Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development
1325 J Street, 18th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
CalCompetes@gobiz.ca.gov
(916) 322-4051

MEMBERS:

Dee Dee Myers, *Chair*
Director
Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development

Fiona Ma
State Treasurer

Keely Bosler, *Director*
Department of Finance

Todd Walters, *Appointee of the Senate Committee on Rules*

Madeline Janis, *Appointee of the Speaker of the Assembly*

California Competes Tax Credit Program

Committee Meeting

Thursday, June 17, 2021
1:00 p.m.

In response to the Governor's Executive Order N-29-20 authorizing public bodies to take necessary action to protect the public from the spread of Coronavirus (COVID-19), the California Competes Tax Credit (CCTC) Committee Meeting was live streamed and open to the public on Zoom.

Members of the public were encouraged to submit public comments or requests during the meeting through email.

MINUTES

OPEN SESSION

A. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair Myers called the meeting of the California Competes Tax Credit Committee (Committee) to order at 1:01 p.m.

Members Present: Chair Dee Dee Myers, Madeline Janis (representing the Speaker of the Assembly), Todd Walters (representing the Senate Committee on Rules), Matt Saha (representing the State Treasurer), and Gayle Miller (representing the Director of the Department of Finance).

Deputy Director Dosick stated that all members were present.

B. Approval of Minutes from April 22, 2021, Committee Meeting

Chair Myers asked if there were any public comments on Item B with regards to the minutes from the April 22, 2021 meeting. Deputy Director Dosick confirmed there were no public comments. Chair Myers requested a motion for approval of Agenda Item B.

Action Moved/Seconded: Members Miller/Walters
Yes: Members Janis, Walters, Saha, Miller, Myers
No: None

C. Deputy Director's Report

- **Agenda Overview – Agreements with 16 Businesses, Total Tax Credits $71,135,999**

Deputy Director Dosick reminded members of the public watching the meeting that they could submit public comments on any agenda item by emailing CalCompetes@gobiz.ca.gov and added that CalCompetes staff are actively monitoring this email and would forward emailed comments to the Committee. He reminded the public that if they submit a public comment, to include a name and organization. He explained that it is used for identification purposes only. He also reminded the public that inappropriate behavior can result in being removed from the meeting based on provisions of the Bagley-Keene Act. He encouraged all individuals having technical issues to call the CalCompetes hotline at 916-322-4051.

Mr. Dosick informed the Committee that it has 31 Agreements up for recapture. He reminded the Committee of the statement he made at previous meetings that CalCompetes awardees sign a 5-year contract (Agreement) that sets forth how much credit they can claim each year if they achieve their employment, wage, and investment milestones. Most of the Agreements recommended for recapture were for Agreements whose 5-year terms have expired. In some cases, the businesses achieved some, but not all the milestones, which is why a business may have a recommendation for a partial recapture of the credit. In other cases, the business failed to achieve any of its milestones over the five years and thus the entire credit is recommended for recapture. As always, there are some voluntary requests from businesses to have their credit recaptured, as their business plans had changed and as a result, requested the Committee recapture the credit to make it available to other businesses. Any credits that are recaptured are made available in the next fiscal year. In those situations where the credit recipient is in material breach of its Agreement, for example, for failure to submit the annual reports required by the Agreement, there is a recommendation that the Committee approve recapturing the entire credit.

Mr. Dosick noted that two businesses are being brought back to the Committee for amended recaptures following reviews by the Franchise Tax Board (FTB). In the first case, the FTB discovered a business had claimed credits to which it was not entitled; GO-Biz is recommending that the Committee recapture the additional amount. In the second case, the FTB found that the business miscalculated its employment figures and the review demonstrated that it was entitled to credits previously recaptured.

Lastly, GO-Biz is recommending 16 tax credit awards today totaling $71.1 million. GO-Biz received over $450 million in credit requests during this application period. He noted a continuing rise of applications from inland parts of the state and areas of high unemployment and high poverty. The 16 Agreements for the Committee's consideration represent commitments for a net increase of over 5,000 new full-time jobs and over $2.1 billion dollars of capital investments in California in exchange for $71.1 million in total recommended tax credits. Each of the businesses recommended for an award has certified in its application that this credit will be a significant factor in its decision or ability to remain and expand in California.

Mr. Dosick thanked the CalCompetes team. He stated that the team is doing an amazing job while working remotely and despite being down three positions was able to review a record number of applications. He noted that the team has also been reviewing the annual milestone information of the roughly one thousand awarded companies. He thanked Jee Liyanage, Jonathan Sievers, Dan Krebs, and Brandon Lowe from the CalCompetes team for their continued diligence and dedication.

Chair Myers and Member Janis echoed Mr. Dosick's appreciation for the CalCompetes staff. Ms. Janis also suggested resuming in-person meetings for the Committee. She stated she was in favor of a Southern California meeting location but highlighted the positive outcomes of the virtual meetings. Ms. Janis reiterated her previous remarks on the training requirements as well as the need to further develop the evaluation on applicant commitments towards diversity.

D. Discussion and Approval of California Competes Tax Credit Agreements
Total Recommended Tax Credits: $70,414,499
Total Recommended Tax Credits after Adjusting for S-Corporation Law: $71,135,999

Chair Myers proposed removing Agenda Items D4, D5, D6, and D7 from consent for further discussion. She asked if there were any other questions or comments from the Committee or members of the public on any of the items not pulled at this time. Deputy Director Dosick confirmed we did not receive any public comments. Chair Myers called for a motion to approve all items under Agenda Item D except for items D4, D5, D6, and D7.

Action Moved/Seconded: Members Miller/Janis
Yes: Members Janis, Walters, Saha, Miller, Myers
No: None

Chair Myers called for the agenda items to be taken out of order. Agenda Item E was reordered prior to the discussion of the remaining items pulled from consent under Agenda Item D.

E. Discussion and Approval of Recommendations for California Competes Tax Credit Agreement Termination and Credit Recapture

Total Tax Credits Recommended to be Recaptured:	**$10,664,500**
Total Tax Credits Recommended to be Recaptured after Adjusting for S-Corporation Law:	**$11,175,333**

Chair Myers asked Deputy Director Dosick if there are any comments from the public regarding Agenda Item E pertaining to the discussion and approval of recommendations for California Competes Tax Credit Agreement Terminations and Credit Recapture. Mr. Dosick confirmed that no public comments have been received at this time.

Hearing none, Chair Myers requested a motion to approve Agenda Item E.

Action Moved/Seconded: Members Miller/Walters
Yes: Members Janis, Walters, Saha, Miller, Myers
No: None

F. Discussion and Approval of Recommendations for Modified California Competes Tax Credit Agreement Termination and Credit Recapture

Total Tax Credits Recommended to be Recaptured:	**$20,000**
Total Tax Credits Recommended to be Recaptured after Adjusting for S-Corporation Law:	**$26,667**

Chair Myers asked Deputy Director Dosick if there are any comments from the public regarding Agenda Item F pertaining to the discussion and approval of recommendations for Modified California Competes Tax Credit Agreement Terminations and Credit Recapture. Mr. Dosick confirmed that no public comments have been received at this time.

Hearing none, Chair Myers requested a motion to approve Agenda Item F.

Action Moved/Seconded: Members Janis/Miller
Yes: Members Janis, Walters, Saha, Miller, Myers
No: None

D-4. EnergySource Minerals LLC

At the request of Chair Myers, Deputy Director Dosick elaborated on Agenda Item D-4. He described the company and the proposed tax credit Agreement to the Committee. EnergySource Minerals LLC (EnergySource) extracts lithium and other minerals from geothermal brine that are critical to the manufacturing of rechargeable batteries for products such as electric vehicles and wireless phones.

EnergySource certified that at least 75% of its net increase of full-time employees will work at least 75% of the time in Calipatria. Calipatria was an Area of High Unemployment and/or an Area of High Poverty at the time EnergySource submitted its application.

In exchange for a $3,500,000 California Competes Tax Credit, EnergySource is proposing to create 78 new, full-time jobs and make over $847,000,000 in investments. The jobs EnergySource is committing to create are in classifications such as chemical technician, operator, instrument & control technician, maintenance mechanic, chemist, procurement manager, control room operator, plant engineer, and general manager.

EnergySource indicated in its application plans to execute what it calls Project ATLiS. Project ATLiS is designed to develop a facility to extract minerals from the Salton Sea. EnergySource stated in its application that without award of the credit, it would be difficult to develop mineral extraction capabilities at the Salton Sea. Competition for lithium is international, with most production coming from China and Chile. These locations are significantly less expensive in which to operate and subject to fewer regulations, making it difficult to compete in the lithium market. Calipatria has high poverty and unemployment rates of 33.3% and 22.1% respectively, and award of the credit would bring almost a billion dollars in direct investment to a high need area of the state.

Mr. Dosick stated that EnergySource representatives Vincent Signoritti, VP of Resource & Real Estate Assets, Eric Spomer, President and CEO, and Derek Benson, COO, were available to address any questions the Committee had.

Mr. Signoritti thanked the Committee for the opportunity to talk about the company. He echoed his appreciation of the assistance they received from the CalCompetes team.

Mr. Spomer also introduced himself and reiterated Mr. Signoritti's comments on the level of support received from Mr. Dosick and his team. He stated that EnergySource has been in Imperial County since 2006 and developed the Salton Sea Geothermal Plant that opened in 2012. He stated that this project aims to unlock the potential of the Salton Sea resource, which is less than 25% developed as a renewable energy source for California. The project expansion into lithium production would open opportunities for both geothermal power and mining.

Member Janis asked the representatives from EnergySource if they could elaborate on how it extracts minerals. She mentioned that mineral extraction needed for electric vehicle batteries sometimes utilizes child labor overseas. She also wanted to know the environmental impacts of the project.

Mr. Spomer started by clarifying that the geothermal resource that is 5,000 to 10,000 feet below the surface is distinct from the surface-level aspects of the Salton Sea. He elaborated that both were formed in the same geological conditions, but the water it deals with as a geothermal resource is ancient Colorado River water that is rich in minerals caused by the formation of the Grand Canyon. He stated the geological environment is unique for geothermal activity due to its water, seismic activity, and magma surface. He added that all the minerals from the rock formations carved by the Colorado River left an abundance of elements available. He stated that lithium is available in commercial quantity but required technical advancement to make it an economic opportunity for the region.

Mr. Spomer added that its association with geothermal power is clean and renewable as it reinjects as much water as it pulls from the reservoir. The mineral project would intercept the brine used for geothermal energy before it goes back into the reservoir. He stated that the extraction of lithium from a life cycle analysis for carbon emissions, water-use, and physical footprint would be the cleanest source of lithium in the world. He added that the lower emissions are due to its ability to take advantage of naturally occurring hydrothermal heat due to its unique geological environment.

Chair Myers asked about the size of the lithium opportunity for California and its overall importance for the United States supply chain. Mr. Spomer stated that the largest lithium battery operation in the United States is the Nevada Gigafactory but noted that the cathodes are primarily produced in Asia. He stated there are federal efforts to attract cathode manufacturing and keep US-based lithium in the United States. The current lithium market processes about one million tons annually and the Salton Sea region has the capacity to produce 120,000 tons annually. This would make it the largest single producer of lithium in the world. He noted that currently the resource is only 25% developed. He believes that through development it can reach a capacity of 500,000 tons a year and expects the lithium market to surpass one million tons through greater electric vehicle adoption.

Chair Myers asked how much geothermal energy the region could contribute towards California's energy needs. Mr. Spomer stated that the producing plants for the region, including CalEnergy, generate about 380 megawatts and estimates that the Salton Sea region can sustainably produce approximately 2,000 megawatts.

Member Miller asked Mr. Spomer if he could elaborate on the company's trajectory for production and timing. Mr. Spomer stated the company plans to begin the two-year construction project in early 2022. Once the plant is constructed it expects to begin optimizing and piloting the plant by second quarter of 2024. Ms. Miller asked if it already had existing contracts to sell lithium. Mr. Spomer stated it is in detailed conversations with a few US companies but could not speak in detail due to confidentiality agreements.

Member Walters asked if EnergySource could elaborate on the technical training and job growth opportunities for the region. Mr. Signorotti stated that the company currently recruits its employees locally and provides on-the-job training. He stated that the company intends to mirror its efforts for the proposed mineral division. He added that it has already engaged the Imperial County Workforce Development Board and is working collaboratively to create a job creation plan. It is currently partnering with the local community college and developing a formal engineering curriculum. He added that the community college program would have transferable units towards San Diego State University and the University of San Diego.

Ms. Janis asked how it arrived at the requested credit amount and wanted to know why it did not request more considering the significance of the project. Mr. Signorotti stated the $3.5 million request is meaningful as the award demonstrates the company's effort to make the project successful towards investors.

Ms. Janis also asked if it could elaborate on the process to convert the lithium into a battery. Mr. Spomer noted the complexity of battery science but simply put, the extracted lithium chloride is concentrated and purified into a specific battery chemistry depending on its final application. The battery chemistry product is sent and converted to a cathode chemistry. The cathode products are assembled into a battery.

Chair Myers asked if there were any more questions or comments from the Committee or the public. Hearing none, she requested a motion for approval of Agenda Item D-4.

> **Action Moved/Seconded:** Members Janis/Miller
> **Yes:** Members Janis, Walters, Saha, Miller, Myers
> **No:** None

D-5. Kubota Tractor Corporation

At the request of Chair Myers, Deputy Director Dosick elaborated on Agenda Item D-5. He described the company and the proposed tax credit Agreement to the Committee. Kubota Tractor Corporation (Kubota) is a heavy equipment and machinery manufacturer and distributor. Kubota certified in its application that absent award of the credit, its project may occur in another state; and, it may terminate all or a portion of its employees in California or relocate to another state.

In exchange for a $1.95 million credit, Kubota is proposing to create 57 new, full-time jobs and make $44.7 million in investments. The jobs Kubota is committing to create are in classifications such as analyst, assembler, clerk, equipment operator, lead, manager, specialist, and supervisor.

Kubota indicated that increased demand for its products has prompted the need for a larger distribution facility to support its dealer operations in the West. It is currently considering a new 700,000 square foot facility with the potential to expand another 300,000 square feet in either Elk Grove, California or Reno, Nevada. The proposed facility would be one of the five Division offices currently located in the United States. It would be one of the few U.S. Divisions to include office support for sales and service, a training facility, and a distribution warehouse. According to Kubota, Nevada is attractive because of lower wages, lower income, and property tax, and most compellingly, geographical proximity to its entire Western United States operations. Kubota provided a cost comparison that projects property and construction costs to be $9.9 million in Nevada compared to $16.4 million in California. It also projects that labor costs would be 10% higher in California. According to Kubota, these costs differentials are offset as California offers certain benefits such as an estimated $1.2 million savings in annual freight charges and faster shipping times for some of its Western dealers. Kubota stated that its complete analysis estimates California would be $1.95 million more expensive due to property, construction, and annual operating expenses. The credit would equalize the cost differential of remaining in California, and the credit will immediately factor into its site selection decision for the proposed property in Elk Grove.

Mr. Dosick introduced Kyle Hagen, Director & Western Division Manager to address any questions from the Committee.

Chair Myers welcomed Mr. Hagen and asked if he had any opening comments.

Mr. Hagen thanked the Committee and appreciated the opportunity to be here. He stated Kubota is a global tractor manufacturing company that also offers a wide range of products ranging from agriculture to water infrastructure solutions.

Member Janis asked if this was a distribution center and where it currently manufactures its tractors. Mr. Hagen stated that its tractors are manufactured in Georgia. He confirmed that this operation is a distribution center for its tractor and related parts. The facility would offer support functions for its authorized dealer network. He also stated that the facility would expand its Kubota University training center. Kubota University offers training for both internal employees as well as its authorized dealers. The authorized dealer network consists of 140 different locations across the Western United States.

Ms. Janis asked if Mr. Hagen could describe its primary customer base and if it sells its product to public agencies. Mr. Hagen stated that as a distribution network it sells wholesale product to its authorized dealer network. He confirmed that many of its state contracts belong to its dealer network rather than directly with Kubota.

Ms. Janis asked if the project is for a new facility or an extension of the existing facility in Lodi. Mr. Hagen responded that it is looking to build a new facility in Elk Grove.

Ms. Janis asked why it wants to be in California and if it would stay in California if awarded a credit. Mr. Hagen stated that California is an agricultural epicenter and fits well for its dealer network. He added that California offers strong benefits due to its diverse labor pool and proximity to California's agricultural communities.

Chair Myers asked about the size of its California customer base relative to the United States. Mr. Hagen stated he did not have specific numbers but noted much of its business volume comes from coastal areas. He added that Kubota does not participate in the 240+ horsepower engines commonly used in large farm tractors commonly associated with the US farming industry.

Member Walters asked how Kubota delivers its product inland to proposed distribution centers, like Elk Grove. Mr. Hagen stated that much of its product is delivered by rail coming from Georgia as well as by port coming from either Japan or France. He estimated that approximately 50% of its product comes directly from Georgia.

Chair Myers asked if there were any other questions from the Committee or the public. Hearing none, she requested a motion for approval of Agenda Item D-5.

Action Moved/Seconded: Members Miller/Walters
Yes: Members Janis, Walters, Saha, Miller, Myers
No: None

D-6. CIVIC Financial Services LLC

At the request of Chair Myers, Deputy Director Dosick elaborated on Item D-6. Mr. Dosick described the company and the proposed Agreement to the Committee. CIVIC Financial Services LLC (CIVIC) is an online nationwide private lender that specializes in financing residential investment properties. CIVIC is a subsidiary of Pacific Western Bank (PacWest), which is a national financial institution. CIVIC has certified in its application that absent award of the credit, its project may occur in another state.

In exchange for a $1.8 million California Competes Tax Credit, CIVIC has committed to a net increase of 211 full-time employees and an investment of $450,000. The jobs CIVIC is committing to create are in classifications such as account manager, general administrative, loan processor, and loan specialist.

CIVIC indicated in its application that it is a large addition to PacWest's operational expansion into the private lending sector and is projecting 15-20% growth over the next five years. It will need to decide where to accommodate the projected growth. It stated that it is considering Colorado, which has been part of PacWest's larger strategic expansion in the Western United States. PacWest started to relocate its executive leadership team to Greenwood Village, Colorado in 2019. It stated that it has an office currently under construction in Colorado that could accommodate CIVIC's employee growth without incurring further costs creating overall lease savings of $1.4 million. It is also eligible for a $400,000 Job Growth Incentive Tax Credit offered by the state of Colorado for the creation of new jobs. The Colorado tax incentive combined with the lease savings result in a $1.8 million cost savings to the business versus expanding in California. CIVIC stated that a $1.8 million tax credit would offset the overall cost differentials and incentivize its decision to hire the proposed new employees in California.

Mr. Dosick stated that Sun Yee, Chief Financial Officer, was available to address any questions from the Committee.

Chair Myers welcomed Mr. Yee and thanked him for joining the meeting on short notice. She asked Mr. Yee if he had any opening remarks. Mr. Yee stated he did not have any opening comments but was ready to answer questions from the Committee.

Member Janis asked what the status was on the construction project in Colorado and if the construction would stop if awarded a credit. Mr. Yee stated that the facility under construction in Colorado is owned by PacWest. He stated that CIVIC was acquired by PacWest in February 2021 and as a subsidiary could petition for expansion at the new Colorado facility. He added that CIVIC was founded in California and that the company would like to continue its growth within the state as long as it makes financial sense.

Ms. Janis asked if Mr. Yee could elaborate more on the type of financial services it provides for real estate. Mr. Yee stated that CIVIC originates non-owner-occupied loans, specifically in residential real estate. Its loan products are used by real estate investors often with the intent of purchasing rental properties or house flipping.

Ms. Janis asked how CIVIC goes about financing its loans for real estate investors. Mr. Yee stated that its current business model is to portfolio loans and all funding comes from PacWest. He added that its loans are not packaged or securitized.

Member Saha asked if the proposed 211 jobs would move to Colorado if not awarded a credit and if it would mean no more further job expansion within California. Mr. Yee confirmed that CIVIC is experiencing a period of high growth and will need additional employees to meet the demand.

Deputy Director Dosick responded to Mr. Saha's question stating that based on CIVIC's submission, it would create 211 jobs but the credit will incentivize the placement of the jobs in California. He added that CIVIC did not indicate any existing California jobs would be at-risk based on its certification.

Chair Myers asked if there were any more questions from the Committee.

Ms. Janis asked whether CIVIC offers loans designated for low-income residential housing rather than just real estate investment properties. Mr. Yee stated that CIVIC does not operate in the residential real estate markets. He stated that CIVIC deals strictly with non-owner-occupied loans largely due to its business model and due to regulation requirements.

Chair Myers asked if there were any other questions from the Committee or the public. Hearing none, she requested a motion for approval of Agenda Item D-6.

Action Moved/Seconded: Members Miller/Saha
Yes: Members Walters, Saha, Miller, Myers
No: Member Janis

D-7. AgLand Renewables LLC

At the request of Chair Myers, Deputy Director Dosick elaborated on Item D-7. Mr. Dosick described the company and the proposed Agreement to the Committee. AgLand Renewables LLC (AgLand) develops and builds bio-conversion facilities that convert poultry waste into a renewable gas. AgLand has certified in its application that absent award of the California Competes Tax Credit, its project may occur in another state. In exchange for a $1.7 million credit, AgLand is proposing to create 38 new, full-time jobs and make over $1 billion in investments. The jobs AgLand is committing to create are in classifications such as technician, engineer, and manager.

AgLand is considering various states for its bio-conversion facilities, specifically Maryland, Georgia, Arkansas, and North Carolina. AgLand indicated in its application that if it comes to California, it will construct facilities in Merced, Hanford, and Lemoore. AgLand stated that compared to other states, California has higher labor, land, and utility costs. Without award of the credit, AgLand stated it could postpone projects in California to focus on other states. Award of the credit would ensure AgLand begins production on the facilities immediately, which will both reduce emissions and provide a source of renewable energy for California.

Mr. Dosick introduced Thomas Spangler, Executive Chairman, and Dr. Kristi Shaw, Director of Environmental and Regulatory Compliance, who were available to answer the Committee's questions.

Chair Myers welcomed AgLand and asked if they had any opening remarks before moving to Committee questions.

Mr. Spangler thanked the Committee for inviting AgLand to participate and stated his appreciation for the entire GO-Biz team. He added that the company was assisted by multiple GO-Biz programs, ranging from permitting to site selection assistance.

Member Janis asked if the representatives for AgLand could expand on its renewable energy process. Mr. Spangler stated that the function is very similar to the dairy digester renewable technology that is common throughout California. AgLand has taken a different approach by focusing its renewable technology on poultry waste. He stated that the technology takes the excrement as well as other poultry byproducts and uses a similar anaerobic digestion process. The anaerobic digestion produces biomethane which is eventually converted to a renewable natural gas and organic fertilizer. The renewable natural gas is reinjected into the public utilities' pipelines. He also noted that AgLand views renewable natural gas as a transitional product and has designed the process to also produce green hydrogen.

Ms. Janis asked if the company has completed an environmental impact report for the proposed facility. Mr. Spangler stated that its facility in Maryland has started construction and it has operated multiple pilot facilities over the last four years. The pilot facilities have allowed it to collect the necessary data to support an environmental impact report and it is now working on a formal submission in both Merced and Lemoore.

Ms. Janis asked if the company intends to move forward with the Maryland facility if awarded a tax credit. Mr. Spangler stated that the credit would allow it to prioritize California as the next project in its portfolio. He added that the credit helps offset the cost of development on the front-end and would incentivize AgLand to bring the project to California.

Chair Myers asked if the representatives could share the carbon footprint difference between renewable natural gas and traditional natural gas. Mr. Spangler stated that the Air Resource Board's Carbon Intensity values are measured in megajoules of CO^2 equivalent reduction. He added that when combining its renewable gas production with its organic fertilizer product the process reduces approximately 500,000 tons of CO^2 equivalent emissions per year for each facility.

Chair Myers asked what the current timeline was for the conversion of green hydrogen. Mr. Spangler stated that the process is currently in development and noted that although the renewable technology exists, it lacks the needed infrastructure support for viability. He projected the conversion to green hydrogen to be approximately three years after an initial pilot.

Member Saha asked how AgLand arrived at the credit amount and why it did not request more considering its proposal of over $1 billion in investments. Mr. Spangler stated the amount was based more on the upfront cost of the proposed project towards constructability. He added that $1.7 million was significant as it is approximately half the total cost of project development and it also demonstrates California's interest in the project for its investors.

Member Walters asked if AgLand could elaborate on its recruitment and training opportunities available with the local community. Mr. Spangler stated community development is a significant driver for the company. He added that the company believes that it does not need to sacrifice economic return for community development. AgLand engages groups early in its project development, ranging from apprenticeships to local community colleges. He added that much of the advantage for its industry is its on-the-job training requirements that can be developed directly with its vendors.

Chair Myers asked if there were any other questions from the Committee or the public. Hearing none, she requested a motion for approval of Agenda Item D-7.

Action Moved/Seconded: Members Walters/Miller
Yes: Members Janis, Saha, Walters, Miller, Myers
No: None

G. Public Comment

Chair Myers asked if there were any additional questions or comments from the public and Committee. Hearing none, she moved to adjourn the meeting.

H. Adjournment

Chair Myers adjourned the meeting at 2:34 p.m.