STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION

PRISON INDUSTRY BOARD

PUBLIC MEETING

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2012

THE BOARD OF PAROLE HEARINGS
1515 K STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

REPORTED BY:

ESTHER F. SCHWARTZ CSR NO. 1564

1	ATTENDEES
2	BOARD MEMBERS:
3	MARTIN HOSHINO, CHAIR
4	JIM BUTLER
5	BRUCE SAITO
6	DARSHAN SINGH
7	MICHELE STEEB
8	RAY TRUJILLO
9	JEANNE WOODFORD
10	STAFF:
11	CHARLES L. PATTILLO, EXECUTIVE OFFICER
12	SCOTT WALKER
13	GARY ALARID
14	ERIC RESLOCK
15	PHYLLIS GUARE
16	LEE DOREY
17	DEVIN FONG
18	NATALIE McCORKLE
19	COUNSEL:
20	JEFF SLY
21	GUEST SPEAKER:
22	SCOTT HAMMON
23	
24	00
25	

Sacramento, California 1 2 TUESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2012, 10:10 A.M. 3 ---000---CHAIR HOSHINO: I call this meeting to 4 5 order at approximately 10:10 a.m., Pacific Standard 6 Time. Good morning. I would like to welcome you all 8 to the Prison Industry Board, staff and others. Specifically the Board Members, as always, thank you 10 for you dedication and time and commitment to this public effort. 11 12 At this time I will begin by asking the Board 13 secretary to call the roll. 14 MS. GUARE: Good morning, everybody. Chair Hoshino. 15 16 CHAIR HOSHINO: Here. 17 MS. GUARE: Delegate for DGS is --MEMBER BUTLER: Jim Butler for Chief Deputy 18 Director Almanza. 19 20 MS. GUARE: Thank you. 21 Member Chapjian is absent. Member Davidson is absent. 22 Member Kelly is absent. 23 24 Member Masteller is absent.

Member Saito.

25

MEMBER SAITO: Present. 1 2 MS. GUARE: Member Singh. 3 MEMBER SINGH: Here. MS. GUARE: Member Steeb. 4 5 MEMBER STEEB: Here. MS. GUARE: Member Trujillo. 6 7 MEMBER TRUJILLO: Good morning. 8 here. MS. GUARE: And Member Woodford. 9 10 MEMBER WOODFORD: Good morning. I'm here, 11 also. 12 MS. GUARE: Thank you. We have a quorum. CHAIR HOSHINO: Thank you, Madame 13 14 Secretary. 15 Let the record reflect we have a quorum. I 16 would like to start by opening with two general 17 comments. Namely, about the strategic planning session that we are planning to have in January, I 18 19 think, the 23rd of next year. I think it is going 20 to be a good opportunity for us to have a broad 21 conversation about PIA, our role in the California correctional system and the communities of 22 California and things that we can do. I think it is 23 24 a chance also for folks to get together and to integrate together, and, let's face it, some old 25

fashion team building opportunities in a typical -in a different kind of setting that we traditionally
operate in.

My impression, we talked about this a little bit at the last Board meeting, how there is so much change going on in the Department right now. And everybody's touched and affected by what is going on in what we call a post-realignment world. It actually started before realignment, and you really have a correctional system that at its peak was at 172,000 inmates. A parole system that had 120,000 parolees. You are looking at a parole system that's dropped about 42,000 of that population. Plans to drop more of that population in its brick and mortar prisons, as well as a parole population that has been cut in half. Literally to about 60,000 today, and could end up somewhere in the 30- to 40,000 range.

Given all that change and a whole lot of -- I won't call it turmoil, but there's been a lot of things going on in the Department right down to a guard changing, a housing unit changing, a mission changing. At the same time we've embarked on an ambitious classification project in the Department. We've also embarked on some more progressive

techniques for dealing with security threat groups, also known as gangs, in the prison system. We've also gotten some more construction pieces that we're planning to do in terms of expansion. We've got a new prison hospital coming on line in June of next year, which will shift other elements of the population around and might bring with it more changes across the spectrum of the system.

So it seems appropriate that every program, A, be very informed about what is going on and, B, think about what the opportunities are there and how it will continue to add value to the good work that it's doing today in order to maintain that, but also to take a step back, to take a look at different things or other things we should be doing along the way and getting organized for that.

I would like to commend the Board staff for, I think, doing an amazing job, like many of the other programs that have been out there, to try and stay in step and in tune with what is going on in terms of the dimension of the change, the level of the change. Right down to high levels, but down to the organic level in keeping things working.

It hasn't been easy, I would say, on any executive or any manager with the Department to

whittle their way through all of this. And by no means is it really owed to some extent. But the good news, I think things are settling in. So really an appropriate time in January for us to at least have a first discussion and conversation.

And I think it was Member Steeb that let us know, or at least reminded me, that there had been some discussion about this in prior Board meetings. And I'm happy to say -- I'm happy to see that we're going to be doing something like this in January. Whether we get it all done then, I don't know, but I know that Mr. Pattillo has been organizing that effort for us. So looking forward to that.

At this time, then, I invite any other Board Members to make any comments for the record, if they wish.

Seeing none, we will move to the General Manager's comments.

MR. PATTILLO: For the record, my name is Charles Pattillo. I am the General Manager of CALPIA, California Prison Industry Authority, Executive Officer of this Prison Industry Board.

Today we have four action items and two information items on the agenda. One of the items is revising the annual plan, which includes an

operating budget that reduces our current year revenues based on many of those things that Secretary Hoshino went through about implications from downsizing Corrections, as well as changes in various revenue sources.

And we are still working on actions to reduce the deficit that we say is going to be \$3.7 million in the current year. One of the fortunate things for us is that we had such a substantial ability to garner cash over the last couple of years. And we've been able to do things like run an operating deficit at this time, but it can only go for so long.

One of challenges we have right now of our cash balances is most of our cash is segregated for OPEB, which is other post-employment benefits, as we've discussed numerous times. And currently there is a pending proposal to transfer about \$25,000,000 of that from PIA to the general fund, and that is not a loan we're talking about. So there is a lot of moving parts that are going on right now.

You know, there is also significant increase in overhead payments that we are seeing across the board. I know we have a couple department level directors here that can relate to the pro rata in

their own department, as well as pro rata going up significantly. Over the past year, our OPEB went from about \$3.7 million to \$4.8 million in one year. That's the overhead that we pay to other state agencies, the Legislature, the Treasurer.

The biggest changes that we see in revenue are from the actions the Board took last month to diminish the modular building program, as well as the construction program, offset by some increases in pricing which we were catching up on where our margins had decreased.

The budget does have -- does include the proposed layoffs that were included in the diminishment of those facilities last month.

However, given some civil service restraints, constraints, we probably won't do any actual layoffs until, probably, May at this point, given it's about a four-month to five-month process with the department of Cal HR, which is a combination of DPA and SPB.

The operating loss is exacerbated by fully funding the CTE programs that we have been operating. The Board put over from last time for discussion the staff's proposal that we de-fund those programs, based on the fact that they are not

statutory expenditure. And we had been funding it, but we are trying to work out some kind of agreement with CDCR for future funding. The Secretary has been working on this.

2.4

In addition, I sent you the other day a copy of the proposed legislation to fund that program that was passed by this Board several years ago that didn't go forward. And I think it needs to be addressed again with the Governor's office as well as the Legislature.

We are continuing to work on day-to-day cost control. One of the things, our administrative costs have gone down from last year, but they increased from what we thought it was at midyear. The retirement contributions are also becoming a significant issue. A lot of the stuff changes after we do our annual budget. Because we pass our budget every year before the 30th and that is not always the way that the State runs. Certain things happen after the State budget closes, including an increase in retirement contributions on our end. That usually impacts us. This budget takes into consideration that.

I mentioned the \$25,000,000 that the Department of Finance believes that is uncommitted funds. That

is money that the Board has been setting aside to abide by federal law that says we must fund, future fund, our other than pension requirements. At the end of this year we estimate we'll have \$32,000,000 in cash set aside for that funding per federal requirement. The Department of Finance believes that is excess cash and has proposed that we transfer over \$25,000,000 of that money.

Fortunately, that transfer can't occur under the law without the Department of Finance and Secretary of Corrections jointly signing a letter that says that is excess cash.

As I'm sure the Secretary's ears are burning now because I've said it so many times, it can't happen. I would appreciate the support of not letting this happen. It would make us insolvent very quickly. On the flip side of that, the last couple of years we've been trying to figure out a way to invest that cash. There is legislation that was approved approximately two years ago, two years ago now, that allows many agencies to reinvest that cash. Unfortunately, they didn't allow for California State agencies. So we -- it's just kind of a glitch in the legislation. We found a way to fall under that legislation. We're hopeful to

invest that cash and not have it slip by the Department of Finance.

As a result of that action taken last month in general restructuring, we submitted a layoff plan to Cal HR. We have approximately 12 positions, is what we have it down to after attrition. We had to submit a layoff of 33 positions because as for every one position that you propose to lay off, the department, State department, requests that you submit three. We are between 33 and 36, is what it will be. Fortunately, a lot of those folks are moving to attrition. We have positions that were available to them to go to other places. Some have gone to CDCR. So we are hoping that, as this attrition goes out in the four months it takes, that it will be minimal in the end, and we will be able to do a soft restructuring from there.

Any questions at this point?

Mr. Singh.

MEMBER SINGH: The \$25,000,000, what are we going to do without, you know, all that money?

MR. PATTILLO: We would be insolvent,
Mr. Singh, as you and I talked about the issue. And
it's just a real easy answer. As you know, it can't
happen. What we are going to do in the interim,

since there's no tentative, there's no actions out there on paper that says this. We just know. We had a discussion with Finance. I'll resubmit a letter tomorrow stating that what would happen and, if it does become an issue in a legislative action, that this Board will take it before the board and oppose the action. I don't think there is anybody on this Board who would support the transfer and that doesn't understand what the implications could be to the PIA for the transfer.

MEMBER SINGH: We can stop that?

MR. PATTILLO: Mr. Singh, you, like everybody else, has -- you have a constituency which is really your appointing authority. And so I think discussions, especially when you have documents from us saying what the impact will be, sharing that with the folks that appointed you, is the best way for this to happen. And we can help you with anything.

MEMBER SINGH: I'll ask you.

MR. PATTILLO: Any other questions on that part?

MEMBER TRUJILLO: I, also, Mr. Secretary. Also, I'm a little concerned with that, Chuck. Not only that, but at the last meeting you put a letter together and answered some questions that I had

regarding the funding of some projects. The modular project being one. I received your letter that you sent CDCR, I believe. And in the letter they stated that information you were looking for was not public records. So maybe I should give the rest of this to the counsel.

2.0

Are you aware what I am talking about?

MR. SLY: Vaguely.

MEMBER TRUJILLO: Okay. There was a letter sent to every Board Member. I requested the letter, and every Board Member got it, regarding projects that we put on ice. And General Manager Pattillo wrote a letter to CDCR, I believe. I don't have the letter in front of me.

MR. PATTILLO: For clarification. I don't think I walked in with it. Mr. Trujillo at a public hearing requested any evaluation that CDCR had done of the modular building program and any response to that. A copy of previous letters of evaluation and my response to that evaluation, which was a very harshly worded critique, was given to Mr. Trujillo with a copy to every Member of the Board. That's what Mr. Trujillo is speaking of.

MEMBER TRUJILLO: My question, Counsel, is that not public records?

MR. SLY: Let me start with saying that the public records are defined in California Public Records Act at Government Code Section 6253, which basically states that records of a public agency are public records, unless specifically excluded in a statute, which 6254 has 31 subdivisions or specifically carve out exceptions to public records that wouldn't be subject to disclosure. Some examples might be preliminary drafts of memos, pending litigation, personal medical information about employees, state employees, proprietary information, investigations and many other numerous, specifically enumerated, exclusions.

Without seeing the letter that you are referring to, at this moment I can't imagine that the type of information that you're asking for would fall under one of those definitions. I would have liked to see how they referenced that. But my position at this point would be that I fail to see how that specifically falls into one of those exclusions, unless the information was being categorized as some type of preliminary draft or not formally requested document.

Since I don't have the letter, I can't give you a definitive answer on that. I would say it is

very hard to get to those exceptions.

MEMBER TRUJILLO: I will email the letter and get back with you. It's hard for me to believe it is not a matter of public record. The request had been made from our General Manager.

MR. SLY: Based on what I recall the discussion back in the public hearing in the last board meeting, and, again, without seeing how they categorized that information, I would find it difficult to think that the information would qualify under one of the specifically enumerated exclusions, but I can't rule out the possibility that it does. I would like to see their explanation. But it's not impossible to get to the exclusions. There are specific -- I said there were 31 of them. But the default position in the State of California is records of a public agency are public records.

MR. TRUJILLO: Thank you, Counsel. I'm a little worried, Mr. Pattillo, General Manager, what is going on now, that they want \$25,000,000 from the program that we are doing here.

MR. PATTILLO: I share your concern,
Mr. Trujillo. This is one of those times where
Board Members -- I end up doing a lot of the banging

on people's heads on behalf of the Board on a lot of things. I get myself in trouble a lot.

Yes, Ms. Woodford, I do.

This is one of the cases where each of you and your constituencies need to step up and help us out on this. You know, Secretary Hoshino knows what the implications are, but this is just another one of those things. This is actually a small thing. I think we can resolve it very easily. But it's just a combination of things that constantly happen with PIA, whether it's getting thrown under the bus with furloughs, which was an easy one that we should have been out of, versus \$25,000,000. This is about as easy as a furlough decision. It just shouldn't happen.

Ms. Woodford.

MEMBER WOODFORD: Did this have something to do with the fact that the State Parks has this fund sitting over in the corner, all that big mess? Is this tied to that, or just a misunderstanding of what this fund is about? That we're really complying with the law.

MR. PATTILLO: It absolutely has to do with what Parks is about, and that is the issue. Some of you may or may not be familiar. There was a lot of

cash that was in certain accounts that weren't exactly accounted for when people were crying poor mouth about their state programs. These things happen.

The Department of Finance is looking very closely at anybody with cash, any type of account. They're looking at it generally. I explained to them very succinctly that this cash is for a certain federal requirement, and it can't happen. So I don't think anybody is unclear on it, but it is tied to what you spoke of.

MEMBER WOODFORD: Is there -- did we -- is there a different kind of account we can set up that makes it very clear that it is retirement?

MR. PATTILLO: It is. And our auditor will speak to it in a second. It is set aside in our financial statements as a requirement under generally accepted or, excuse me, Government Accounting Standard Boards 45, that it is set aside for that purpose. It is on our financial statement.

MEMBER WOODFORD: Is there a different kind of account so it doesn't look like a slush fund?

MR. PATTILLO: What the proposal is right

now is to transfer that money over to CALPERS in a

higher investment fund. Take it off our books. So it's sitting as invested, as an investment. So it can't be swept. You can't sweep money out of invested funds. So that's what we're looking at right now. I was a little behind. I should have known that this was going to happen. When we were at \$20,000,000, we should have done it instead of waiting till we are at \$32,000,000.

CHAIR HOSINO: To demystify this a little bit because Member Woodford is dialing in on this. I think the General Manager is doing a job that he should be doing, just putting it on the screen or radar, so to speak, for the Board Members. There isn't an action that is pending that we know of in the administration.

MR. PATTILLO: No.

CHAIR HOSHINO: It is arising out of -because I want to tamp this down a little bit for
everybody. It is arising out of proper diligence
out of the State government, which is driven by the
Department of Finance to identify all of the funding
sources that are out there, that are either off
general fund or off book or special fund, or however
you want to describe it. But they generally don't
come into the orbit typically of the general fund,

which has been their primary focus for the last 15 years or so.

The State Parks scandal or example, if you describe it that way, but that's the way the media described it, certainly made the issue pop. So what they're continuing to do is the proper financial diligence, I think, which can also have benefits for this program or any other program. If we truly know the amount of dollars that are available and decisions get made about how to allocate those throughout state government, including this particular program.

So the money in the fund that Mr. Pattillo just described was identified as one of those. So the discussion has been occurring between the Prison Industry Authority as well as finding out what that means. We know now, at least for this budget round, January 10 being the date, it is unlikely there is anything in there related to this \$25- or \$32,000,000. And the reason, of course, to get the attention is that the fund grew, as the General Manager described, to a large amount over time.

In response to that, I think they're doing the right, diligent thing. Is there a better way to categorize this or place it, for lack of a better

term, protect it so it is more defined and more linked to what its true purpose is, which is the OPEB funding and things related to that?

I presume there's going to be more conversation about this in the coming meetings, about this, as the General Manager and myself and the Department of Finance talk about what this is. But I would characterize this more as they're doing their diligence. They stumbled upon it, and the right action is taking place in conversations about what this is and what it is for and what it is about. So we can demonstrate that it is not what you saw over at State Parks.

I hope that is helpful.

MR. PATTILLO: The Secretary is correct.

It is due diligence on their part to go through and look at every fund that may have extra cash. To do whatever potential if it transfers. What is going to happen, though, is after -- hopefully, we've done enough push back that it won't happen January 10th right now.

We do need to bring it to your attention because what's going to happen is after January 10th, that look again is going to be done by the Legislature. They're going to look through and see

what all the funds are. Finance, Governor, why didn't you transfer those funds? When I was an analyst, that is exactly what I did. So this will come back around. But I think with the right set of facts, it defeats everything.

MEMBER BUTLER: May I ask a question,
Mr. Chairman? Is this partly a discussion over the
amount of the reserve? It seemed -- you seemed to
indicate the amount -- they're not sweeping the
entire fund, leaving a portion? Does that intimate
that they have a disagreement with you about the
level of reserve that is required?

MR. PATTILLO: They have a belief that I can deal with \$25,000,000 less. That's kind of how the initial discussion is.

MEMBER BUTLER: Is the answer then to that an accounting question? Is it reading of the GASB rules for this type of a fund? Who is the final authority, or is this just really at the end of the day a matter of opinion?

MR. PATTILLO: It's really just a matter of opinion. When the auditor comes up, we can talk about months of operating fund. We put it out that we would only have about two months of operating fund if they took the 25,000,000. That is really --

for us that is about, that is another two months is what it equates to. There is no set in stone for, especially, government budgets, what the operating budget is.

MEMBER BUTLER: I guess I misunderstood what the funds were. I thought they were related to future obligations for employee benefits or related to employee costs. Is that an accurate statement?

MR. PATTILLO: They are other post-employment benefits. Everything other than pensions. The way we keep it, we keep it in one fund.

MEMBER BUTLER: I guess something that would concern me is whether or not those funds were being intermingled inappropriately, being used for the investment of the operation. Again, I'm not an accountant. But when you're thinking about employee obligations, those are very important obligations. They need to be protected against risk of operational loss and things like that. So I don't know if that is part of the discussion, too. It would seem to me that the right thing to do would be to determine what the appropriate level of reserve to make for this specific purpose and then not intermingle that with the operating. Just as my

opinion.

MR. PATTILLO: Mr. Butler, that amount is identified each year by the controller's office, the exact dollar amount. That's what we're talking about setting aside, is exactly what the controller has identified.

MEMBER TRUJILLO: Mr. Pattillo, I do have a letter that was addressed to Mr. Chris Meyer from you. I think at this point I would encourage my colleagues on this Board. I think I'm going to send an email, write a letter, to the Inspector General and get my answer from him regarding this issue.

MR. PATTILLO: I would appreciate any response that you get.

MEMBER TRUJILLO: Absolutely.

MEMBER SINGH: I just want to know when is this going to happen? When are they going to take?

MR. PATTILLO: Mr. Singh, this was an initial proposal in building the budget. I think there's been enough push back between me and the Secretary, the Secretary and I, that it may not occur on January 10th. He seems very confident that it won't occur on January 10th, given that it requires his signature to happen. But as we stated, once other folks see the cash balances that we've

incurred - we put our financial statement out in February - it's going to -- the subject will be broached again with your constituencies, which is the Legislature. Then we will address it then again.

MEMBER SINGH: I would talk to Marc Leno. He is the chairman of budget committee, finance. We can go over together.

MR. PATTILLO: Thank you.

Any questions so far? I've taken up my two minutes.

Lastly, I want to apologize for a comment I made last time at the Board meeting. I think you guys know I am very protective and very proud of what PIA does. The CTE programs are one of the most important things we have done.

I made a comment regarding another program which was not -- it was with CDCR, regarding what their abilities are compared to our abilities. It is not right to denigrate another program, especially when I have the facts that show we do run a very good program. We do have the facts that support it. So I do apologize for that comment. It had to do with saying that another program built stuff out of popsicle sticks. So I apologize.

The Secretary did mention that this is -- he is still the acting Secretary. And one of the things that's going on right now is that there is a nationwide search for a Secretary. As you are members of a constituency, again, I would take it upon yourselves to educate, not only the Governor's office or your own constituencies, on what your expectations are of a Secretary and Chair of the Board. This is the opportunity to do this.

I think Mr. Hoshino has come in here as an interim, thrown into something, and has done a very good job. Luckily, we have a working relationship that goes back a lot of years. But, in general, this is your opportunity to say what the expectation of this Board is and what this Board should be doing and what the Secretary should be doing for the Board.

I would also encourage you to spend some time with Secretary Hoshino - he has none, but when he does - and you will find that he's been around this Department for a long time.

I think my expectations of a Secretary, and I want to be very clear, I've had conversations, to do the help that we need as the General Manger of PIA and represent me and this organization, in State

government. So I appreciate that in a secretary.

I look forward to the upcoming strategic planning session and the Board's willingness to provide extra focus on CALPIA. I will send you a copy of our strategic planning document so we have a working document. The person that we would be dealing with is Laura Mason Smith, who has a very long pedigree of doing these kinds of facilitations for a lot of state agencies. So I'm looking forward to it. I will send you her bio.

That is what I have.

CHAIR HOSINO: For general comments?

MR. PATTILLO: General comments, yes.

CHAIR HOSHINO: Would you like to move to the action items?

MR. PATTILLO: Mr. Secretary, if we can, I would like to take an item out of order. I would like the auditor to come up first to talk about the PIA audit, the wrap-up and where we're at. That will give us context for the rest of our discussion. The audit is an audit by the PIB. You contract for this individual. This is not a contracted auditor between PIA and the audit firm. If I could have Scott Hammon come up.

CHAIR HOSHINO: I want the record to

reflect that I have no card for general comments from members of the public. I do not see members of the public in attendance today. If that changes, I will state it on the record.

MR. HAMMON: Good morning, Members of the Board. Scott Hammon. Thank you for your time and thanks for letting us be here this morning.

I've been asked to keep our comments in the 10- to 15-minute range. Hopefully, all of you have a copy of our presentation document, which should be distributed as part of your package.

We previously had a meeting last week with Members of the Audit Committee. We went through this in detail in approximately a one-hour conference call. I am going to touch on a couple high points. Also, I do want to leave time at the end of my comments for any questions you may have. I will forewarn you my comments are going to be very brief. If I did not cover something in sufficient detail or there is an additional question you have, based on your reading of this document, please don't hesitate to ask.

Having said that, I do want to highlight a couple things. For those of you that were on the Board last year, this format, this presentation, is

similar to that which we presented last year. So I think you'll find it pretty easy to work through.

I'm going to ask that you flip to Page 2 of the document. Apologize for my voice.

Status of our Audit. And I just want to highlight a couple of things here. One, first, we are substantially completed with the audit. The only thing pending at this point in time is finalization on some edits that we proposed to the organization relating to a portion of the financials called management's discussion and analysis. We expect to have that resolved in the very near future. At that point in time we will go ahead and issue the financial statements.

My voice chose a bad time to go out on me this morning.

To highlight, when we do the audit, it is in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and also the government auditing standards.

To highlight and clarify, when we do an audit, we are really responsible for the opinion of the financial statements. The ultimate responsibility for the financial statement and numbers themselves stays with management. That is consistent with how

an audit is performed. When we do an audit, we are looking for what we call reasonable assurance that there aren't any misstatements. Because we use sampling and other techniques that involve less than testing 100 percent of all transactions, there is always the chance that there could be an error in the financials that we would not locate.

As mentioned, as part of the audit we did look at management's discussion and analysis. We don't issue an opinion on management's discussion and analysis. When we go through that part of the document, we're looking for either numbers or facts or comments that are inconsistent with the financial statements themselves, primarily. So that is our focus there. We do not issue a separate stand alone opinion.

Finally, I do want to thank everybody associated with PIA for their help and support during the audit process. We've got a good working relationship, and that continued this year.

Unless any questions on these comments, I'm going to next focus on the back of the document, towards the back, specifically Page 7. And this page is highlighted on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting (Continued). The page number is

in the lower left in small print. I apologize for the small font.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What I want to do here is to highlight what we might call here some of our findings and recommendations that came from the audit process. When we do an audit, we are focused on the accuracy of financial statements. We do look at internal controls in the context of determining the extent of our testing, the nature of that testing as opposed to issuing a separate report specifically on internal controls. It is inevitable that as part of that audit process, as we are doing our testing, we see things, areas, that we believe could be improved, processes, transactions that we think the organization should consider for change. And we highlight both the current year comments we have, as well as the status of some of the comments that we had last year, and have provided an update on those.

The current year comments are at the top of the page. First one under subheading Significant Deficiencies. When we look at recommendations, we break them into three buckets. The first listed here is what we call material weakness. We didn't have any that we thought were material weaknesses

this year. A material weakness would be a failure or potential failure that is so strong or so likely that the financial statements themselves could be materially misstated.

A significant deficiency is the next step down. It's something that wouldn't necessarily cause a material weakness, but is significant enough that we think the organization should take steps to address it.

The third category is called other matters for consideration. Are really suggestions for improvement. They may not have a direct impact on the financial numbers in a day-to-day sense.

Going back to look at the first item, which is timely reconciliations of subsidiary ledgers. One of the basic accounting controls is that the underlying records, the detailed records, whether it be listings or fixed assets, inventory records, bank statements, should be reconciled to what we call a trial balance or a general ledger on a periodic basis. Frequently it would be monthly.

When we went out to do the audit this year, we noted that, primarily due to some of the staff shortages they incurred, they're behind in this process. The problem with being behind in

reconciling information like this is, if they're either inadvertent errors or deliberate errors, perhaps as a result of a fraud, it can take longer to uncover those things as a result, particularly if it's fraud. There is a likelihood the amount would be larger because it goes undetected for a long period of time.

As we finished up the audit, we noted that they had basically caught up and basically addressed that issue. But that is something we have mentioned to the Audit Committee, that perhaps periodically the Board would want to check and just make sure they're on pace with these and have continued to stay up to speed.

The second item relates to identifying slow moving inventory items. As you know, towards the significant balance at the organization, critical to its function. And one of things that is done on a periodic basis is to identify whether there are any parts or finished goods that may not be selling at a sufficient pace to get consumed. Basically, if something is sitting on the shelf for an extended period of time, there is an issue whether that value is represented or should be carried over or written down.

So the organization goes through a process to potentially identify those items, based on how much has moved over a period of time. And then, if they have fallen into that threshold, they will then go through a more specific evaluation process and look at each of those identified numbers.

2.4

Our concern in the current year was that the threshold we thought was not broad enough. Our approach is we want to cast a reasonably wide net when you're doing this, and then you can go through and kick things out, based on your specific evaluation. The threshold that was used in this past year we felt was too low, and made suggestions for improvement. Our understanding is that those will be adopted.

The other matters for consideration: One had to do with State policy about the level in which they would capitalize expenditures as a fixed asset. Currently, the State has a threshold of \$5,000. So if it is below that amount, you do not capitalize. And that is an individual level. Meaning, if I buy, in PIA's case, 50 sewing machines that collectively exceed \$5,000, I'm not allowed to capitalize it unless each individual machine was over that \$5,000 threshold.

PIA has asked for an exception for that policy because of how they operate. It is uncommon to buy these assets on an infrequent basis. So there might be significant amounts of money, like sewing machines, once every 10 to 20 years. Each individual item wouldn't come close to the threshold, but collectively it's a large amount of money. They're waiting for a response for the exception from the Department of Finance. I hope to expect it shortly. I'm hopeful it would be granted, but can't predict.

The next item is compensated absences. This is not uncommon in State agencies, but for this year there was a threshold in the amount of accrued vacation and PT that you're allowed to record, allow a person to carry into the next fiscal year. There is a relatively small amount, but, nonetheless, we are highlighting it. A lot of that had to do with the impact of the furloughs and staffing, where people weren't able to take vacations.

Our comment here is to keep an eye on it, and make sure it doesn't grow unchecked, and just touch base on it periodically and just make sure it stays at a reasonable level.

Prior year comments. I think these speak for

themselves, by and large. One item I do want to highlight is at the very bottom, financial analysis and reporting. Those who were here last year remember we spent a fair amount of time talking about this issue. Part of it had to do with, perhaps, hiring somebody within the organization that could act as a conduit for better financial analysis and dissemination of information in the organization. The phrase was used, whether you agree with it or not, getting someone to act as a CFO, chief financial officer, to serve in that role. And the organization, I know, has made an offer to somebody and is hopeful of closing the door and finding that person that can provide more in-depth financial analysis and take action to perhaps identify trends, sort of in the process to act more quickly with regards to losses or where revenue opportunities exist and act upon those.

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Unless there are any specific questions on the document or what I presented, I'm finished with my comments. I would be happy to take any questions you may have or any other issue you may want me to discuss at this time.

[Inaudible question.]

As I said, we're waiting for feedback from

management. We're hoping to do it before the first of the year, but to a large degree have to defer to PIA, and we're waiting for those edits that were proposed to come back, and whether there is further discussion.

MEMBER BUTLER: Question. You are or are not offering an opinion on the sufficiency of OPEB, the obligation that the funds have been set aside?

MR. HAMMON: I will respond in two parts.

One is the OPEB liability is recorded on the books and financial statements, in that context. We issue an opinion on the appropriateness of that amount. It is based on an actuarial study performed by a third party. The issue at this time that was talked about from my perspective is a broader and somewhat more complicated one. Because you have a situation where the accounting rules do not match with the organization's legal contractual obligations.

So as you currently sit here today, from my perspective as a layperson, there is a significant contractual and legal obligation which the organization has, which is not fully reflected on its financial statements because of how the accounting rules are drafted. Similar situation exits for pension liability.

The accounting rule makers have taken steps to address that pension liability, and some of you may be familiar with this issue. It's been written up a fair amount in the Wall Street Journal, The Bee and other publications. Starting June 30th, 2015, governmental organizations will be required to more accurately reflect the amount of their future pension obligations as opposed to kind of the pay-as-you-go approach that's currently being taken.

While there is currently no rule that has been issued for the OPEB obligation, in talking to all of our technical people and reading tea leaves, it is expected that rules would be issued in the near future. I don't have a date. That will take a similar stance and require organizations to similarly, like pensions, accrue the full amount of the OPEB obligation. Currently, it is more -- it's something called an ARC basis, which is an acronym to use, which is not the full liability you currently have.

Sorry for the long winded answer.

MEMBER BUTLER: Just to follow up. I know you can't predict the outcome of the rules, but did I hear you intimate that the current reserve may still be insufficient, even before this sweep, that

PIA may still have insufficient funds to meet future obligations?

MR. HAMMON: I would caution, from my perspective as an accountant, I would not use the phrase "reserve" necessarily. These are assets, the organization's. They are not legally restricted, per se, as I perceive from an accounting perspective. But from a pragmatic operational --

MEMBER BUTLER: Cash flow.

MR. HAMMON: Exactly. From my perspective, it is a prudent action to take, knowing that you have a legal, contractual obligation, regardless of whether current accounting rules reflect all of those things. As we know, accounting is a language. And like all languages, it may occasionally lack the words to properly reflect underlying reality. That is the case here.

Unfortunately, the rule makers haven't acted on the OPEB portion, but given what they've done on the pension side to fix the exact same issue, again, we expect they will take action on OPEB, as well.

MEMBER BUTLER: Thank you.

MR. HAMMON: Yes, Mr. Singh.

MEMBER SINGH: Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the Audit Committee, and it was explained to us

very, very properly, and it was satisfactory. So I 1 2 move the motion, move this. 3 MEMBER BUTLER: Second. MR. PATTILLO: Mr. Singh, we actually don't 4 5 have to an action today because, unfortunately, due 6 to our full operations, we haven't finalized it yet. There won't be an action necessary today. Your concurrence in the PIB Audit Committee was to, and 8 you've done it, was to point out any discrepancy 10 that you saw at the same time. So we won't have an 11 action, just an issuance. That will probably come 12 in January. 13 CHAIR HOSHINO: So, Mr. Pattillo, do you want to continue with the informational items? 14 15 There is one more on the agenda. MR. PATTILLO: Go back to the action items. 16 17 Take care of that. CHAIR HOSHINO: Mr. Hammon, thank you very 18 19 much. 20 MR. HAMMON: Thank you for your time. Take 21 care. 22 MR. PATTILLO: Mr. Chairman and Members, if I could take a second. We do have a member of the 23

She is the Executive Director of the Board of Parole

public here. Jennifer Shaffer is my counterpart.

24

25

Hearings. And it was a position Mr. Hoshino held, too. And she is here just to observe. This is her room, and I appreciate her letting us use it.

MS. SHAFFER: Good morning.

CHAIR HOSHINO: Good morning. Hello, Executive Officer Shaffer. Thank you for joining us.

MR. PATTILLO: Mr. Chair, Members, if we can go back to the action items. We are starting with the very first one, which is adoption of the midyear revised, FY 2012-2013. And in your -- there should be a sleeve that's got a picture of a whole lot of copy being on the front of it. And that is the actual plan.

We are submitting a midyear plan to reflect adjustments that occurred after we closed the annual plan. We kind of hit on the high points of that, whether it was an increase in retirement contributions or an increase in OPEB. Coupled by decreases in revenues in the areas that diminished last month in construction and modular building. Some of that is offset by some pricing increase that we've done over the last six months. If I can run through it real quick, I can tell you what the highlights of this are.

We are proposing that our revenues will decrease \$7.7 million, about 4.4 percent, to \$172,000,000. That was just audited, \$165,000,000. And as a change, a decrease from the annual plan that we passed, what our proposal was, of \$2.2 million.

Manufacturing overall a decrease of about \$.3 million. And it's offset by -- we have a bunch of increases and lowering. Run through them really quick.

Metal products: About \$3.5 million increase because of huge orders from Cal Trans for truck bodies that we're building out at Solano, which is a great trade in welding, which has a very low recidivism rate.

Fabric products: Decreasing about 1.5 million because of a reduction in CDCR orders because of a realignment issue.

Modular construction: A million and a half decrease, a 100 percent decrease because of the diminishment of that program.

And shoes: We're seeing about a \$600,000 decrease because of CPP reduction of inmates.

The other thing that we're seeing happen is a lot of our products are having a longer life cycle

and that's kind of catching up from -- the longer they wear, the less they're going to buy. We've got some pretty high quality fabric products out there that are lasting a long time. We'e trying to get more into the local markets, but local markets seem still to be in the mindset of 90-day clothes and things like that. With realignment, they're going to realize that they need a lot longer product. So we are having success with a couple large agencies, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department and the San Diego County Sheriff's Department, which are very large organizations.

In services we have a decrease of \$2.4 million. In printing, a million-seven. That's mostly because CDCR forms and records that we're digitizing for folks.

Food and beverage packages: A decrease of about \$.9 million. That is mostly because of pricing in everybody's favorite topic, peanut butter. So peanut better will never go away.

Last year what happened, we lost a little bit of money on our food packaging, specifically in peanut butter because of the peanut shortage in the United States. We became the only game in town because most private vendors got out of it. All the

state agencies had to turn to us because we were the only ones who could go out and get it because of volume and because of the high price increase.

In ag we're seeing an increase of half million in dairy, about \$700,000 increase. Most of that is marketing, market price. However, there could be a significant increase in pricing in the public sector in milk if things don't go as well. I think we've all heard enough in the fiscal cliff. There is also a dairy clip out their right now that December 31st there is some very large subsidies that go out to dairy farmers in the United States; that if they don't go through, the price of milk in the public will go through the roof. So there are very few dairies in the state as it is.

Crops: About a \$200,000 decrease. This is mostly a decrease in our almond sales, but those almond sales have been picked up because we're packing somewhere else.

Cost of goods sold: The \$13,000,000 estimate increase from unaudited actuals of cost of goods sold to \$127,000,000 is actually a reflection of lower revenues. And then changing the annual plan is about \$8 to \$9,000,000. And the change is primarily in manufacturing, about \$.2 million change

in the cost of goods. Services, about \$.7 million. And agriculture will have a decrease of \$.03 million, very small decrease.

Raw material pricing: Overall about \$1.7 million increase in raw materials, based on unaudited actuals.

Civil Service costs: Overall the actual cost is about \$1.1 million decrease in our field operations. So we're trying to right-size our field as it is. Take into consideration that we've lost 42,000 paying customers, that on an average our daily rate for inmates is about \$1.52. So if you multiply that by 42,000, you can see we're losing about \$60,000 a day in reduced revenues as part of the realignment. We are picking it up in areas where we're increasing our sales. Doing different volumes of products.

The gross profit increase from the unaudited actuals is \$5.4 million. That primarily is from pricing increases, where we were deficient in our pricing. Raw materials got ahead of us. We were doing a lot more 12-month forward contracting.

We'll see a lot less forward contracting and a lot more quarterly and monthly pricing adjustments now.

Selling and administration: About \$.3 million

decrease from the unaudited actual of \$41.2 million, which is some decrease in distribution. Offset by some increase in distribution to bring ourselves in line with California Air Resources Board requirements on the trucking. And just the cost of diesel has not gone down as much as gasoline has.

Central office: Decrease about half a million from the unaudited actuals. We basically have a hiring freeze on. We have had one for a while. We won't go above 542 positions. We think some of that will be reduced, about 12 positions, by the end of the year.

State mandated costs: One of the big adjustments we did was about \$700,000 increase of OPEB already unaudited actuals, what we had in the annual plan at the end of the year. That's because the State Controller doesn't issue that number till about a month after our budget closes. So they have increased our part of OPEB by \$700,000.

Our pro rata allocation, which we talked about, has gone from \$3.7 to \$4.8 million. It's another issue that's increasing.

Overall operating income is going to be \$3.8 million, and that is a decrease from where we were at about \$700,000, we thought in the annual plan.

Most of that's been taken into consideration for having these decreases in revenues, which I identified. Plus we have fully funded the CTE programs, as I mentioned. Right now we are hoping to work something out with CDCR on reimbursement funding. We are going to pursue the legislation that we have that was approved by this Board. I think that we have to have a discussion about that. In the interim I can't see shutting down a program when we do actually have the cash to operate this, even though we'll be running into a deficit in the current year.

So for the time being, so we can get our ship right through the next months and get everything rectified, including accomplishing layoffs, right-sizing our organization and increasing revenues, which we've actually been doing in certain areas. The big revenue loss that you see, the change, is mostly modular, MSF, modular systems furniture, which, as Mr. Butler can tell you, is a declining business in the state, although we're trying to grab as much of the business as we can with a declining product.

Any questions at this time in?

MEMBER BUTLER: I would just congratulate

```
the management for doing such a good job in the
 1
    really difficult circumstances that you're in. As I
    look at the profitability of your business line is
 3
   nearly all of them are profitable at the op inc
 4
 5
    level, which says you've got good core businesses.
    I understand the actions you're taking in modular
 6
    furniture, which hasn't been profitable and support
 8
    those.
         I did -- had a -- it's really more of just a --
    I think there's maybe a typographical error in the
10
11
    exhibits. I just want to clarify, If I could.
12
   Under Exhibit B1 -- don't let me get ahead of you if
    this for a different issue.
13
             MR. PATTILLO: It's the next item.
14
             MEMBER BUTLER: I will wait to talk about
15
16
   those things.
17
             CHAIR HOSHINO: So, not seeing anybody from
18
   the public who wants to comment on this, the
19
   recommendation is, and we're seeking a motion to
   approve this action item for approval. Fiscal Year?
20
             MR. PATTILLO: Yes, Mr. Chair.
21
             CHAIR HOSHINO: Midyear revised.
22
         Is there a motion?
23
             MEMBER TRUJILLO: So moved.
24
25
             MEMBER SAITO: I second.
```

CHAIR HOSHINO: Are we doing ayes now or by

2 role?

MS. GUARE: By aye.

CHAIR HOSHINO: Those in support, say aye.

Those opposed.

Motion carries.

Item B, Mr. Pattillo.

MR. PATTILLO: Item B, which I think has a typographical error, is the designation of cash. The purpose of this item is something we started several years ago, is identifying the amount of cash in our cash balances that we'll be setting aside to do our operations during the year. The purpose is to update PIB on the designation of cash, based on our midyear revised.

Our proposed cash position for FY is projected to decrease the ending year to \$68.2 million, which is reflected in the document. What I'm working from is Exhibit B1. And of that cash at the end of the year, we're obligated, between OPEB and short-term liabilities, mostly payables, is a total of \$54.4 million is obligated, OPEB is about \$39.3 million. Worker's Comp is 1.9 million. Since we self-fund our workers' comp, we set that money aside every year. We get an actuarial report on what we need to

set aside for that year from SCIF.

Accounts payable is about \$7.9 million. And all over, \$5.3 million. And then we have various cash flow issues.

Our capital schedule is \$13.4 million which is a \$100,000 increase. We did various adjustments throughout the capital schedule for this year.

However, we did increase \$200,000. And the reason for that \$200,000 increase, this Board has previously appropriated approximately \$3,000,000 for us to build prototypes for marketing purposes for the modular program. We built three. One is the telemedicine facility which we installed at Pelican Bay. The second one is the Office of Correctional Safety and Emergency Operations Center, which we are building into another training center for emergency responders up at Camp 12. We hope to market that building. It has been installed.

We're opening it when?

MR. WALKER: Should be the end of January.

MR. PATTILLO: About January we will start having folks use it for classes up there. Our hope is somebody goes in there and says, "I'd like to have one of these in my backyard." Is what we're

looking at.

The third one was a modular light, which is a very light type modular. It is not a heavy duty. As former Secretary Tilton said, modular on steroid, but a lighter duty one. And we need about \$200,000 to finish that project out. That is going to be a replication of our business services building which is about near to be condemned. We are installing it in the back of our parking lot right now.

That is the major changes in the capital. We're hoping when folks see that building, it will revive our modular building program. This is the only way we can do it. As you may recall, you had appropriated about four years ago about \$600,000 for one building, that we ended up turning around and selling \$42,000,000 worth of those buildings?

CHAIR HOSHINO: Questions? Comments,

Members?

MEMBER BUTLER: So the number that stood out to me was your operating expense number for the proposed midyear revised of '12-13 at \$189,240. That same number shows up in Exhibit B2 at the last page as one \$169,240. I think there was just a transpositional error made from the six to the eight. If the eight were correct, I think the math

would mean that you lost 24,000,000 on the revised. 1 2 Does that make sense? 3 MR. PATTILLO: What page? MEMBER BUTLER: The first one is on B1, the 4 5 operating expense number for FY '12-13 proposed midyear revise. My copy shows 189-; I don't know if 6 that's what the others show. MR. PATTILLO: You're right; there is an 8 9 error. THE COURT REPORTER: Could you identify 10 yourself, please? 11 12 MR. ALARID: I'm Gary Alarid, Chief of 13 Budget for California Prison Authority. 14 MEMBER BUTLER: If you have the last page of Exhibit B2, you see the same numbers where it's 15 16 169-. 17 MR. ALARID: What I'm thinking is I would 18 have to calculate real quick is for the purpose of 19 the display on the midyear revise pamphlet, we 20 actually pull out the pro rata. 21 MEMBER BUTLER: If that's the case, the 22 math is wrong. MR. PATTILLO: The math is wrong. 23 CHAIR HOSINO: Mr. Pattillo, can you 24 correct the record here of what the report will 25

reflect so you can still move the item? 1 2 MR PATTILLO: The bottom line numbers will 3 remain the same. Mr. Butler correctly pointed out the number on operating expenses, four columns over, 4 5 should reflect \$169,240. And it was a typographical error, instead of \$189,240. 6 CHAIR HOSINO: Thank you. 8 Any more comments on this item, Members? 9 Is there a motion to approve the designation 10 of cash to support Fiscal Year '12-13 subject to the 11 adjustment in the record that Mr. Patillo referenced 12 moments ago? 13 MEMBER SINGH: So moved. 14 CHAIR HOSHINO: Member Singh. 15 Do we have a second? 16 MEMBER STEEB: I will second. 17 CHAIR HOSHINO: Members in support, say aye. 18 Opposed. Motion carries. 19 20 Item C, Mr. Pattillo. MR. PATTILLO: Thank you, Mr. Butler. 21 MEMBER BUTLER: I should have gotten to you 22 23 before the meeting. My apologies for not reading this binder. You gave it to me. 24 CHAIR HOSHINO: No. This is a good example 25

of open public meetings and the work in records that we make as you spoke.

Thank you, Mr. Butter.

2.5

MEMBER BUTLER: Thank you.

MR. PATTILLO: C, Prison Industry Board report to the Legislature. A couple of years ago the Governor's Office gave us the option of invoking his own executive orders that says we didn't have to make a report to the Legislature, and we were given the option of saying yea or nay.

We didn't concur with that because we think this is one of the most important documents that we can put out on an annual basis. It includes what the plans of this Board are. What CALPIA's plans are and if the Board's blessed those plans and also the financial audit. It's a great tool for communication. We have it posted so anybody can read it. We didn't want to hide anything whatsoever.

We have a draft item in here, but given that we do have a meeting in January, this is not due until February 1st. We want to take the time to have more Board Members give us some input on it. It is a very basic item. We do it -- we don't have a lot of pictures in it. We just have text, and this is the

1 report of it. But given that there are some things that 3 still aren't finished right now, including the Governor's budget coming out, we thought it would be 4 5 wise to wait until the Governor's budget is finalized, just in case 25,000,000 things pop up. 6 So we can have that conversation with the Legislature. The document is there for your 8 9 perusal. We are suggesting that we put it over to the next January meeting, have the strategic 10 11 planning and have this one item. Serve as a road 12 map for the strategic planning session. 13 CHAIR HOSHINO: Comments? Questions, 14 Members? 15 So I think the recommendation is, this is not an action item for today's meeting. It is something 16 17 we will defer until the next meeting. Correct? 18 MR. PATTILLO: Yes, sir. CHAIR HOSINO: There is no opposition to 19 20 that. Then let's move to Item D. 21 MR. PATTILLO: D, I am going to bring in 22 the attorney. 23 CHAIR HOSINO: Because it is regulatory. MR. SLY: Jeff Sly, General Counsel for 24

Prison Industry Authority.

25

Item D is our next installment in our regulatory process. Comes to you in three parts. In the way of little background.

Department of Corrections has personnel regulations set forth in their Title XV, and they apply to all employees of the Department of Corrections. We have a lot of employees that work in institutions along with those folks. They asked us to promulgate some regulations that would be similar to, coincide, and have our employees be subject to the regulations that are already in place for CDCR employees.

essentially are established to be very similar to and hold some of the same requirements that the Title 15 for CDCR employees. These will apply to PIA employees. One of the important parts to this is there is a catch-all regulation there that says PIA employees, when you're working at the CDCR institution, the CDCR Title 15 rules apply to you.

First of all, just kind of in the way of preliminary comments as well. Because of the large number of regulations we put together here, the Office of Administrative Law says to break this up into three groups so they can look at them in

smaller packages. Easier for them to process.

Exhibit 2 is some more personnel regs, but
these are additional personnel regs that go beyond
a little bit what the first exhibits of personnel
regs did. Here we've got our statement of
incompatibility, which all state agencies have in
their regulations. This one specifically applies to
PIA employees and their outside employment, outside
activities that they have. One of important parts
of the second group is that we took these regs and
made our personnel regs applicable to our
contractors. So contractors who are working at or
on Prison Industry Authority areas are now subject
to the same -- will be subject to the same
regulatory requirements as regular PIA employees.

We also added a reg in there that makes them responsible if they are on our behalf on institution property, that they are also subject to the CDCR regulations as well. So we are trying to make sure that everybody's following the same rules and subject to the same requirements as CDCR has for their employees.

And the third section, third exhibit, is the Prison Industry Authority Conflict of Interest Code. Since we are having -- since it was determined that

PIA has its own regulatory authority through the Board, the Office of Administrative Law and the Fair Political Practices Commission — the Fair Political Practices Commission is statutorily charged with approving all conflict of interest codes for all state agencies. Prior to us creating our own and working with FPPC to do that, PIA was included in the Department of Corrections Conflict of Interest Code, and so was the Prison Industry Board.

In looking at how they included PIA and what positions they had and what disclosure categories they had, we decided we needed to expand on that a bit. In cooperation with CDCR, we are in the process of removing PIA and Prison Industry Board from their Conflict of Interest Code. We are now putting forth our own conflict of interest code which will take both Prison Industry Authority employees and the Prison Industry Board. The FPPC has already approved the code that's been presented to you today. The Office of Administrative Law defers to the FPPC approval.

Essentially, you approve this today, will go right into your 45-day public notice period for all three units here. Once that process is complete, we'll submit Exhibit 1 and 2 to the Office of

Administrative Law for their further review.

We will take the third exhibit back to the Fair

Political Practices Commission and make sure there

4 is no changes we want to make, based upon the public

5 comments. Once the FPPC approves it, it will go

straight to the Secretary of State's Office through the Office of Administrative Law and be approved.

What we need from you today, what we are asking from you today, is to approve these regs as they are presented. Start the 45-day notice period, very shortly, and then we come back if there are any proposed changes we have. Otherwise, they will go through the regulatory process and look to be adopted sometime in April of next year.

CHAIR HOSINO: Comments? Questions from the Members of the Board?

I have one. I want to make sure I understand. So the first two items are regulations, it seems to me, to conform with the existing standards for all employees in the Department, extending them to PIA.

MR. SLY: Correct. Yes.

CHAIR HOSINO: The third one is enhancement or expansion of the list of folks that might be relevant to conflict of interest, to make designation here to PIA, given the nature of PIA

business? 1 2 That is correct. MR. SLY: 3 MEMBER TRUJILLO: Move adoption, Mr. Secretary. 4 5 CHAIR HOSHINO: So the motion is to adopt the regulations so that they will be submitted in 6 advance and read, the extensive list. I will 8 reference that this is a motion to approve the adoption of these regulations, which are cited as 10 Item 5D in the public agenda. 11 Is there a second? MEMBER STEEB: I second that. 12 13 CHAIR HOSHINO: Those in support, say aye. 14 Opposed. The motion carries. 15 16 CHAIR HOSINO: Thank you, Mr. Sly. On to the balance of information items. 17 18 MR. PATTILLO: Our next item is a report of 19 general education, GE requirements, and reporting on 20 the number of GEDs that we have been issuing 21 throughout the year. This is an item that was brought up a couple times now by Member Steeb. 22 I 23 think she understands what the importance of getting the GED are, given that she has a better track 24 25 record than us with her own organization, getting

more GEDs than anybody I've ever seen in a nonprofit organization.

I want to put my hat out to her for asking for it and also for the accomplishment of what she's done with her organization, of getting women that are in need their GEDs.

Mr. Walker.

MR. WALKER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Board Members. I'm Scott Walker, the Assistant General Manager of Operations Division. I will be presenting the item on GED this morning.

This is our first reporting of this, as

Mr. Pattillo mentioned. This will become part of
the regular report on certifications, lost hours and
now GED. It will be a standard report that we'll do
every quarter for the Board going forward.

As you know and as you approved and concurred with, CALPIA requires inmates to possess high school diplomas - I'm Exhibit F1, is the document itself - or a general education diploma upon entering PIA or within two years of entering PIA if they don't have one. The PIB adopted a policy in April 2012 requiring inmates without a high school diploma or GED to participate in GED programs and obtain the GED within two years to continue participation in

the program.

1

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CALPIA maintains data on inmate compliance with that requirement now. So that would be reported to the Board, as I mentioned before, at every quarter. Exhibit 1 shows that we currently have 4,307 inmates currently assigned to CALPIA and 3,238 or approximately 75 percent possess a high school or GED diploma. 252 inmates, 5 percent, are currently enrolled in the GED, which leaves us with 20 percent of the inmates that are currently in our program that aren't enrolled in a program. Part of that is attributable to the fact Secretary Hoshino mentioned, the yard swap. We are going to some conversions out there. So we are kind of in a state of flux, getting inmates back into the program. We are working on that diligently.

Every institution that we're in, every program, has access to a GED. We operate some of them internally within PIA and some externally. We have very good cooperative relationship with the education department out there. So we are pushing this forward. They like it because it gives the inmate some incentive to get a GED, i.e., they can get a good paying job with a GED. Kind of works in everyone's best interest.

There's minimal cost for this program, but there is some cost. Basically for study guides and other supplies for inmates to complete the GED process.

Any questions I might answer on this?

CHAIR HOSHINO: Thank you, Mr. Walker.

Now turning to Item 7 of the public agenda, external affairs. Mr. Reslock.

MR. RESLOCK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members. I am very pleased to announce we have scheduled a graduation day, and it is going to be a double header. January 25th, starting at 10:00 a.m., at the Leonard Greenstone Marine Technology Training Center and the California Institution for Men. And then at 2:00 p.m., at the California Institution for Women. And Under Secretary McDonald has very graciously accepted our invitation to be our guest speaker. She's a wonderful, very dynamic speaker, and I hope you can come.

As far as press release, we are still waiting what I hope to be a very, very good story on the CBS Los Angeles news station on our braille program at Folsom. The were produced for sweeps, but I think they're looking for more footage in the L.A. area. Just to make more of a local news item.

And I believe we should be expecting a story from California Watch. It's an Internet government focused news site, looking into the CTE program. That's it. MEMBER WOODFORD: What is the date of the graduation? MR. RESLOCK: January 25th, 10:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. We will get invitations out to everyone. MR. PATTILLO: The second graduation is for carpentry, female carpentry graduation. CHAIR HOSHINO: Thank you, Mr. Reslock. Item 8, public comment. This portion of the meeting is reserved for comments not on the agenda. Under the Bagley-Keene Act, the Board cannot act on items raised during public comment, but may respond briefly to statements made or questions posed, request clarification or refer the item to staff. Is there anyone who would like to make a comment or address the Board? Ms. Shaffer, last call. Forgive me, for not including you as a member of the public. Just know you so well. Don't see you that way anymore. Probably vice versa.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now we move to adjournment of the meeting.

want to close by thanking the Members of the Board,

as well as the staff. In the short time that I've been here, in the two meetings, I have found the Members here to be forceful and passionate advocates of things that they believe in and that the Members are very strong in their convictions. And I think that is a very impressive thing.

This is my 37th day in the interim role. Not that anybody is counting. Candidly, I do not know whether it is three more days or three months or three years, but I've really enjoyed the tenure and time here with you all, and look forward to working with you in any other capacity that I'm lucky to be in.

I think we are very lucky to have Governor Brown. He is moving very quickly and very swiftly and is very engaged on this particular important appointment. He knows how important it is. To some extent it is, but at the same time I want you all to appreciate the fact that to some extent the selection is locked in in terms of what the Secretary, he or she, needs to be. Because we are still in the midst of the biggest public safety realignment in the history of California that will continue in years to come, we have issued the blueprint. And there are many things in play that

kind of govern the future and the destiny of the Department. That burden and responsibility will fall to whoever the Governor selects.

I want to thank you all for making me feel welcome, not just last month but also this month.

Is there a motion to adjourn the meeting?

MEMBER TRUJILLO: Before we adjourn, I

would like to make a comment, Mr. Secretary. I

would like to thank Mr. Pattillo and his staff for
an excellent report and for outstanding service in
educating this Board throughout the year.

I thank you.

CHAIR HOSHINO: I would second that.

Again, I just reiterate that I share the challenges from the Board as well as the staff here. Having to superintend the \$1,000,000,000 reduction in downsizing of the Department, which grows to \$1.5 billion over the next two or three years. There is no program or area or function or unit or employee or individual that is not touched by the dimension of what we're doing. It is far more than just a map exercise. These are humans. These are lifers.

These are things that we impact every single day, up and down the state; and it makes a big difference on every decision that we do. This Board is no

exception to the decision makers and shakers of the world that we're operating in.

Again, a motion to adjourn.

MEMBER SINGH: Mr. Chairman, I want to know when you're confirmation for the job is going to be.

I want to make your promotion here.

and appointment, Member Singh. The process is that the Governor will have to make a selection, appoint that individual. That would be announced and then the clock would run for confirmation. And I'm sure, whether it's me or anybody else, would be happy to have your support when we roll into the State Senate for something like that. But thank you.

MEMBER SINGH: Do you know?

CHAIR HOSHINO: I know the Governor is moving very quickly. I know it is 37 days, and that seems to be a long time to some people. But in the business that all of us are in, we know the appointments process. This is actually my professional opinion. We are moving along very quickly because these things can sometimes take months, if not sometimes borderline on a year. We are very lucky to have Governor Brown. He's very focused and very engaged on this particular

appointment. Knows how important it is to this Board, to the public and to California. So thank you, sir. MEMBER SAITO: Move for adjournment. MEMBER BUTLER: Second. CHAIR HOSHINO: Said meeting is adjourned at approximately 11:30 a.m., Pacific Standard time. (Hearing concluded at 11:30 a.m.) ---000---

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 1 2 3 STATE OF CALIFORNIA 4 SS. 5 COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO 6 I, ESTHER F. SCHWARTZ, certify that I was the 8 official Court Reporter for the proceedings named herein, and that as such reporter, I reported in 10 11 verbatim shorthand writing those proceedings; That I thereafter caused my shorthand writing 12 13 to be reduced to printed format, and the pages 14 numbered 3 through 68 herein constitute a complete, 15 true and correct record of the proceedings. 16 17 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed this certificate at Sacramento, California, on this 12th 18 19 day of February, 2012. 20 21 22 23 1564 24 CSR NO. 25