morning, and happy Friday to everyone! Welcome to our eighth panel meeting for the 2025–26 fiscal year. I am proud that ETP continues to play a critical role in advancing workforce training across California for almost 50 years.

Before we begin with the content of the agenda, I am pleased to welcome our new representative from GO-Biz, Chief Deputy Director, Emily Desai.

Prior to her time at GO-Biz, Emily served the U.S. Congress as a Senior Project Manager for international affairs, trade, and national security at the U.S. Government Accountability Office. Emily was appointed to serve on the U.S. Investment Advisory Council and appointed to serve on the Intergovernmental Policy Advisory Committee for the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative.

As you can see, Emily brings a wealth of experience and leadership that will be an asset for advancing our mission. Welcome Emily!

At the same time, we offer our sincere appreciation to Derek Kirk, whose service and contributions to the Panel have been greatly valued. He will be missed.

### **Highlight - Stakeholder Engagement**

ETP has begun an expanded stakeholder engagement process to help inform and strengthen how we make decisions. Today's presentation and action item on Apprenticeships were enhanced by the insights gathered from these engagement sessions, and I am deeply appreciative of the valuable insights that we have gained during these listening sessions to help shape the discussion that the Panel will be voting on today.

As part of our engagement effort, ETP has also conducted a survey on AI and its impact on workers. Respondents who participated were invited to attend an engagement session on the 15th, so we appreciate their contributions. We are now exploring ways that ETP can continue deepening our understanding of how AI is impacting the workforce so that we can support retaining jobs and averting layoffs as workers adapt to emerging AI technologies.

### **Proposal Highlights**

For this panel, we have 13 proposals submitted for review. If approved, ETP will fund projects totaling approximately \$3.4 million dollars:

- 46% fell within the priority industry sector of manufacturing.
- 46% represent small businesses.
- 63% are repeat contractors, while
- 38% are from new contactors.

### **Presentations**

Additionally, ETP staff will share two action items today:

- First, Marcela Loza will begin by presenting the recommended Funding Priorities and Limitations for ETP's annual review of funding strategies and recommendations for the upcoming state fiscal year.
- Then, Willie Atkinson will wrap up the presentations with the FY 26/27 Apprenticeship Funding Model addressing the allocation of limited apprenticeship funds within a highly oversubscribed program.

## **LEGISLATIVE REPORT**

Legislature came back from recess on April 6th. Most of the bills are currently running through committee. Things change as they go through committee. We don't typically do a deep dive at this point because of the changes. However, since we do have the May revise on your next legislative report, I'll be including a lot more of the legislative bills we are tracking.

There are two things to point out in the memo, the first being on page one, AB 1534. This is a bill that creates an Advisory Board for the federal workforce Pell grant program. It was recently amended to make it an urgency bill. So, if that does pass and get signed, then it would become effective immediately. Another bill is SB 1059, which is the Employment Training Panel bill. You will find it on the bottom of page 2, rolling onto page 3. The bill was in committee last week, and there were some changes. What has been provided to you is the updated version with those amendments. More importantly is the last five or six pages of that document which includes the legislative analysis that accompanied the bill.

Next time, I will provide more on the budget bills and any updates on this ETP bill.

Legal Unit currently is doing legislative analysis looking at AB 1534 and SB 1059. Thanks to our fiscal unit who have been looking at the fiscal impacts of that.

## **TECHNOLOGY REPORT**

### **GenAI Adoption for ETP**

A couple updates in our technology area are more around our ETP application coming up for fiscal year 26-27. We are in our final stages for improvements. The application will open May 1<sup>st</sup> for 26-27 funding.

The enhancements include eliminating duplicative questions, adding page headers, pick lists, and conditional questions, and adding a funding cap enhancement so that applicants can not submit funding over the funding cap. There are a couple of additional questions that came from recommendations from the Policy Committee. Those included asking whether their repeat PEs are offering new training programs and a business model question allowing applicants to select yes/no, as well as what the reimbursement would look like, if yes. An additional question asks if they are using AI or GenAI. This resulted in a reduction of 19% of the required questions and a reduction of about three form pages.

The biggest impact was the consolidation of the MEC services and resources area. Our in-house testers reported that it is way more efficient.

Tara Armstrong stated that the cap last year was \$500,000, so when contractors are creating their applications, anyone submitting over that would get an alert to adjust their training plan to be under that cap. She also pointed out that critical proposals have a higher cap, in which case, they can self-identify, and it can be adjusted in-house.

## **REPORT OF THE CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR**

Good morning and welcome Panel Members and stakeholders. Thank you for the opportunity to provide a summary of the Employment Training Panel's funding.

### **Regarding Funding**

- Today's Panel Meeting is for approximately \$3.4 million dollars.
  - That includes 5 approved delegation orders for a total of \$291,760.
  - Delegation Orders are Proposals capped at \$75,000 and approved under delegated authority by the Director on a continuous flow basis.
- If all the proposals scheduled for today's Panel meeting are approved, the Panel will fund 13 projects for a total of \$3,380,363.

### **Regarding Demand**

We have 230 applications in demand:

- 84 applications are currently in development.
- 27 applications are in eligibility review.
- 119 submitted applications are pending review.

## **Regarding Allocations**

Including today's proposals, we will have approved 269 contracts for a total of \$78.8 million, which is 77% of the total allocation for state fiscal year 25/26. Together, these proposals are projected to train 68,687 workers in various industries across California.

## **Closed Contracts Highlights**

With that exciting progress in mind, I'd like to highlight some recent accomplishments. Since our last meeting in March, ETP has successfully closed 57 contracts, resulting in:

- \$13.5 million dollars earned by contractors.
- 10,964 trainees successfully completed their training and met all retention requirements.

Of these contracts:

- 5 of these were Multiple Employer Contracts (MEC).
- 22 were Apprenticeships (APPR).
- 24 were Single Employer Contracts (SE).
- 6 were Small Businesses (SB).

These outcomes reflect continued progress and impact on expanding workforce opportunities across sectors and business sizes.

## **POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT**

ETP Policy Committee met yesterday afternoon with people attending both in person and via Zoom.

As per Deputy Director, Tara Armstrong's report, Committee first heard an update on the efforts to improve the MEC application, and two new questions were added to the application for the upcoming fiscal year. They were whether the repeat participating employers are offering a new training plan and what the business model is for each of them.

Committee also held a discussion item on each piece of the revision process led by Staff Attorney Michale Cabe, which was an excellent report.

There was a second discussion on the Welfare to Work guidelines, which will be converted into a simpler, streamlined Cal Works information sheet.

Lastly, committee members voted in the affirmative to forward recent edits to the Medical Skills guidelines to panel for full approval, probably coming up in May.

## **ACTION ON PROPOSALS**

### **Single Employer Contracts**

#### **Tab No. 1: AeroVironment, Inc.**

AeroVironment, Inc. presented its proposal to Panel. Panel had no questions or comments.

**ACTION:** Member Newsom moved to approve AeroVironment, Inc. in the amount of \$150,024. Member Smiles Seconded. All Panel Members present voted in the affirmative for approval as moved.

Motion carried by roll call vote, 6 to 0.

Rebecca Bettencourt – aye  
Rick Smiles – aye  
Gretchen Newsom – aye  
Jennifer Fothergill – aye  
Emily Desai – aye  
Mike Greenlee – aye

#### **Tab No. 2: Balfour Beatty Construction, LLC**

Balfour Beatty Construction, LLC presents its proposal to Panel. Panel had no questions or comments.

**ACTION:** Member Newsom moved to approve Betts Company in the amount of \$455,000. Member Smiles Seconded. All Panel Members present voted in the affirmative for approval as moved.

Motion carried by roll call vote, 6 to 0.

Rebecca Bettencourt – aye  
Rick Smiles – aye  
Gretchen Newsom – aye  
Jennifer Fothergill – aye  
Emily Desai – aye  
Mike Greenlee – aye

#### **Tab No. 3: CMH Manufacturing West, Inc. dba Clayton Homes**

Withdrawn.

Panel requested staff look at productive lab.

**Tab No. 4: GKN Aerospace Chem-Tronics Inc. dba CGKN Aerospace (Critical Proposal)**

Withdrawn.

**Tab No. 5: Mariani Nut Company**

Withdrawn.

**Tab No. 6: Sierra Pacific Home & Comfort, Inc.**

Panel observed that the audit findings reported a sizable chunk that was a disallowed cost. What has been put into place to potentially stop this from happening again.

Jason Hanson explained that they discovered it was more of a timing issue, and they learned and understand the process now. Timing and retention have been corrected internally.

Panel commented on how compensation being provided through bonuses, commissions, or piece-meal rates when not directly for sales staff raised a red flag. The presented piece-meal compensation for the Installers was questioned, as the priority of ETP is to invest in high road, stable jobs. The priority of ETP is to invest in high road, high wages, stable jobs.

“Jason Hanson explained that the Installers earn a very high hourly average rate, so they have the ability to expect the rate to be consistent. For every installation job, they are able to add to their income. He shared that the Company’s average hourly range for their Installers was \$50.00-78.00.

Panel questioned that 25 Technicians and 20 Installers were being compensated \$20.00 and under and weren’t seeing the bonus or piece-meal rate. They asked whether the column was a guaranteed minimum.

Consultant stated yes, and that they were still learning where to put things such as commission and bonuses.

Panel commented that the entire workforce must earn a minimum of \$33.64 per hour to qualify for training compensation, regardless of whether their pay includes commissions or other variable components. The primary concern moving forward will be ensuring that administrative processes are in place so that these wage requirements are consistently met, unlike issues in the past.

Panel asked about the off season and what the layoffs looked like as they came across Indeed reviews that detailed layoffs in the slow season.

Jason Hanson shared that over the last several years, they have had very minimal seasonal fluctuations and have been able to retain their teammates. There are seasonal peaks and valleys to the heating and air business, so they have adjusted accordingly to accommodate that. He also said that they can move them to another trade to keep turnover

low. An example was their solar pool installation division, where they have some Installers that will do water treatment and water softener installations.

Panel wanted to confirm that the Company wasn't hiring them as seasonal, but with a specialty and cross-training them to allow them to continue working throughout the year.

Jason Hanson stated absolutely.

**ACTION:** Member Smiles moved to approve Sierra Pacific Home & Comfort, Inc. in the amount of \$159,600. Member Fothergill Seconded. All Panel Members present voted in the affirmative for approval as moved.

Motion carried by roll call vote, 6 to 0.

Rebecca Bettencourt – aye  
Rick Smiles – aye  
Gretchen Newsom – aye  
Jennifer Fothergill – aye  
Emily Desai – aye  
Mike Greenlee – aye

**Tab No. 8: Vehicles For Change San Diego, Inc.**

Withdrawn.

Member Newsom requested to visit them if something can be set up by staff.

**PRESENTATIONS / ACTION ITEMS**

**Proposed Employment Training Panel funding strategies and action items for the next fiscal year 26-27**

Marcela Loza, Chief of Finance, presented the recommendations for priority industries, funding allocations, funding limitations and moratoriums, project caps and reimbursement rates. As part of the annual state fiscal year process, staff conducted extensive financial and economic analysis, incorporating various methods.

This year, staff recommended maintaining the current priority industries while adding healthcare and social assistance and removing retail trade based on stakeholder feedback.

With respect to funding allocations, funding limitations, and moratoriums, staff recommended those remain the same. For project caps, staff recommended an increase of \$50,000 across the single employer, critical proposal, and multiple employer contracts, to reflect changes in demand. These adjustments reflect changes in demand.

Staff recommended maintaining current reimbursement rates across all training categories.

In conclusion, staff are requesting Panel approval of recommendations for priority industries, funding allocations, limitations and moratoriums, project caps, and reimbursement rates for fiscal year 26-27 as presented.

Member Newsom requested that consideration be given to take another look at allocation percentages for fiscal year 27-28, due to the oversubscribed, huge demand for apprenticeship programs. She instructed staff to do a data analysis on whether it was feasible to boost the apprenticeship allocation from 25% to 30%, and lowering the multiple employers from 25% to 20%.

**ACTION:** Member Newsom moved to approve the recommendations for priority industries, funding allocations, limitations and moratoriums, project caps, and reimbursement rates for fiscal year 26-27, with the understanding that there will be another look at the funding allocation percentages for fiscal year 27-28. Member Smiles Seconded. All Panel Members present voted in the affirmative for approval as moved.

**Public Comment:**

Michelle Rychener from JobForward wanted to thank staff for looking at priorities and bringing hospitals back into the healthcare realm.

Motion carried by roll call vote, 6 to 0.

- Rebecca Bettencourt – aye
- Rick Smiles – aye
- Gretchen Newsom – aye
- Jennifer Fothergill – aye
- Emily Desai – aye
- Mike Greenlee – aye

**Memo for fiscal year 26-27 Apprenticeship Funding Model recommendations**

Willie Atkinson, Assessment and Programs Division Manager, presented on the FY 26/27 Apprenticeship Funding Model Recommendations. Panel has been asked to address challenges of allocating limited apprenticeship funding within a highly oversubscribed program. There is a need to establish a consistent equitable allocation framework to address the continuing excess and demand. At the March 2012 Panel meeting, Panel approved the Apprenticeship Pilot Guidelines. The pilot was established to supplement rather than displace existing apprenticeship funding.

Since the implementation of the Apprenticeship Pilot program, overall demand has increased, with 92 apprenticeship proposals approved in fiscal year 25-26, with a total funding demand reaching approximately \$80 million. Targeted enhancements included transitioning to an annual funding window to ensure all eligible programs can apply and receive some level of funding, allocating a set percentage of core funding toward funding the apprenticeship program, supporting the passage of legislation to clarify ETP's ability

to fund the apprenticeship program, and lastly, establishing a dedicated Apprenticeship unit and creation of an Apprenticeship Subcommittee.

The Apprenticeship Subcommittee hosted two listening sessions, one in Long Beach and the other in Sacramento.

Consideration in the development of an equitable funding model was that funding under the Apprenticeship program is subject to availability and may vary from year to year. Additionally, funding is intended to be supplemental and not designed to displace existing employers or sponsor investments in training.

Staff recommended the following actions for approval; 1) the funding model includes a structured three-part administration analysis to determine contract responsibility. Under this approach, contract determination would default to the sponsor of the approved program standards. Multiple programs under the sponsor would be consolidated into a single contract. 2) The entity identified on the STD 204 would be reviewed to confirm the appropriate legal payee and ensure alignment with the contracting entity. 3) Apprenticeship training trust documents would be considered to further validate governance structure, fiscal accountability, and authorized responsibility for administering funds. Panel will choose whether to approve inclusion of #1 relating to who may apply and if so, whether to apply either #2 or #3 to the applications submitted.

The apprenticeship model selected was Per Apprentice Rate I, where the apprenticeship rate is determined strictly by the total number of registered apprentices with DAS from applications submitted as per existing state law.

Panel appreciated the input given by our stakeholders, and staff coming up with a strong model and proposals. Panel had questions from the public pertaining to how the 23 proposals would have been consolidated into eight with no change in total amounts awarded. Willie Atkinson said that's because there wouldn't be a cap associated with it.

Member Newsom remarked that the apprentice rate or amount available determined by the number of registered apprentices with DAS provides a level of transparency and accountability. Going in that direction, #2 would provide ample time to get those numbers up to date. She also stated that all the registered apprentices should be tracked, which will provide enough time to register with DAS before the close of the application period.

Member Greenlee agreed on the DAS reporting and was in alignment with the funding going to only apprentices and not journey workers or pre-apprentices. He also mentioned how state-certified apprenticeship programs were there to do one thing, train apprentices. He has seen apprenticeships come in and list training in their curriculum that they are not approved to train apprentices for. The answer contractors always give is that they are training journey workers, however, in the State of California, that is not approved.

Member Desai asked what staff recommended #2 or #3.

Director Grimes explained that either could work, but with the secondary goal of transparency, #2 is the one that staff recommended.

Willie Atkinson and Peter Cooper both concurred.

Chair Bettencourt agreed that as we adjust the model, there are some levels of journey workers that we need to be able to give them some skills, so they can be paid more, and some journey workers are training apprentices. Aligning the apprenticeship funding model and how we are distributing funds is the first step. As we look at more non-traditional programs, that is where it could get complex, as they could come in as an apprenticeship program, single employer, or MEC. Speaking from prior experience, Chair Bettencourt stated that they should come in as a single employer and not include the apprentices as they could get more money. She said that staff should look at that in the projections going forward as different occupations come in potentially for more of this.

Assistant Director Cooper commented that the apprenticeship system is only getting more complex, and that if we are aiming to have a program that is as fair and transparent as possible, that would push us towards a simpler decision model.

Member Greenlee added that if we were to include the journey workers and pre-apprentices, a registered apprenticeship in California is only allowed to train in these aspects, and if you are getting ETP funds, you should only be allowed to get funds for what you are allowed to train, not something so far out of scope.

Chair Bettencourt added that if you are using apprentices, there is a grey area, which gets into the DAS side, not ETP side, about what is approved curriculum for an apprentice versus journey workers, which are under the DAS regulations. She suggested the curriculum may need to identify journey worker courses such as medical didactic. An example would be if staff sees a title for journey workers, and it's only on the apprentice side, it would become disallowed.

Member Newsom reiterated that this is a phased approach. We will continue to revise.

Willie Atkinson said that staff is looking at the curriculum, as there is a difference between the training that is standard and what we allow as ancillary training, and we want to make this distinction

**ACTION:** Member Newsom moved to approve the inclusion of #1 related to whom may apply given that they are a DAS registered apprenticeship program, and if so, to apply #2 to the application submitted to determine the contract amount. Member Smiles Seconded. All Panel Members present voted in the affirmative for approval as moved.

### **Public Comment**

Curtis Notsinneh with Strategy Workplace Communications thanked ETP. He commented that the current cap structure does not reflect the actual number of apprentices served by reach program. For example, JATCs serving 1000 apprentices are subject to the same cap as a JATC serving 200.

Curtis Notsinneh proposed items for Panel to consider such as a funding model that accounts for the number of apprentices served by each JATC using verified apprenticeship data to determine the program size. This could be done using DAS data. There should be an established per-apprentice funding baseline dividing the total number of registered apprentices by each program, perhaps a tiered system for the cap structure with flexibility and the ability to adjust per year. He also suggested that there should be a work and learn model that provides industry recognized credentials recognized by multiple and single employers that pay the prevailing wages and offer full-time employment during and after the apprenticeship program.

Curtis Notsinneh also brought up the fact that DAS is new to registering pre-apprenticeships and might not be updated yet. Additionally, a lot of the pre-apprenticeship programs that are operating in the field are multi-craft, so not directly tied to an apprenticeship program. Therefore, he supports keeping the funding to apprenticeship programs only.

Motion carried by roll call vote, 6 to 0.

Rebecca Bettencourt – aye

Rick Smiles – aye

Gretchen Newsom – aye

Jennifer Fothergill – aye

Emily Desai – aye

Mike Greenlee – aye

Willie Atkinson reminded everyone that the applications would close on June 22nd at 11:59 p.m., and the numbers would be pulled the next business day, which would be a Monday.

### **Tab No. 7: Greater San Fernando Valley Chamber of Commerce**

Member Smiles departed.

Panel asked for an update on their current contracts, as their last one was showing potential earnings of 75% but they were anticipating 100%, and their Workforce Advancement Fund one was at 4%.

The representative stated that they have a revision to switch job numbers and once done, would be at 100%. The Workplace contract has a lot to do with LMS, as healthcare organizations don't do paper rosters and train 2 people at a time, causing time constraints. Additionally, there are 2 new participating employers. All issues have been addressed, and they are using a different name, which is gaining more interest. They now have Goodwill Southern California and Jay Nolan Center that are starting their training. She believes they will sit at 100%, because of how much training Jay Nolan has been doing, hiring 10 people a month.

Panel had questions about one of the employers on the list, West Coast Drywall. West Coast Drywall was held accountable by the DOL for widespread wage and hour violations and paid \$994,000 in back wages to 1069 employees. They are currently under

investigation by the Attorney General of California for continuing the same practices and have 9 plus other private lawsuits against them for wage and hour violations.

The representative stated that they could remove West Coast Drywall, as they have plenty of other participating employers.

**ACTION:** Member Newsom moved to approve Greater San Fernando Valley Chamber of Commerce in the amount of \$849,045 with the caveat that they are removing from their participating employer list West Coast Drywall. Member Fothergill Seconded. All Panel Members present voted in the affirmative for approval as moved.

Motion carried by roll call vote, 5 to 0.

Rebecca Bettencourt – aye  
Gretchen Newsom – aye  
Jennifer Fothergill – aye  
Emily Desai – aye  
Mike Greenlee – aye

#### **OPPORTUNITY FOR PANEL MEMBERS TO REQUEST AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE PANEL MEETING**

No comments.

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

Sam Rodriguez, Strategic Parters, Senior advisor for SOMA, Vice Chair for the San Francisco Workforce Development Board where they have a signature program called City Build which is a partnership, a pre apprenticeship program for the building and trades. He is a commissioner for the Board of Pilot San Francisco Bay and a former ETP Panel member for almost a decade, wanted Panel to reconsider a job creation category to help address the wage compression environment in the State of California. He submitted a memo that included statistics, but the common thread was that the fundamental pillars of the state's economy were small and medium sized businesses creating long local employment and vital tax revenues to local and state government. He also said ETP plays a significant role in the state's job creation for those entering the workforce looking for employment opportunities with high skill-oriented training.

#### **MEETING ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Bettencourt asked for motion to adjourn the Panel meeting.

**ACTION:** Member Fothergill moved to adjourn the Panel meeting. Member Newsom Seconded. All Panel Members present voted in the affirmative to adjourn the Panel meeting as moved.

Motion carried by roll call vote, 5 to 0.

Rebecca Bettencourt – aye

Gretchen Newsom – aye

Jennifer Fothergill – aye

Emily Desai – aye

Mike Greenlee – aye

Chair Bettencourt Adjourned the meeting at 11:17 a.m.