1	FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING COUNCIL
2	Meeting Notice and Agenda
3	
4	VIII. Public Hearing: Proposed Employment Regulations
5	Regarding Criminal History, the California Family Rights
б	Act, and the New Parent Leave Act
7	CORRECTED TRANSCRIPT 6-6-18
8	Attachment E: Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
9	Attachment F: Initial Statement of Reasons
10	Attachment G: Proposed Employment Regulations
11	Regarding Criminal History, the California Family
12	Rights Act, and the New Parent Leave Act
13	
14	Junipero Serra Building
15	Carmel Room Auditorium (First Floor)
16	328 W. 4th Street
17	Los Angeles, California
18	Wednesday, April 4, 2018
19	
20	ATKINSON-BAKER, INC. COURT REPORTERS
21	500 North Brand Boulevard, Third Floor Glendale, California 91203
22	(800) 288-3376
23	Reported by: Marceline F. Noble, CSR No. 3024
24	FILE No. AC02DD0
25	PAGES 1 - 45

1	APPEARANCES:	1	gender, gender identity, gender expression, age, sexual
2	CHAIRMAN CHAYA MANDELBAUM	2	orientation and military and/or veteran status.
	COUNCIL MEMBER DARA SCHUR	3	Proposed regulations are slated to appear in
3	COUNCIL MEMBER LISA CISNEROS	4	the California Code of Regulations at Title 2, Sections
4		5	
-	COUNCIL MEMBER DALE BRODSKY COUNCIL MEMBER TIM IGLESIAS	6	11017.1 and 11087 through -97.
5	COUNCIE MEMBER HIM IGLESIAS	7	Copies of the proposed amendments are
	DIRECTOR KEVIN KISH		available in the back of the room and are reflected in
6	HOLLY A. THOMAS	8	Attachment D to the materials.
7	BRIAN SPERBER	9	The Notice and assistant Initial Statement
7 8		10	of Reasons are reflected in attachments.
9	SPEAKERS	11	I'm sorry, the proposed regulations are in
10	MELISSA PATACK	12	Attachment G to the materials. And the Notice and
	DOUG BONEY	13	additional Statement of Reasons are there.
11 12	SARAH GLENN-LEISTIKOW	14	The proposed regulations can also be found
13		15	on the Council's web page, the same case the last screen
14		16	is on.
15		17	We're holding this hearing as part of our
16		18	formal rulemaking process. We noticed the hearing more
17 18		19	than 45-days ago in the California Regulatory Notice
19		20	Register when it's published on February 16th, 2018, and
20		21	also noticed it via e-mail sent to thousands of
21		22	individuals and stakeholders on the department's e-mail
22		23	list and through posting on the Council's web page.
23 24		24	Pursuant to the notice, we are taking
24		25	testimony here today and we'll also accept written
-			, , ,
	Page 2		Page 4
1	Los Angeles, California, Wednesday, April 4, 2018	1	comments until 5 p.m. today, April 4th, 2018.
2	11:40 a.m 12:36 p.m.	2	You may e-mail your written comments to
3		3	DFEHCouncil@DFEH.ca.gov, or you can submit them in the
4	CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: All right. We are	4	mail to the Council in care of Brian Sperber at the
5	back on the record and ready to commence with our public	5	DFEH's Los Angeles office located at 320 West
6	hearing regarding the Fair Employment Housing Act	6	4th Street, 10th Floor, Los Angeles, California, 90013.
7	Employment Regulations that address new provisions on	7	If you brought a written copy of your
8	criminal history and employment, the California Family	8	comments and you have not separately submitted them, you
9	Rights Act and the New Parent Leave Act.	9	can give them to Brian Sperber here today.
10	Again, welcome to this section of the	10	If you haven't brought them, please remember
11	meeting and this hearing.	11	to submit them by 5 p.m. today.
12	I'm the Chair of the Council, Chaya	12	Anyone who testifies here today or submits
13	Mandelbaum, and joining me are colleagues on the	13	written comments will receive a copy of any changes or
14	Council, Dale Brodsky, Dara Schur, Tim Iglesias, Joseph	14	amendments the Council makes in response to this round
15	Ortiz, and Lisa Cisneros, along with the ex-officio	15	of public comment and will have an opportunity to
16	member and director of the department, Kevin Kish.	16	provide additional comments during a 15-day period if
17	We are here to take public comments and	17	the Council makes further changes.
18	testimony regarding the criminal history and employment,	18	We'll consider each comment here today as
19	California Family Rights Act and New Parent Leave Act	19	well as all written comments received and the comments
20	draft proposed amended to the FEHA regulations.	20	will be responded to in the Council's Final Statement of
21	As it relates to employment, the FEHA	21	Reasons, which will be part of the rulemaking record.
22	prohibits harassment and discrimination because of race,	22	The hearing is being transcribed by a
23	religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry,	23	certified court reporter and the transcript of the
24	physical disability, mental disability, medical	24	hearing as well as the written comments will be part of
25	condition, genetic information, marital status, sex,	25	the official rulemaking record.
	contractory genetic mornation, municul status, sex,		
	Page 3		Page 5

2 (Pages 2 to 5)

1	Because this hearing is being transcribed,	1	done through the Department of Education.
2	it is critical that we speak as slowly slower than we	2	In the motion picture industry, time and
3	would in the ordinary course of conversation,	3	production production scheduling is a major factor.
4	particularly given the technical terms being used. And	4	It's not our our sets are not run the way other
5	that one person, only one person speaks at a time.	5	businesses are, that you come in at 9 o'clock in the
6	We'd ask that you come to the front and	6	morning and you work until 5 o'clock at night.
7	speak into the microphone when you testify. You will	7	Production has very irregular hours. And in the case of
8	not be sworn in. But hopefully you can please start by	8	production, minors it could be that a teacher could
9	introducing yourselves, spelling your name. And if you	9	get a call at 5 o'clock one afternoon asking if that
10	brought a card, you can give it to the court reporter.	10	teacher's available to report to work at 8 a.m. the next
11	That will help create a nice, clean	11	morning.
12	transcript of what you're saying.	12	So there really isn't the opportunity for
13	So we'll hear testimony until all those	13	the employer/producer to do a background check once they
14	wishing to testify have had an opportunity to do so.	14	have made an offer to that particular teacher.
15	Without further ado, would someone like to	15	So through the collective bargaining process
16	start us off on public comment?	16	with IATSE, the International Alliance of Theatrical and
17	MS. PATACK: Members of the Council, my name	17	Stage Employees, and Local 884, that is the local union
18	is Melissa Patack. P-a-t I'm going to bring you a	18	that represents studio teachers and you'll hear from
19	card.	19	my colleague, Doug Boney, who is the business agent with
20	THE REPORTER: Thank you.	20	that local. And we have we agree on many, many
21	MS. PATACK: Melissa Patack with the Motion	21	principles about this issue. A slightly different
22	Picture Association of America.	22	approach, but we agree in the principles.
23	The MPAA is the trade association. We're	23	And through that collective bargaining
24	the leading producers and distributors of film and	24	process, what has developed what has been developed
25	creative content across all platforms, from movie	25	is an availability list of teachers. And that
	Page 6		Page 8
	1 age 0		1 age 6
1	theaters to home entertainment to streaming services.	1	availability list is maintained by an organization
2	We are here also today in conjunction in	2	called Contract Services. It's a trust fund. The
3	representation of our sister trade association, the	3	employer pays into the trust fund and Contract Services
4	Alliance of Motion Picture and Television Producers,	4	performs many functions for the convenience and good of
5	which is the multi-employer collective bargaining agent	5	the motion picture and television industry.
6	for these producers and distributors.	6	And so one of the tasks that it does is to
7	Our member companies, which are shared by	7	keep this availability list.
8	both associations, are Disney, Fox, NBC Universal,	8	And so, again, through the bargaining
9	Paramount Pictures, Sony Pictures and Warner Brothers.	9	process, the parties agree that is, producers and the
10	In addition, CBS is an associate member of the MPAA.	10	union agree that CATS should conduct a background
11	So let me start by framing the issues. And	11	check periodically and to ensure that those teachers who
12	I'm here to talk really only about the background	12	are on the availability list do not have any negative
13	checks, the criminal history background check provision	13	criminal history in their background.
14	of the regulation.	14	And that way when the producer calls, like I
15	And this is really about a narrow part of	15	said at 5 o'clock one afternoon for an 8 o'clock report
16	our industry. And it concerns children and the people	16	time or at 8 o'clock in the morning asking for a noon
17	who are onset to educate the children, who are working	17	report time, that that producer can have the confidence
18	as performers, and also provide for their safety, health	18	that that teacher is appropriate to be working with
19	and welfare, studio teachers.	19	children.
20	So the teachers hold appropriate credentials	20	So that's the basic issue.
21	from the California Commission on Teacher Credentials.	21	Now, you overlay that with the current law
22	And they can only be employed if they have appropriate	22	and these regulations, which say that only upon an offer
23	teacher credential. And as we as you may be aware,	23	of employment is an employer allowed to conduct a
24	under the Education Code, teachers, in order to hold	24	background check.
25	their jobs, must undergo a background check, and that is	25	So we would like some clarity from the
			So we would like some cluricy nom the
	Page 7		Page 9

3 (Pages 6 to 9)

1	Council that the circumstances that I have just	1	MS. PATACK: Sure.
2	described, that availability list, is the equivalent of	2	COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: I just want to make
3	an offer of employment. It's not for any particular	3	sure that I understand the process.
4	employer, we can see that, but it is an offer a	4	So in order to get the credentials, the
5	presentation that the teacher is available and that the	5	state conducts a background check.
6	employers know that that teacher is has the	6	MS. PATACK: Yes.
7	credentials as well as the appropriate background to be	7	COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: But then your
8	working with children.	8	contracting association conducts an additional
9	We think that the two there are two	9	background check before the teachers are put on the
10	exceptions that this falls into potentially with a	10	list.
11	little bit of clarification. Exception A says that,	11	MS. PATACK: Availability list, yes.
12	"where the position is one for which a state or local	12 13	COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Okay.
13	agency is otherwise required by law to conduct a		MS. PATACK: Yes. The education department,
14	conviction history background check" and we think by	14 15	they do a background check when the credential is up for
15	adding a few extra words "including a position		renewal. There is also a the live we
16	requiring a credential issued by the California	16	understand we know and recognize that the education
17	Commission on Teacher Credentialing," that that would	17	department does have an ongoing obligation. However, we
18	recognize our process.	18	feel very strongly and have reached this agreement with
19	And again, put the premature of, you know, a	19	the union who represents the teachers and they also feel
20	stamp that indicates that the commission that the	20	it's important that the teachers they're not working
21	Department of Fair Employment and Housing would regard	21	in a classroom setting, they're working individually.
22	our process as within the boundaries of the law.	22 23	They're also responsible not just for teaching children
23	Alternatively, exception D says that, "where	23	under five, they're responsible for the health, safety
24 25	the position is one that an employer and employer's	24	and welfare of the children.
25	agent is required by any state, federal or local law"	25	And so maybe it's a little bit belt and
	Page 10		Page 12
1	and again, the Educational Code does require that	1	suspenders, but there is a collective harabing
2	teachers undergo a background check by any state,	2	suspenders, but there is a collective bargaining understanding through the collective bargaining process,
3	federal or local law to conduct criminal background	3	an agreement that Contract Services should conduct this
4	checks for employment purposes or to restrict employment	4	background check to ensure that the teachers have the
5	based on criminal history.	5	appropriate background.
6	And then, again, we would recommend	6	We understand that the framework in which
7	asserting that same clause at the end of that, including	7	we're allowed to conduct motion picture production is
8	a position requiring a credential issued by the	8	unconventional. You know, we're taking kids out of
9	California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.	9	school and we are providing education, but we're also
10	So we're recommending and we're requesting	10	producers are providing education through the studio
11	that the Council give consideration to adding some	11	teachers as well as working to ensure the safety of the
12	clarity for us in either of those sections that	12	children as well.
13	currently provide for an exception.	13	So may be extra precautionary, but we think
14	And I would also just point out that the	14	it's warranted and it's worked for decades and decades.
15	draft regulations made reference to a law in	15	COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: Another point of
16	Los Angeles, we we have worked out an arrangement	16	clarification. Once you get on the list, you're
17	with the City of Los Angeles with the help in	17	basically offered the position?
18	partnership with Local 884 and the City of Los Angeles,	18	MS. PATACK: Well, you're available for a
19	the law that they have on background checks acknowledges	19	position. Remember, there are many, many production
20	our process and our process of having this availability	20	companies. It doesn't mean that you have a report date
21	list and having Contract Services provide this	21	or time. What it means is that at any time a producer
22	conduct the background check, if that is not contrary to	22	calls you to check your availability and asks if you're
23	the Los Angeles city ordinance.	23	available to report, you know, the next day or
24	COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: May I ask a	24	COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: Do you have to go
25	clarifying question?	25	through an additional screening process after you're
	Page 11		Page 13

4 (Pages 10 to 13)

1	placed on that availability list?	1	line between what you're going to, you know, include in
2	MS. PATACK: I don't I think that's why	2	your exemption?
3	and maybe that does speak to this a little bit better	3	MS. PATACK: Well, again our correct.
4	that the individual company would then probably not	4	Our suggested language references only the California
5	conduct an additional background check.	5	commission on teacher credentialing. It would be
6	Some of this is also if we didn't have	6	that that category.
7	this mechanism, somebody might work at Paramount this	7	COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: Which is my point.
8	week, next week get a job at Warner Brothers, they've	8	It's singling out one type of licensing. And then
9	undergone a background check from Paramount, now	9	you you know, it presents a lot of questions, what
10	Warner Brothers wants to do a background check only one	10	about the others where their licensing departments or
11	week later.	11	background checks might, you know, come up.
12	So knowing that Contract Services has	12	COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: I have questions too
13	performed and conducted this background check, I think,	13	about where this falls in the process. Because I know I
14	gives all the companies, you know, comfort and assurance	14	can label my expertise as a laborer, but I know there
15	that there is criminal-free background.	15	are unions quite often that have availability lists
16	COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: I'm trying to get a	16	where these individuals are tested, not only in order to
17	sense of how the availability list goes into the	17	get on the list but then before they are dispatched to
18	framework of post offer and preoffer. And in public	18	the contractor in the cases I know.
19	education, which I deal with a lot in my 9:00 to 5:00	19	I'm wondering if we've ever solicited input
20	job, you do I mean, there is substitute teachers all	20	from the DIR or figure out where the state's position is
21	the time.	21	and how that's interpreted, whether there's somehow an
22	MS. PATACK: The school would rely on that	22	exemption that's implied in here or whether it, perhaps,
23	credential as being	23	doesn't fall into the rubric of a preemployment inquiry
24	COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: You have gone	24	if it's an availability list.
25	through, you know, but if if there is a post offer,	25	I guess I need clarification.
	Page 14		Page 16
1		1	
2	you may be subjected to a live but that's after	2	CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Do you know whether
3	you've been offered the position. I'm trying to get a	3	this issue was raised with the legislature when they
4	sense in this context whether that availability is pre	4	were adopting the
5	or post offer?	5	MS. PATACK: It was not.
	MS. PATACK: It's again, it's it	6	CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: So it wasn't expressly
6	doesn't fit exactly into that model because, like I		considered and rejected in terms of the exception, the
7	said, you could get a call at 5 o'clock today asking the	7	delineated statute?
8	teacher could you come to work tomorrow at 8 a.m.	8	MS. PATACK: Exactly right. We did not
9	And so at that point, that's an offer,	9	engage in the legislative process last year.
10	that's a firm offer. Once if they're on the	10	Any other questions?
11	availability list, they're available and eligible, not	11	Okay. I've submitted a letter and I will
12	necessarily with a specific report time or	12	also submit it by e-mail this afternoon.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: No, I understand	13	Thank you for your time and your
14	that.	14	consideration.
15	MS. PATACK: So that really the reason	15	CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you.
16	for this Contract Services conducted background check is	16	COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: Thank you for raising
17	the recognition that in that short time gap the employer	17	this issue.
18	isn't going to have time to run the background check.	18	MR. BONEY: Council members, my name is Doug
19	COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: There are a lot of	19	Boney, B-o-n-e-y. I am the business representative for
20	other entities and circumstances where people have to be	20	the Motion Pictures Studio Teaches and Welfare Workers
21	licensed. So I'm concerned about putting into a	21	of Local 884 of the International Alliance of Theatrical
22	regulation one particular type of because then we're	22	Stage Employees, Moving Picture Technicians, Artists and
23	opening up does that mean, for example, medical	23	Allied Crafts of the United States, its territories and
24	licensing personnel have to you know, should be	24	Canada.
25	accepted in the same way or wherever do you draw the	25	Pleased to be here to present the views on
	Page 15		Page 17
	rage 15		rage 17

5 (Pages 14 to 17)

			_
1	Local 884 on the proposed rulemaking, and hopefully	1	teacher.
2	answer some of your questions that you have.	2	On the other hand, in Local 884's view,
3	The proposed language suggested by Local 884	3	studio teachers are not subject to the statutory
4	and its international union, the IATSE, for a new	4	exemptions in Government Code Section 12952 in large
5	subsection on the regulations is contained in a letter	5	part because they are employed by production companies,
6	from the IATSE to the Council which was e-mailed to the	6	not by school districts or private schools.
7	Council yesterday.	7	The very fact that studio teachers work for
8	I'll provide you an additional copy of that	8	production companies means that their employment is
9	letter.	9	generally short term. Many studio teachers teach and
10	My purpose here today is to amplify on that	10	work for multiple production companies in a single year.
11	proposal. AB 1008, eliminates a preoffer of employment	11	And while a studio teacher's assignment can extend for
12 13	criminal background check and provides an applicant who	12 13	weeks or even months, many assignments are short term,
	has a negative result with an opportunity to respond in		often just a day.
14 15	an individualized assessment of whether the individual	14 15	So preemployment screening is often
16	should be hired.	16	impractical.
17	Unfortunately, this protocol is almost	17	Given those competing requirements, the
18	impossible to administer in the context of employment of	18	union represented studio teachers have agreed in a
19	studio teachers because of the intermittent nature of	19	collective bargaining to a background check that is
20	their employment and it ends up disadvantaging the	20	conducted not after an offer has made by a production
20	employee applicant rather than helping.	20	company, but prior to placement on an availability list,
21	This defeats the very purpose for which the	21	which is pretty much a roster of studio teachers
22	statute was enacted. These problems are of fundamental	23	entitled Contractural Priority in Hiring By Signatory
23	importance to studio teachers because an application of	23	Entertainment Industry Employers, and annually
24	the statute that ignores the singular issues confronted	24	thereafter.
25	by studio teachers deprive a great many studio teachers	23	This contest (sic) has been crafted to take
	Page 18		Page 20
1	an opportunity for gainful employment they enjoyed	1	into account the intermittent nature of studio teacher
1 2	an opportunity for gainful employment they enjoyed	1	into account the intermittent nature of studio teacher
2	before the statute was passed and will make it harder to	2	employment. And the fact that if each employer were
2 3	before the statute was passed and will make it harder to provide children in the entertainment industry the	2 3	employment. And the fact that if each employer were required or allowed to conduct background checks, studio
2 3 4	before the statute was passed and will make it harder to provide children in the entertainment industry the protections that they need and that only a studio	2 3 4	employment. And the fact that if each employer were required or allowed to conduct background checks, studio teachers, especially those who had not worked for an
2 3	before the statute was passed and will make it harder to provide children in the entertainment industry the protections that they need and that only a studio teacher can provide.	2 3 4 5	employment. And the fact that if each employer were required or allowed to conduct background checks, studio teachers, especially those who had not worked for an employer in the recent past, would not be able to be
2 3 4 5 6	before the statute was passed and will make it harder to provide children in the entertainment industry the protections that they need and that only a studio teacher can provide. These problems must be addressed in a	2 3 4	employment. And the fact that if each employer were required or allowed to conduct background checks, studio teachers, especially those who had not worked for an employer in the recent past, would not be able to be hired when needed.
2 3 4 5 6 7	before the statute was passed and will make it harder to provide children in the entertainment industry the protections that they need and that only a studio teacher can provide. These problems must be addressed in a regulation because, as described in our letter, studio	2 3 4 5 6 7	employment. And the fact that if each employer were required or allowed to conduct background checks, studio teachers, especially those who had not worked for an employer in the recent past, would not be able to be hired when needed. This would not just deprive many studio
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	before the statute was passed and will make it harder to provide children in the entertainment industry the protections that they need and that only a studio teacher can provide. These problems must be addressed in a regulation because, as described in our letter, studio teachers do not fit within the exemptions from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	employment. And the fact that if each employer were required or allowed to conduct background checks, studio teachers, especially those who had not worked for an employer in the recent past, would not be able to be hired when needed. This would not just deprive many studio teachers of work but, because of the limited number of
2 3 4 5 6 7	before the statute was passed and will make it harder to provide children in the entertainment industry the protections that they need and that only a studio teacher can provide. These problems must be addressed in a regulation because, as described in our letter, studio teachers do not fit within the exemptions from the requirements of Government Code Section 12952 set forth	2 3 4 5 6 7	employment. And the fact that if each employer were required or allowed to conduct background checks, studio teachers, especially those who had not worked for an employer in the recent past, would not be able to be hired when needed. This would not just deprive many studio teachers of work but, because of the limited number of qualified studio teachers, the danger to child
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	before the statute was passed and will make it harder to provide children in the entertainment industry the protections that they need and that only a studio teacher can provide. These problems must be addressed in a regulation because, as described in our letter, studio teachers do not fit within the exemptions from the requirements of Government Code Section 12952 set forth in subsections (d)(1) or (d)(4).	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	employment. And the fact that if each employer were required or allowed to conduct background checks, studio teachers, especially those who had not worked for an employer in the recent past, would not be able to be hired when needed. This would not just deprive many studio teachers of work but, because of the limited number of qualified studio teachers, the danger to child performers who need the supervision and education
2 3 6 7 8 9 10	before the statute was passed and will make it harder to provide children in the entertainment industry the protections that they need and that only a studio teacher can provide. These problems must be addressed in a regulation because, as described in our letter, studio teachers do not fit within the exemptions from the requirements of Government Code Section 12952 set forth in subsections (d)(1) or (d)(4). Under the California Code of Regulations,	2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	employment. And the fact that if each employer were required or allowed to conduct background checks, studio teachers, especially those who had not worked for an employer in the recent past, would not be able to be hired when needed. This would not just deprive many studio teachers of work but, because of the limited number of qualified studio teachers, the danger to child performers who need the supervision and education provided by the studio teacher.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	before the statute was passed and will make it harder to provide children in the entertainment industry the protections that they need and that only a studio teacher can provide. These problems must be addressed in a regulation because, as described in our letter, studio teachers do not fit within the exemptions from the requirements of Government Code Section 12952 set forth in subsections (d)(1) or (d)(4). Under the California Code of Regulations, studio teachers have a legal responsibility for caring	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	employment. And the fact that if each employer were required or allowed to conduct background checks, studio teachers, especially those who had not worked for an employer in the recent past, would not be able to be hired when needed. This would not just deprive many studio teachers of work but, because of the limited number of qualified studio teachers, the danger to child performers who need the supervision and education provided by the studio teacher. Further, a system that called for a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	before the statute was passed and will make it harder to provide children in the entertainment industry the protections that they need and that only a studio teacher can provide. These problems must be addressed in a regulation because, as described in our letter, studio teachers do not fit within the exemptions from the requirements of Government Code Section 12952 set forth in subsections (d)(1) or (d)(4). Under the California Code of Regulations, studio teachers have a legal responsibility for caring for and attending to the health, safety and worlds of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	employment. And the fact that if each employer were required or allowed to conduct background checks, studio teachers, especially those who had not worked for an employer in the recent past, would not be able to be hired when needed. This would not just deprive many studio teachers of work but, because of the limited number of qualified studio teachers, the danger to child performers who need the supervision and education provided by the studio teacher. Further, a system that called for a background check by each employer would also subject
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	before the statute was passed and will make it harder to provide children in the entertainment industry the protections that they need and that only a studio teacher can provide. These problems must be addressed in a regulation because, as described in our letter, studio teachers do not fit within the exemptions from the requirements of Government Code Section 12952 set forth in subsections (d)(1) or (d)(4). Under the California Code of Regulations, studio teachers have a legal responsibility for caring for and attending to the health, safety and worlds of child performers under 16 years of age while those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	employment. And the fact that if each employer were required or allowed to conduct background checks, studio teachers, especially those who had not worked for an employer in the recent past, would not be able to be hired when needed. This would not just deprive many studio teachers of work but, because of the limited number of qualified studio teachers, the danger to child performers who need the supervision and education provided by the studio teacher. Further, a system that called for a background check by each employer would also subject studio teachers to having to provide each of potentially
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	before the statute was passed and will make it harder to provide children in the entertainment industry the protections that they need and that only a studio teacher can provide. These problems must be addressed in a regulation because, as described in our letter, studio teachers do not fit within the exemptions from the requirements of Government Code Section 12952 set forth in subsections (d)(1) or (d)(4). Under the California Code of Regulations, studio teachers have a legal responsibility for caring for and attending to the health, safety and worlds of child performers under 16 years of age while those children are engaged or employed in any activity	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	employment. And the fact that if each employer were required or allowed to conduct background checks, studio teachers, especially those who had not worked for an employer in the recent past, would not be able to be hired when needed. This would not just deprive many studio teachers of work but, because of the limited number of qualified studio teachers, the danger to child performers who need the supervision and education provided by the studio teacher. Further, a system that called for a background check by each employer would also subject studio teachers to having to provide each of potentially dozens of employers each year with responses to the same
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	before the statute was passed and will make it harder to provide children in the entertainment industry the protections that they need and that only a studio teacher can provide. These problems must be addressed in a regulation because, as described in our letter, studio teachers do not fit within the exemptions from the requirements of Government Code Section 12952 set forth in subsections (d)(1) or (d)(4). Under the California Code of Regulations, studio teachers have a legal responsibility for caring for and attending to the health, safety and worlds of child performers under 16 years of age while those children are engaged or employed in any activity pertaining to the entertainment industry.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	employment. And the fact that if each employer were required or allowed to conduct background checks, studio teachers, especially those who had not worked for an employer in the recent past, would not be able to be hired when needed. This would not just deprive many studio teachers of work but, because of the limited number of qualified studio teachers, the danger to child performers who need the supervision and education provided by the studio teacher. Further, a system that called for a background check by each employer would also subject studio teachers to having to provide each of potentially dozens of employers each year with responses to the same erroneous information.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	before the statute was passed and will make it harder to provide children in the entertainment industry the protections that they need and that only a studio teacher can provide. These problems must be addressed in a regulation because, as described in our letter, studio teachers do not fit within the exemptions from the requirements of Government Code Section 12952 set forth in subsections (d)(1) or (d)(4). Under the California Code of Regulations, studio teachers have a legal responsibility for caring for and attending to the health, safety and worlds of child performers under 16 years of age while those children are engaged or employed in any activity pertaining to the entertainment industry. Studio teachers must possess two teaching	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	employment. And the fact that if each employer were required or allowed to conduct background checks, studio teachers, especially those who had not worked for an employer in the recent past, would not be able to be hired when needed. This would not just deprive many studio teachers of work but, because of the limited number of qualified studio teachers, the danger to child performers who need the supervision and education provided by the studio teacher. Further, a system that called for a background check by each employer would also subject studio teachers to having to provide each of potentially dozens of employers each year with responses to the same erroneous information. The collectively bargained procedure affords
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	before the statute was passed and will make it harder to provide children in the entertainment industry the protections that they need and that only a studio teacher can provide. These problems must be addressed in a regulation because, as described in our letter, studio teachers do not fit within the exemptions from the requirements of Government Code Section 12952 set forth in subsections (d)(1) or (d)(4). Under the California Code of Regulations, studio teachers have a legal responsibility for caring for and attending to the health, safety and worlds of child performers under 16 years of age while those children are engaged or employed in any activity pertaining to the entertainment industry. Studio teachers must possess two teaching credentials, both of which require that the studio	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	employment. And the fact that if each employer were required or allowed to conduct background checks, studio teachers, especially those who had not worked for an employer in the recent past, would not be able to be hired when needed. This would not just deprive many studio teachers of work but, because of the limited number of qualified studio teachers, the danger to child performers who need the supervision and education provided by the studio teacher. Further, a system that called for a background check by each employer would also subject studio teachers to having to provide each of potentially dozens of employers each year with responses to the same erroneous information. The collectively bargained procedure affords at least as much protection to the studio teacher as the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	before the statute was passed and will make it harder to provide children in the entertainment industry the protections that they need and that only a studio teacher can provide. These problems must be addressed in a regulation because, as described in our letter, studio teachers do not fit within the exemptions from the requirements of Government Code Section 12952 set forth in subsections (d)(1) or (d)(4). Under the California Code of Regulations, studio teachers have a legal responsibility for caring for and attending to the health, safety and worlds of child performers under 16 years of age while those children are engaged or employed in any activity pertaining to the entertainment industry. Studio teachers must possess two teaching	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	employment. And the fact that if each employer were required or allowed to conduct background checks, studio teachers, especially those who had not worked for an employer in the recent past, would not be able to be hired when needed. This would not just deprive many studio teachers of work but, because of the limited number of qualified studio teachers, the danger to child performers who need the supervision and education provided by the studio teacher. Further, a system that called for a background check by each employer would also subject studio teachers to having to provide each of potentially dozens of employers each year with responses to the same erroneous information. The collectively bargained procedure affords at least as much protection to the studio teacher as the statutory protocol because the removal from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	before the statute was passed and will make it harder to provide children in the entertainment industry the protections that they need and that only a studio teacher can provide. These problems must be addressed in a regulation because, as described in our letter, studio teachers do not fit within the exemptions from the requirements of Government Code Section 12952 set forth in subsections (d)(1) or (d)(4). Under the California Code of Regulations, studio teachers have a legal responsibility for caring for and attending to the health, safety and worlds of child performers under 16 years of age while those children are engaged or employed in any activity pertaining to the entertainment industry. Studio teachers must possess two teaching credentials, both of which require that the studio teacher not have been convicted of certain disqualifying	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	employment. And the fact that if each employer were required or allowed to conduct background checks, studio teachers, especially those who had not worked for an employer in the recent past, would not be able to be hired when needed. This would not just deprive many studio teachers of work but, because of the limited number of qualified studio teachers, the danger to child performers who need the supervision and education provided by the studio teacher. Further, a system that called for a background check by each employer would also subject studio teachers to having to provide each of potentially dozens of employers each year with responses to the same erroneous information. The collectively bargained procedure affords at least as much protection to the studio teacher as the statutory protocol because the removal from the availability list can be challenged in arbitration.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	before the statute was passed and will make it harder to provide children in the entertainment industry the protections that they need and that only a studio teacher can provide. These problems must be addressed in a regulation because, as described in our letter, studio teachers do not fit within the exemptions from the requirements of Government Code Section 12952 set forth in subsections (d)(1) or (d)(4). Under the California Code of Regulations, studio teachers have a legal responsibility for caring for and attending to the health, safety and worlds of child performers under 16 years of age while those children are engaged or employed in any activity pertaining to the entertainment industry. Studio teachers must possess two teaching credentials, both of which require that the studio teacher not have been convicted of certain disqualifying offenses.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	employment. And the fact that if each employer were required or allowed to conduct background checks, studio teachers, especially those who had not worked for an employer in the recent past, would not be able to be hired when needed. This would not just deprive many studio teachers of work but, because of the limited number of qualified studio teachers, the danger to child performers who need the supervision and education provided by the studio teacher. Further, a system that called for a background check by each employer would also subject studio teachers to having to provide each of potentially dozens of employers each year with responses to the same erroneous information. The collectively bargained procedure affords at least as much protection to the studio teacher as the statutory protocol because the removal from the availability list can be challenged in arbitration. For these reasons, we hope that you can find
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	before the statute was passed and will make it harder to provide children in the entertainment industry the protections that they need and that only a studio teacher can provide. These problems must be addressed in a regulation because, as described in our letter, studio teachers do not fit within the exemptions from the requirements of Government Code Section 12952 set forth in subsections (d)(1) or (d)(4). Under the California Code of Regulations, studio teachers have a legal responsibility for caring for and attending to the health, safety and worlds of child performers under 16 years of age while those children are engaged or employed in any activity pertaining to the entertainment industry. Studio teachers must possess two teaching credentials, both of which require that the studio teacher not have been convicted of certain disqualifying offenses. Studio teachers also must hold a certification that is issued by the DLSE.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	employment. And the fact that if each employer were required or allowed to conduct background checks, studio teachers, especially those who had not worked for an employer in the recent past, would not be able to be hired when needed. This would not just deprive many studio teachers of work but, because of the limited number of qualified studio teachers, the danger to child performers who need the supervision and education provided by the studio teacher. Further, a system that called for a background check by each employer would also subject studio teachers to having to provide each of potentially dozens of employers each year with responses to the same erroneous information. The collectively bargained procedure affords at least as much protection to the studio teacher as the statutory protocol because the removal from the availability list can be challenged in arbitration. For these reasons, we hope that you can find a way to include in the regulations an acknowledgment
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	before the statute was passed and will make it harder to provide children in the entertainment industry the protections that they need and that only a studio teacher can provide. These problems must be addressed in a regulation because, as described in our letter, studio teachers do not fit within the exemptions from the requirements of Government Code Section 12952 set forth in subsections (d)(1) or (d)(4). Under the California Code of Regulations, studio teachers have a legal responsibility for caring for and attending to the health, safety and worlds of child performers under 16 years of age while those children are engaged or employed in any activity pertaining to the entertainment industry. Studio teachers must possess two teaching credentials, both of which require that the studio teacher not have been convicted of certain disqualifying offenses. Studio teachers also must hold a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	employment. And the fact that if each employer were required or allowed to conduct background checks, studio teachers, especially those who had not worked for an employer in the recent past, would not be able to be hired when needed. This would not just deprive many studio teachers of work but, because of the limited number of qualified studio teachers, the danger to child performers who need the supervision and education provided by the studio teacher. Further, a system that called for a background check by each employer would also subject studio teachers to having to provide each of potentially dozens of employers each year with responses to the same erroneous information. The collectively bargained procedure affords at least as much protection to the studio teacher as the statutory protocol because the removal from the availability list can be challenged in arbitration. For these reasons, we hope that you can find a way to include in the regulations an acknowledgment that a collectively bargained procedure that provides
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	before the statute was passed and will make it harder to provide children in the entertainment industry the protections that they need and that only a studio teacher can provide. These problems must be addressed in a regulation because, as described in our letter, studio teachers do not fit within the exemptions from the requirements of Government Code Section 12952 set forth in subsections (d)(1) or (d)(4). Under the California Code of Regulations, studio teachers have a legal responsibility for caring for and attending to the health, safety and worlds of child performers under 16 years of age while those children are engaged or employed in any activity pertaining to the entertainment industry. Studio teachers must possess two teaching credentials, both of which require that the studio teacher not have been convicted of certain disqualifying offenses. Studio teachers also must hold a certification that is issued by the DLSE. So on one hand, studio teachers have great	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	employment. And the fact that if each employer were required or allowed to conduct background checks, studio teachers, especially those who had not worked for an employer in the recent past, would not be able to be hired when needed. This would not just deprive many studio teachers of work but, because of the limited number of qualified studio teachers, the danger to child performers who need the supervision and education provided by the studio teacher. Further, a system that called for a background check by each employer would also subject studio teachers to having to provide each of potentially dozens of employers each year with responses to the same erroneous information. The collectively bargained procedure affords at least as much protection to the studio teacher as the statutory protocol because the removal from the availability list can be challenged in arbitration. For these reasons, we hope that you can find a way to include in the regulations an acknowledgment
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	before the statute was passed and will make it harder to provide children in the entertainment industry the protections that they need and that only a studio teacher can provide. These problems must be addressed in a regulation because, as described in our letter, studio teachers do not fit within the exemptions from the requirements of Government Code Section 12952 set forth in subsections (d)(1) or (d)(4). Under the California Code of Regulations, studio teachers have a legal responsibility for caring for and attending to the health, safety and worlds of child performers under 16 years of age while those children are engaged or employed in any activity pertaining to the entertainment industry. Studio teachers must possess two teaching credentials, both of which require that the studio teacher not have been convicted of certain disqualifying offenses. Studio teachers also must hold a certification that is issued by the DLSE. So on one hand, studio teachers have great responsibilities for the children in their charge and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	employment. And the fact that if each employer were required or allowed to conduct background checks, studio teachers, especially those who had not worked for an employer in the recent past, would not be able to be hired when needed. This would not just deprive many studio teachers of work but, because of the limited number of qualified studio teachers, the danger to child performers who need the supervision and education provided by the studio teacher. Further, a system that called for a background check by each employer would also subject studio teachers to having to provide each of potentially dozens of employers each year with responses to the same erroneous information. The collectively bargained procedure affords at least as much protection to the studio teacher as the statutory protocol because the removal from the availability list can be challenged in arbitration. For these reasons, we hope that you can find a way to include in the regulations an acknowledgment that a collectively bargained procedure that provides studio teachers with at least as much protection as the

6 (Pages 18 to 21)

1	Government Code Section 12952.	1	and they are available to work on any union job where
2	Thank you.	2	there's no union teacher available to take the job.
3	CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you.	3	CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: So I think one
4	COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: May I ask another	4	question that seems to be a thread on a lot of our
5	question?	5	questions, our concern is where is the kind of merit
б	So it seems I understand the scheme I	6	selection decisions being made?
7	think, but I think your proposal totally exempts both	7	So how does one get on that list, leaving
8	the ultimate employer and the contract agency from	8	aside, you know, passing a background check, how does
9	complying with the terms of this law, as I read it,	9	someone get on that first list and what goes into a
10	because they would fall under one of the exemptions.	10	studio's decision about who on this list they're going
11	And I'm just wondering, it seems to me, perhaps, then in	11	to call first?
12	the circumstance, the contracting agency that does the	12	Like who where is where are
13	criminal screen should be able to to be required by	13	qualifications beyond merely background checks being
14	the law by putting people on the list or tentatively	14	evaluated?
15	approving people for the list and then complying with	15	Are they being evaluated to get on the list
16	the background screening.	16	and a selection from the list, or both?
17	Is that am I correct about that as an	17	MR. BONEY: So, as I said, it's a freelance
18	alternative?	18	position. So this is the availability list is our
19	MR. BONEY: Well, our position is that the	19	roster. It just since the companies that we that
20	background checks were done by Contract Services should	20	employ our members, because of our Collective Bargaining
21	be exempt.	21	Agreement, they are required to first check hire
22	Under our Collective Bargaining Agreement,	22	someone off the availability list.
23	each company still has the opportunity to do an	23	This these positions are hired
24	additional background check based on their company	24	companies have worked with previous studio teachers.
25	policies.	25	It's usually not the company itself hiring. It's
	Page 22		Page 24
1	We feel that those background checks should	1	usually the individual productions for the companies,
2	fall under this regulation. But the only background	2	different producers, production coordinators, assistant
3	check is the preemployment background check that should	3	directors who will call studio teachers they know. But
4	be exempt and one that is done by Contract Services	4	the list is not a list that is just who is available on
5	is the only background check that should be exempt	5	that day. It is just our term for using the roster,
6	because it is a roster of available studio teachers	6	that they had gone through the process of having their
7	instead of not they're not being offered a job at the	7	certifications and credentials verified and going
8	time, but they are available for future jobs.	8	through a background check.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: But if I understand	9	COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: But do you actually
10	the implication, if you don't get on that list, you	10	have to apply to get onto the availability list?
11		11	MR. BONEY: No.
12	could never get one of these jobs. So it does serve a	12	COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: Are there
13	significant screening function.	13	qualifications other than certification, are there
14	MR. BONEY: You could not get a union	14	i ,
15	this only covers union studio teachers. So just out in the it's a freelance job. So there are nonunion	15	other qualifications to get on the availability list?
16	5	16	MR. BONEY: So anyone who has is
17	productions that use nonunion studio teachers. Those	17	certified by the State of California to work as a studio
18	teachers are not subject to a background check like the studio teachers that are on our availability list.	18	teacher is eligible to apply beyond our it's an
19	,	19	application. They have to provide proof of their two
20	There are nonunion studio teachers on a	20	credentials, they have to provide proof of their
20	separate list that would be covered by this. You have a	20	certification and then they must go through a background
21	separate list called a Dual Credential Substitute List.	21	check, and we have separate safety classes that are
22	That list is a list of nonunion studio teachers who have	22	required for all employees in the entertainment industry
23	their cert credentials, their two credentials have been	23	in Contract Services under the Collective Bargaining
24	verified, their certification by the DLSE has been certified. They have gone through a background check	24	Agreement. Any of those people anyone who has a
23			Any or those people anyone who has a
	Page 23		Page 25

^{7 (}Pages 22 to 25)

1	certification as a studio teacher can ask for their name	¹ our availability list or substitute list.
2	to be put on the list.	² Not all of the companies, I'm not sure from
3	COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: So when a studio	³ their parent companies, not all companies are able to
4	calls and says I need somebody at 8 a.m. tomorrow	⁴ use that background check for themselves.
5	morning, they could send somebody? Can they say no?	⁵ So we do have a couple of companies that
6	Can they interview them?	⁶ require a second background check, because for their
7	MR. BONEY: They don't usually interview	⁷ own internal purposes.
8	them unless last-minute jobs are usually we have a	⁸ That is not covered by our CBA. We do not
9	separate we have a separate available list that is a	⁹ think that that one should be exempt.
10	list of teachers who call in we have a dispatch	¹⁰ We just feel that the background check done
11	office that will call in and say I'm available tomorrow	¹¹ by Contract Services that have been collectively
12	and you know, some weekly list that they'll say I'm	¹² bargained and the individuals even the union and
13	available Monday, Wednesday, Thursday of next week.	¹³ nonunion individuals have an opportunity in arbitration
14	Productions can call the dispatch office to get a list	¹⁴ to to respond to any information.
15	of teachers or the first person off that list.	¹⁵ COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: So the background
16	Productions have the right to they can	¹⁶ check by the ultimate employer, the studio, you're
17	call the individual teacher directly. They canif	¹⁷ referring to that's covered and it would be after an
18	there's no there's not the production themselves	¹⁸ initial offer, right?
19	the it's a freelance job. Just as if a director,	¹⁹ MR. BONEY: Correct.
20	photographer, a a production designer, if it's a	20 COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: I guess my inquiry is
21	studio teacher, if it's a last-minute job sometimes	the union is not employing these individuals; correct?
22	since it's the state law that they're required to have	²² MR. BONEY: The union is not employing these
23	them, if they don't know anyone, they'll just call the	²³ individuals and the union is not doing the background
24	dispatch office and have someone sent to the job.	²⁴ check. Contract Services is a trust fund that has been
25	For long-term projects, they may want to	²⁵ bargained into our contracts. It's employer funded and
	For long term projecto, they may mane to	
	Page 26	Page 28
1	intension. If there's cortain advectional requirements	1 an amployor run but it is compthing that is in our
1	interview. If there's certain educational requirements	an employer run, but it is something that is in our
2	for something of that sort, they may interview a	 contracts, not just for Local 884 but for the entire
2 3	for something of that sort, they may interview a studio teacher. But that's usually not on the	 contracts, not just for Local 884 but for the entire IATSE covered under the basic agreement, which is one of
2 3 4	for something of that sort, they may interview a studio teacher. But that's usually not on the last-minute job.	 contracts, not just for Local 884 but for the entire IATSE covered under the basic agreement, which is one of our contracts.
2 3 4 5	for something of that sort, they may interview a studio teacher. But that's usually not on the last-minute job. COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Who actually pays	 contracts, not just for Local 884 but for the entire IATSE covered under the basic agreement, which is one of our contracts. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: I think where I'm
2 3 4 5 6	for something of that sort, they may interview a studio teacher. But that's usually not on the last-minute job. COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Who actually pays the	 contracts, not just for Local 884 but for the entire IATSE covered under the basic agreement, which is one of our contracts. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: I think where I'm kind of going is I'm thinking generally and not just
2 3 4 5 6 7	for something of that sort, they may interview a studio teacher. But that's usually not on the last-minute job. COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Who actually pays the MR. BONEY: Production company. In the	 contracts, not just for Local 884 but for the entire IATSE covered under the basic agreement, which is one of our contracts. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: I think where I'm kind of going is I'm thinking generally and not just unions in general, they're not the employers, but I know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	for something of that sort, they may interview a studio teacher. But that's usually not on the last-minute job. COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Who actually pays the MR. BONEY: Production company. In the entertainment business, the employer of record is	 contracts, not just for Local 884 but for the entire IATSE covered under the basic agreement, which is one of our contracts. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: I think where I'm kind of going is I'm thinking generally and not just unions in general, they're not the employers, but I know that they often maintain these availability lists.
2 3 4 5 6 7	for something of that sort, they may interview a studio teacher. But that's usually not on the last-minute job. COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Who actually pays the MR. BONEY: Production company. In the entertainment business, the employer of record is usually a payroll company, such as Entertainment	 contracts, not just for Local 884 but for the entire IATSE covered under the basic agreement, which is one of our contracts. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: I think where I'm kind of going is I'm thinking generally and not just unions in general, they're not the employers, but I know that they often maintain these availability lists. And I guess my initial thought is that they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	for something of that sort, they may interview a studio teacher. But that's usually not on the last-minute job. COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Who actually pays the MR. BONEY: Production company. In the entertainment business, the employer of record is usually a payroll company, such as Entertainment Partners or Cast & Crew. The employer would be the	 contracts, not just for Local 884 but for the entire IATSE covered under the basic agreement, which is one of our contracts. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: I think where I'm kind of going is I'm thinking generally and not just unions in general, they're not the employers, but I know that they often maintain these availability lists. And I guess my initial thought is that they wouldn't be employers and so their checks wouldn't be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	for something of that sort, they may interview a studio teacher. But that's usually not on the last-minute job. COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Who actually pays the MR. BONEY: Production company. In the entertainment business, the employer of record is usually a payroll company, such as Entertainment Partners or Cast & Crew. The employer would be the production company.	 contracts, not just for Local 884 but for the entire IATSE covered under the basic agreement, which is one of our contracts. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: I think where I'm kind of going is I'm thinking generally and not just unions in general, they're not the employers, but I know that they often maintain these availability lists. And I guess my initial thought is that they wouldn't be employers and so their checks wouldn't be under the rubric of this criminal history check, the ban
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	for something of that sort, they may interview a studio teacher. But that's usually not on the last-minute job. COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Who actually pays the MR. BONEY: Production company. In the entertainment business, the employer of record is usually a payroll company, such as Entertainment Partners or Cast & Crew. The employer would be the production company. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: Mr. Boney, just to be	 contracts, not just for Local 884 but for the entire IATSE covered under the basic agreement, which is one of our contracts. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: I think where I'm kind of going is I'm thinking generally and not just unions in general, they're not the employers, but I know that they often maintain these availability lists. And I guess my initial thought is that they wouldn't be employers and so their checks wouldn't be under the rubric of this criminal history check, the ban the box law, so to speak. And I wonder
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	for something of that sort, they may interview a studio teacher. But that's usually not on the last-minute job. COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Who actually pays the MR. BONEY: Production company. In the entertainment business, the employer of record is usually a payroll company, such as Entertainment Partners or Cast & Crew. The employer would be the production company. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: Mr. Boney, just to be clear, there are two background checks. There's one	 contracts, not just for Local 884 but for the entire IATSE covered under the basic agreement, which is one of our contracts. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: I think where I'm kind of going is I'm thinking generally and not just unions in general, they're not the employers, but I know that they often maintain these availability lists. And I guess my initial thought is that they wouldn't be employers and so their checks wouldn't be under the rubric of this criminal history check, the ban the box law, so to speak. And I wonder COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: I don't think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	for something of that sort, they may interview a studio teacher. But that's usually not on the last-minute job. COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Who actually pays the MR. BONEY: Production company. In the entertainment business, the employer of record is usually a payroll company, such as Entertainment Partners or Cast & Crew. The employer would be the production company. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: Mr. Boney, just to be clear, there are two background checks. There's one that the production company or the payroll company will	 contracts, not just for Local 884 but for the entire IATSE covered under the basic agreement, which is one of our contracts. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: I think where I'm kind of going is I'm thinking generally and not just unions in general, they're not the employers, but I know that they often maintain these availability lists. And I guess my initial thought is that they wouldn't be employers and so their checks wouldn't be under the rubric of this criminal history check, the ban the box law, so to speak. And I wonder COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: I don't think that no. This isn't going it's the union only
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	for something of that sort, they may interview a studio teacher. But that's usually not on the last-minute job. COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Who actually pays the MR. BONEY: Production company. In the entertainment business, the employer of record is usually a payroll company, such as Entertainment Partners or Cast & Crew. The employer would be the production company. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: Mr. Boney, just to be clear, there are two background checks. There's one that the production company or the payroll company will perform before a person actually begins to work, right?	 contracts, not just for Local 884 but for the entire IATSE covered under the basic agreement, which is one of our contracts. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: I think where I'm kind of going is I'm thinking generally and not just unions in general, they're not the employers, but I know that they often maintain these availability lists. And I guess my initial thought is that they wouldn't be employers and so their checks wouldn't be under the rubric of this criminal history check, the ban the box law, so to speak. And I wonder COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: I don't think that no. This isn't going it's the union only negotiating on behalf of the individuals who are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	for something of that sort, they may interview a studio teacher. But that's usually not on the last-minute job. COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Who actually pays the MR. BONEY: Production company. In the entertainment business, the employer of record is usually a payroll company, such as Entertainment Partners or Cast & Crew. The employer would be the production company. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: Mr. Boney, just to be clear, there are two background checks. There's one that the production company or the payroll company will perform before a person actually begins to work, right? So after an initial offer.	 contracts, not just for Local 884 but for the entire IATSE covered under the basic agreement, which is one of our contracts. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: I think where I'm kind of going is I'm thinking generally and not just unions in general, they're not the employers, but I know that they often maintain these availability lists. And I guess my initial thought is that they wouldn't be employers and so their checks wouldn't be under the rubric of this criminal history check, the ban the box law, so to speak. And I wonder COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: I don't think that no. This isn't going it's the union only negotiating on behalf of the individuals who are members. It's not they're conducting a background
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	for something of that sort, they may interview a studio teacher. But that's usually not on the last-minute job. COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Who actually pays the MR. BONEY: Production company. In the entertainment business, the employer of record is usually a payroll company, such as Entertainment Partners or Cast & Crew. The employer would be the production company. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: Mr. Boney, just to be clear, there are two background checks. There's one that the production company or the payroll company will perform before a person actually begins to work, right? So after an initial offer. And then there's one in order for the	 contracts, not just for Local 884 but for the entire IATSE covered under the basic agreement, which is one of our contracts. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: I think where I'm kind of going is I'm thinking generally and not just unions in general, they're not the employers, but I know that they often maintain these availability lists. And I guess my initial thought is that they wouldn't be employers and so their checks wouldn't be under the rubric of this criminal history check, the ban the box law, so to speak. And I wonder COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: I don't think that no. This isn't going it's the union only negotiating on behalf of the individuals who are members. It's not they're conducting a background check. So the employer is the production company.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	for something of that sort, they may interview a studio teacher. But that's usually not on the last-minute job. COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Who actually pays the MR. BONEY: Production company. In the entertainment business, the employer of record is usually a payroll company, such as Entertainment Partners or Cast & Crew. The employer would be the production company. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: Mr. Boney, just to be clear, there are two background checks. There's one that the production company or the payroll company will perform before a person actually begins to work, right? So after an initial offer. And then there's one in order for the individual to get on the availability list, that's	 contracts, not just for Local 884 but for the entire IATSE covered under the basic agreement, which is one of our contracts. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: I think where I'm kind of going is I'm thinking generally and not just unions in general, they're not the employers, but I know that they often maintain these availability lists. And I guess my initial thought is that they wouldn't be employers and so their checks wouldn't be under the rubric of this criminal history check, the ban the box law, so to speak. And I wonder COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: I don't think that no. This isn't going it's the union only negotiating on behalf of the individuals who are members. It's not they're conducting a background check. So the employer is the production company. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: On the behest, that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	for something of that sort, they may interview a studio teacher. But that's usually not on the last-minute job. COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Who actually pays the MR. BONEY: Production company. In the entertainment business, the employer of record is usually a payroll company, such as Entertainment Partners or Cast & Crew. The employer would be the production company. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: Mr. Boney, just to be clear, there are two background checks. There's one that the production company or the payroll company will perform before a person actually begins to work, right? So after an initial offer. And then there's one in order for the individual to get on the availability list, that's performed on behalf of the union. The union says in	 contracts, not just for Local 884 but for the entire IATSE covered under the basic agreement, which is one of our contracts. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: I think where I'm kind of going is I'm thinking generally and not just unions in general, they're not the employers, but I know that they often maintain these availability lists. And I guess my initial thought is that they wouldn't be employers and so their checks wouldn't be under the rubric of this criminal history check, the ban the box law, so to speak. And I wonder COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: I don't think that no. This isn't going it's the union only negotiating on behalf of the individuals who are members. It's not they're conducting a background check. So the employer is the production company. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: On the behest, that's not just specific, on the behest of the union so they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	for something of that sort, they may interview a studio teacher. But that's usually not on the last-minute job. COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Who actually pays the MR. BONEY: Production company. In the entertainment business, the employer of record is usually a payroll company, such as Entertainment Partners or Cast & Crew. The employer would be the production company. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: Mr. Boney, just to be clear, there are two background checks. There's one that the production company or the payroll company will perform before a person actually begins to work, right? So after an initial offer. And then there's one in order for the individual to get on the availability list, that's performed on behalf of the union. The union says in order to be on a list, you need to have this check,	 contracts, not just for Local 884 but for the entire IATSE covered under the basic agreement, which is one of our contracts. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: I think where I'm kind of going is I'm thinking generally and not just unions in general, they're not the employers, but I know that they often maintain these availability lists. And I guess my initial thought is that they wouldn't be employers and so their checks wouldn't be under the rubric of this criminal history check, the ban the box law, so to speak. And I wonder COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: I don't think that no. This isn't going it's the union only negotiating on behalf of the individuals who are members. It's not they're conducting a background check. So the employer is the production company. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: On the behest, that's not just specific, on the behest of the union so they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	for something of that sort, they may interview a studio teacher. But that's usually not on the last-minute job. COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Who actually pays the MR. BONEY: Production company. In the entertainment business, the employer of record is usually a payroll company, such as Entertainment Partners or Cast & Crew. The employer would be the production company. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: Mr. Boney, just to be clear, there are two background checks. There's one that the production company or the payroll company will perform before a person actually begins to work, right? So after an initial offer. And then there's one in order for the individual to get on the availability list, that's performed on behalf of the union. The union says in	 contracts, not just for Local 884 but for the entire IATSE covered under the basic agreement, which is one of our contracts. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: I think where I'm kind of going is I'm thinking generally and not just unions in general, they're not the employers, but I know that they often maintain these availability lists. And I guess my initial thought is that they wouldn't be employers and so their checks wouldn't be under the rubric of this criminal history check, the ban the box law, so to speak. And I wonder COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: I don't think that no. This isn't going it's the union only negotiating on behalf of the individuals who are members. It's not they're conducting a background check. So the employer is the production company. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: On the behest, that's not just specific, on the behest of the union so they can maintain an availability list. Then is it really the employer who is doing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	for something of that sort, they may interview a studio teacher. But that's usually not on the last-minute job. COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Who actually pays the MR. BONEY: Production company. In the entertainment business, the employer of record is usually a payroll company, such as Entertainment Partners or Cast & Crew. The employer would be the production company. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: Mr. Boney, just to be clear, there are two background checks. There's one that the production company or the payroll company will perform before a person actually begins to work, right? So after an initial offer. And then there's one in order for the individual to get on the availability list, that's performed on behalf of the union. The union says in order to be on a list, you need to have this check, right? MR. BONEY: The so our Collective	 contracts, not just for Local 884 but for the entire IATSE covered under the basic agreement, which is one of our contracts. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: I think where I'm kind of going is I'm thinking generally and not just unions in general, they're not the employers, but I know that they often maintain these availability lists. And I guess my initial thought is that they wouldn't be employers and so their checks wouldn't be under the rubric of this criminal history check, the ban the box law, so to speak. And I wonder COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: I don't think that no. This isn't going it's the union only negotiating on behalf of the individuals who are members. It's not they're conducting a background check. So the employer is the production company. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: On the behest, that's not just specific, on the behest of the union so they can maintain an availability list. Then is it really the employer who is doing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	for something of that sort, they may interview a studio teacher. But that's usually not on the last-minute job. COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Who actually pays the MR. BONEY: Production company. In the entertainment business, the employer of record is usually a payroll company, such as Entertainment Partners or Cast & Crew. The employer would be the production company. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: Mr. Boney, just to be clear, there are two background checks. There's one that the production company or the payroll company will perform before a person actually begins to work, right? So after an initial offer. And then there's one in order for the individual to get on the availability list, that's performed on behalf of the union. The union says in order to be on a list, you need to have this check, right? MR. BONEY: The so our Collective Bargaining Agreement, the studios came together to have	2contracts, not just for Local 884 but for the entire3IATSE covered under the basic agreement, which is one of4our contracts.5COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: I think where I'm6kind of going is I'm thinking generally and not just7unions in general, they're not the employers, but I know8that they often maintain these availability lists.9And I guess my initial thought is that they10wouldn't be employers and so their checks wouldn't be11under the rubric of this criminal history check, the ban12the box law, so to speak. And I wonder13COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: I don't think14that no. This isn't going it's the union only15negotiating on behalf of the individuals who are16members. It's not they're conducting a background17check. So the employer is the production company.18COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: On the behest, that's19not just specific, on the behest of the union so they20can maintain an availability list.21Then is it really the employer who is doing22the check? I guess that's kind of where I'm going with23it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	for something of that sort, they may interview a studio teacher. But that's usually not on the last-minute job. COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Who actually pays the MR. BONEY: Production company. In the entertainment business, the employer of record is usually a payroll company, such as Entertainment Partners or Cast & Crew. The employer would be the production company. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: Mr. Boney, just to be clear, there are two background checks. There's one that the production company or the payroll company will perform before a person actually begins to work, right? So after an initial offer. And then there's one in order for the individual to get on the availability list, that's performed on behalf of the union. The union says in order to be on a list, you need to have this check, right? MR. BONEY: The so our Collective	 contracts, not just for Local 884 but for the entire IATSE covered under the basic agreement, which is one of our contracts. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: I think where I'm kind of going is I'm thinking generally and not just unions in general, they're not the employers, but I know that they often maintain these availability lists. And I guess my initial thought is that they wouldn't be employers and so their checks wouldn't be under the rubric of this criminal history check, the ban the box law, so to speak. And I wonder COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: I don't think that no. This isn't going it's the union only negotiating on behalf of the individuals who are members. It's not they're conducting a background check. So the employer is the production company. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: On the behest, that's not just specific, on the behest of the union so they can maintain an availability list. Then is it really the employer who is doing the check? I guess that's kind of where I'm going with it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	for something of that sort, they may interview a studio teacher. But that's usually not on the last-minute job. COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Who actually pays the MR. BONEY: Production company. In the entertainment business, the employer of record is usually a payroll company, such as Entertainment Partners or Cast & Crew. The employer would be the production company. COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: Mr. Boney, just to be clear, there are two background checks. There's one that the production company or the payroll company will perform before a person actually begins to work, right? So after an initial offer. And then there's one in order for the individual to get on the availability list, that's performed on behalf of the union. The union says in order to be on a list, you need to have this check, right? MR. BONEY: The so our Collective Bargaining Agreement, the studios came together to have a background check done through Contract Services that	2contracts, not just for Local 884 but for the entire3IATSE covered under the basic agreement, which is one of4our contracts.5COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: I think where I'm6kind of going is I'm thinking generally and not just7unions in general, they're not the employers, but I know8that they often maintain these availability lists.9And I guess my initial thought is that they10wouldn't be employers and so their checks wouldn't be11under the rubric of this criminal history check, the ban12the box law, so to speak. And I wonder13COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: I don't think14that no. This isn't going it's the union only15negotiating on behalf of the individuals who are16members. It's not they're conducting a background17check. So the employer is the production company.18COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: On the behest, that's19not just specific, on the behest of the union so they20can maintain an availability list.21Then is it really the employer who is doing22the check? I guess that's kind of where I'm going with23it.24DIRECTOR KISH: I would just say from an

8 (Pages 26 to 29)

1	of FEHA is just so broad that I don't think that's the	¹ MR. BONEY: That, I guess, is a possibility.
2	particular avenue that we should encourage people to go	² The problem being that it's freelance and that if you're
3	down.	³ waiting and you're not able to get on the list so I
4	But I do have one question for you, which	4 guess what you're saying is you get a conditional
5	is, in order to get the teacher credential in the first	⁵ placement on the list and so after the background check
6	place, you go through a background check that's required	⁶ is performed and then you're either removed or then you
7	by the Education Code, correct?	⁷ are kept on the list is what you're suggesting.
8	MR. BONEY: Correct.	8 COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Something along those
9	DIRECTOR KISH: And if you have some kind of	⁹ lines so that those folks who want to get on the list
10	disqualifying criminal conviction for that credential,	¹⁰ have the protections of the statute, which is
11	the Department of Education is required to decertify	¹¹ limitations on the background list instead of on the
12	you; is that correct?	¹² check (sic) as opposed to being totally exempted but
13	MR. BONEY: Correct.	¹³ you're still not messing with the employer's right to
14	DIRECTOR KISH: So what is the is it	¹⁴ get somebody at 8 a.m. the next morning so that the
15	correct to say that the added value of the background	¹⁵ contracting people, it would require some rewriting, I
16	check that's performed by Contract Services to place	¹⁶ think, but as agents of the employees and the
17	people on a list or a roster is just kind of a	¹⁷ contractors have to follow this statute.
18	reassurance that that check is recent?	¹⁸ MR. BONEY: I don't think the local would be
19	MR. BONEY: That is correct. I mean, it's	¹⁹ opposed to that. I would just need to make sure that
20	the reason where the law does require schools in a	²⁰ there are no barriers in our CBA that would that we
21	school district or a private school to also be able to	²¹ may have to complete some language in our CBA in order
22	do a separate background check on top of the	²² to do you know, so that it would fall under and be
23	credentialed background check. But the problem is that	²³ spelled out.
24	law is very specific to teachers in school districts and	²⁴ COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: I mean, I'm not
25	private schools.	²⁵ saying we should do that. I'm exploring alternatives
	D 30	D 22
	Page 30	Page 32
1	COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: It's also after the	¹ that seem to me to be the protection of the statute
2	offer is made. So it implies that the procedure	² without interfering with what is obviously very time
3	complies with the law.	³ sensitive.
4	MR. BONEY: Okay. But our, you know	4 COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: The other thing is
5	it's our understanding is that because of the nature	⁵ the credentialing process. If someone is convicted of
6	of being you know, one, you could work for as	⁶ an offense, immediately that is communicated from the
7	Melissa said, you could work for different production	⁷ DOJ to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the
8	companies in a week. You could actually work for five	⁸ person's credential is defended right then and there.
9	different production companies in one week. I mean,	⁹ So it shows up right away if you've got a conviction.
10	each day work for a separate production company. So we	¹⁰ So it's not as though there's a layer or
11	feel like this having this background check so that	¹¹ anything. It is timely. There is a list of convictions
12	you will be available for these jobs through Contract	¹² in the code that require immediate suspension of the
13	Services when you have a collectively bargained	¹³ credential.
14	arbitration procedure to answer to any and to respond to	14 CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: I appreciate I
15	any any negative negative that shows up, that it	¹⁵ think this gives us a good sense on the on the
16	should be exempt.	¹⁶ quagmire and we'll look forward to reviewing the written
17	COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: So what I'm trying to	¹⁷ comments.
18	figure out is given that the employers under these	¹⁸ MR. BONEY: Thank you very much.
19	circumstances don't really do any often don't do	¹⁹ MS. GLENN-LEISTOKOW: Good afternoon. My
20	background checks, but this background check does act as	²⁰ name is Sarah, S-a-r-a-h, Glenn, like G-l-e-n-n, hyphen,
21	a barrier for people being able to get a job, a union	²¹ L-e-i-s-t-i-k-o-w. I'm here on behalf of Center For
22	job. Is there any tactical reason why the contract	²² Employment Opportunities. They're nonprofit. That
23	folks couldn't follow the same procedure? I.e.,	 helps people coming home from jail and prisons to get
24	tentatively approve people for the list subject to	²⁴ jobs, to reduce recidivism, increase public safety and
25	background check and then do their background check?	 ²⁵ improve our community.
	see sy oana check and then do their buckyround theek:	
	Page 31	Page 33

9 (Pages 30 to 33)

1	Thank you so much for your time and the	1	put on the list, the difference between the example they
2	ability to present oral comments on the proposed	2	gave where everybody on that list is going into a very
3	regulations.	3	particular field right where it is a vulnerable
4	We are submitting written comments in	4	population and they would be allowed to do background
5	conjunction as well as a number of other folks who were	5	checks and to screen out people very clearly as they
6	part of the coalition that worked to get AB 1008 passed.	6	based on business necessity and nexus of the conviction
7	And I'm here today to actually respond to a few of the	7	to the job.
8	comments already raised.	8	If you apply to a staffing agency, they
9	As you give a summary of the comments, we'll	9	might have 10 different places they can send you. One
10	be giving in written statement later today.	10	of them could be residential construction where a
11	I'm actually very glad I was able to hear	11	particular conviction would be impermissible in that
12	those concerns that were just presented by the two	12	location. Another one could be street cleaning at night
13	previous speakers, because they're important and very	13	where your criminal conviction has nothing to do with
14	relevant and I want to just offer a couple areas for	14	that potential job, there's no nexus, there's nothing
15	further consideration on those issues.	15	related.
16	No. 1, I want to highlight what you so	16	A staffing agency can and does we work
17	astutely noticed, that it's very dangerous to allow	17	with thousands of people a year and many staffing
18	employers to go around these by allowing staffing	18	agencies they can use background checks as these
19	agencies or contracting agencies like this to do	19	preliminary screening tools to then blanket, not hire
20	background checks at impermissible times and then relay	20	people, put them on their list or their rosters because
21	that information to the employer such that the employer	21	they say, well, we have one of 10 clients who you might
22	never did the background check, but somehow they are now	22	not be able to be placed. That would be a perversion of
23	benefitting from somebody having done the background	23	the intent of this law and it would create some concern
24	check impermissibly.	24	for us considering very high number of our folks are
25	So I just want to urge you to be careful in	25	hired through background I'm sorry, through staffing
	Page 34		Page 36
	1 420 54		1 420 50
1	your considerations on when the background check can	1	agencies.
2	be done and by who.	2	So I don't have exactly the answers. I know
3	Ms. Schur, I appreciate your creative	3	this is a consideration that will be ongoing. I just
4	understanding that one way that this could be done to	4	want to urge you to keep thinking of the potential
5	better follow the law would be to have the contracting	5	consequences of considering the points that they made.
6	agency do it as a conditional at you know, in	6	And I do understand, those are valid points.
7	reference to their conditional offer. The concern I	7	I also want to commend you on pointing out
8	have there is be careful not to frame somebody like this	8	that we don't want to overlay more barriers when they
9	contracting agency as having made a conditional offer	9	are already covered by existing laws.
10	when there isn't actually employment on the line because	10	So because the teaching credential is
11	of the potential implications that could have for	11	already heavily regulated and the information from the
12	staffing agencies and unions.	12	DOJ is immediately reported, there is an existing way in
13	So the majority of folks, one in three	13	which you can make sure that you're not allowing people
14	Americans, have no convictions or arrest records that	14	to maintain a credential when they shouldn't be because
15	could potentially show up on employment background	15	they worked with vulnerable populations.
16	checks. So this affects a vast number of people.	16	So I believe there are some narrow ways in
17	And many of these people may be coming in to	17	which the issues that were important, that were already
18	jobs through staffing agencies, through unions, through	18	raised, are already addressed. And I want to urge you
19	construction agencies that create these lists, these	19	to be careful about allowing exemptions and writing in
20	availability lists. And if we start construing beyond	20	more exemptions into the clause because that can affect
21	an availability list as a conditional offer, it will	21	all sorts of people that are not in this very particular
22	allow far more people to potentially conduct background	22	situation.
23	checks in disagreement with the intent of this law.	23	So I wanted to make sure I was able to state
24	So if you apply to a staffing agency and	24	that. And then I just want to give a brief summary of
25	you're required to undergo a background check to even be	25	the comments that were provided in case you have
	Page 35		Page 37
			Voga 41

1	questions on those.	1	that. It would be challenging for somebody to address
2	So we're very thankful for the regulations	2	an issue where they felt the law wasn't followed
3	and we're very appreciative of the way in which they	3	properly if they didn't know the source of the
4	further promote the ideals of AB 1008.	4	information. And the way it's written, it could
5	And I just have a few points of requests for	5	potentially be confusing to employers and they think,
6	consideration and/or clarification of the regulations.	6	oh, well, I didn't use a a Criminal Conviction
7	No. 1, we would like to ask that the Council	7	History Report and therefore I don't have to indicate
8	establish a rebuttable presumption, that the employer	8	the source of the information.
9	failed to adequately conduct an individualized	9	We'd also ask that you clarify the bar
10	assessment, unless the employer recorded that assessment	10	against inquiring into job applicants' conviction
11	in writing.	11	history before a conditional offer to include Internet
12	So if it's just a clarification of what it	12	searches performed to uncover online evidence of
13	means to conduct an individualized assessment and how	13	conviction or history.
14	you show that.	14	So similar to the point I just made is
15	So if the individual was in litigation over	15	currently not clear in those regulations or in the law
16	the decision, either with DFEH or in the court after	16	that these more informal methods of acquiring
17	getting a Right to Sue Letter, it would be very hard for	17	information are also impermissible before the
18	them to prove a negative. It would be very hard for	18	conditional offer.
19	them to prove that no individual assessment existed when	19	So simply adding clarifying language, and
20	the employer just said I did one.	20	details of this proposed language are in the comments.
21	We ask that a rebuttable presumption be	21	So the idea that an employer may not be in
22	created that unless you can provide in writing that you	22	fear right now that though I cannot conduct a background
23	did an assessment, that it be presumed that you did not	23	check through an agency, which is what most people do,
24	do one. It would then be very easy to rebut by showing	24	they hire commercial agencies to do the background
25	yes, I did do an individualized assessment because I	25	check, they may think it's okay for me to go Google
	Page 38		Page 40
1	enverteened these these these end these	1	consthing year quick. And that's what I do all day
2	considered this, this, this and this.	2	something real quick. And that's what I do all day
3	So the idea is to make it much more	3	long, I Google complaints. You know, that's pretty
4	logically clear for the potential defendant to redress	4	informal.
5	the situation that they feel they were not subject to	5	We just want to clarify that that action would also be impermissible under these regulations.
6	individualized assessment, which is one of the most	6	
7	important provisions of the law. Employers are actually doing individualized assessments.	7	No. 4, we would suggest providing additional examples of evidence of mitigating circumstances or
8	5	8	rehabilitation efforts to assist both the job applicants
9	No. 2, we would like to ask that you clarify	9	and the employers in understanding what mitigating
10	that an employer is required to identify the source of	10	circumstances may look like.
11	conviction history information on which it bases its	11	
12	decision through both a conditional offer, even if the	12	This again, under the written comments, but
13	employer did not obtain the information from a	13	examples of this would be just listing some of the information that the EEOC put out in their guidelines to
14			
	conviction history report.		
	The way the law and the regulations are	14	Title 7. So including some of the character
15	The way the law and the regulations are currently written, it provides a little bit of ambiguity	14 15	Title 7. So including some of the character information, some of the other very specifically
15 16	The way the law and the regulations are currently written, it provides a little bit of ambiguity over if you have to provide the written document if it	14 15 16	Title 7. So including some of the character information, some of the other very specifically enumerated ways in which you can do individualized
15 16 17	The way the law and the regulations are currently written, it provides a little bit of ambiguity over if you have to provide the written document if it wasn't a formal criminal history conviction report.	14 15 16 17	Title 7. So including some of the character information, some of the other very specifically enumerated ways in which you can do individualized consideration and show evidence of rehabilitation under
15 16 17 18	The way the law and the regulations are currently written, it provides a little bit of ambiguity over if you have to provide the written document if it wasn't a formal criminal history conviction report. For example, you could ask the candidate	14 15 16 17 18	Title 7. So including some of the character information, some of the other very specifically enumerated ways in which you can do individualized consideration and show evidence of rehabilitation under the EEOC guidelines.
15 16 17 18 19	The way the law and the regulations are currently written, it provides a little bit of ambiguity over if you have to provide the written document if it wasn't a formal criminal history conviction report. For example, you could ask the candidate themselves if you're doing so at the permissible time.	14 15 16 17 18 19	Title 7. So including some of the character information, some of the other very specifically enumerated ways in which you can do individualized consideration and show evidence of rehabilitation under the EEOC guidelines. No. 5, and I'm almost done here, just a few
15 16 17 18 19 20	The way the law and the regulations are currently written, it provides a little bit of ambiguity over if you have to provide the written document if it wasn't a formal criminal history conviction report. For example, you could ask the candidate themselves if you're doing so at the permissible time. That can be the basis of your information. And nothing	14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Title 7. So including some of the character information, some of the other very specifically enumerated ways in which you can do individualized consideration and show evidence of rehabilitation under the EEOC guidelines. No. 5, and I'm almost done here, just a few more. We would ask that the regulations provide clearer
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	The way the law and the regulations are currently written, it provides a little bit of ambiguity over if you have to provide the written document if it wasn't a formal criminal history conviction report. For example, you could ask the candidate themselves if you're doing so at the permissible time. That can be the basis of your information. And nothing in the regulations or law currently specify that you	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Title 7. So including some of the character information, some of the other very specifically enumerated ways in which you can do individualized consideration and show evidence of rehabilitation under the EEOC guidelines. No. 5, and I'm almost done here, just a few more. We would ask that the regulations provide clearer and more detailed guidance with regard to the local Fair
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	The way the law and the regulations are currently written, it provides a little bit of ambiguity over if you have to provide the written document if it wasn't a formal criminal history conviction report. For example, you could ask the candidate themselves if you're doing so at the permissible time. That can be the basis of your information. And nothing in the regulations or law currently specify that you would then write that down as the reason because the	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Title 7. So including some of the character information, some of the other very specifically enumerated ways in which you can do individualized consideration and show evidence of rehabilitation under the EEOC guidelines. No. 5, and I'm almost done here, just a few more. We would ask that the regulations provide clearer and more detailed guidance with regard to the local Fair Chance hiring laws. There is already mentioned in
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	The way the law and the regulations are currently written, it provides a little bit of ambiguity over if you have to provide the written document if it wasn't a formal criminal history conviction report. For example, you could ask the candidate themselves if you're doing so at the permissible time. That can be the basis of your information. And nothing in the regulations or law currently specify that you would then write that down as the reason because the language just says Criminal Conviction History Report.	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Title 7. So including some of the character information, some of the other very specifically enumerated ways in which you can do individualized consideration and show evidence of rehabilitation under the EEOC guidelines. No. 5, and I'm almost done here, just a few more. We would ask that the regulations provide clearer and more detailed guidance with regard to the local Fair Chance hiring laws. There is already mentioned in there and this is a little bit technical, so I'll
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	The way the law and the regulations are currently written, it provides a little bit of ambiguity over if you have to provide the written document if it wasn't a formal criminal history conviction report. For example, you could ask the candidate themselves if you're doing so at the permissible time. That can be the basis of your information. And nothing in the regulations or law currently specify that you would then write that down as the reason because the language just says Criminal Conviction History Report. We're just asking that you clarify whatever	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Title 7. So including some of the character information, some of the other very specifically enumerated ways in which you can do individualized consideration and show evidence of rehabilitation under the EEOC guidelines. No. 5, and I'm almost done here, just a few more. We would ask that the regulations provide clearer and more detailed guidance with regard to the local Fair Chance hiring laws. There is already mentioned in there and this is a little bit technical, so I'll defer to the to the written comments about a
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	The way the law and the regulations are currently written, it provides a little bit of ambiguity over if you have to provide the written document if it wasn't a formal criminal history conviction report. For example, you could ask the candidate themselves if you're doing so at the permissible time. That can be the basis of your information. And nothing in the regulations or law currently specify that you would then write that down as the reason because the language just says Criminal Conviction History Report.	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Title 7. So including some of the character information, some of the other very specifically enumerated ways in which you can do individualized consideration and show evidence of rehabilitation under the EEOC guidelines. No. 5, and I'm almost done here, just a few more. We would ask that the regulations provide clearer and more detailed guidance with regard to the local Fair Chance hiring laws. There is already mentioned in there and this is a little bit technical, so I'll
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	The way the law and the regulations are currently written, it provides a little bit of ambiguity over if you have to provide the written document if it wasn't a formal criminal history conviction report. For example, you could ask the candidate themselves if you're doing so at the permissible time. That can be the basis of your information. And nothing in the regulations or law currently specify that you would then write that down as the reason because the language just says Criminal Conviction History Report. We're just asking that you clarify whatever	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Title 7. So including some of the character information, some of the other very specifically enumerated ways in which you can do individualized consideration and show evidence of rehabilitation under the EEOC guidelines. No. 5, and I'm almost done here, just a few more. We would ask that the regulations provide clearer and more detailed guidance with regard to the local Fair Chance hiring laws. There is already mentioned in there and this is a little bit technical, so I'll defer to the to the written comments about a

11 (Pages 38 to 41)

-		1	
1	of law that people are required to follow any local	1	CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Any other public
2	ordinances or guidelines that relate to the same issue	2	comments for this morning's hearing?
3 4	and that people aren't confused which to follow or what		COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: I have a question.
5	to follow.	4	There's no further public comment. Should we wait until
6	They need to follow the stricter guidelines	6	after the court reporter concludes?
7	that may exist in Los Angeles or San Francisco. And	7	CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Sorry. Is this
8	just a little bit of clarity in the wording so that's	8	COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: I have a question
9	clear to employers.	9	for the subcommittee, but I don't know that it needs
	We request that the that you reinsert the		CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Okay. So why don't we
10	deleted language that describes the requirements of an	10 11	do that after.
11	individualized assessment for adverse employment actions	12	Any e-mailed comments?
12	other than hiring decisions, such as "promotion" and	13	Okay. Well, thank you.
13	"termination." We're worried that as it exists by	14	That concludes the public hearing for the
14 15	deleting that, it becomes unclear to people that that		proposed new Employment Regulations Regarding Criminal
16	the existing DFEH regulations outside of the Fair Chance	15 16	History, the California Family Rights Act and the
	Act applies to those other points within an employee's		New Parent Leave Act. I feel like those two latter
17 18	cycle, such as promotion and termination.	17	statutes we look forward to written comments on them.
	I understand that this act in particular	18	Written comments need to be submitted by 5 p.m. today.
19 20	applies to hiring, but we know that the 2017 guidelines	19 20	So if you haven't already done so, please do so.
	that included in FEHA specifically discussed the		And that concludes our second portion of the
21	other points of the of the employee's life cycle,	21 22	hearing and we can go off the record.
22	such as promotion and termination and we just wanted		(Off record ar 12:36 p.m.)
23	that to be clarified.	23 24	
24	Again, a bit specific and technical and	24	
25	those are in the written comments.	25	
	Page 42		Page 44
1	Too fast. So sorry. Bad habit. And I	1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION
2	think we're wrapping up. One more.	2	REPORTERS CERTIFICATION
3	We'd like to clarify that the job applicant	3	I, Marceline F. Noble, a Certified Shorthand
4	shall be permitted five additional business days. This	4	Reporter in and for the State of California, do hereby
5	is just very specifically inserting the word "business"	5	certify:
6	into that Section 2-C at the very end throughout that	6	certify.
7	that proposed languages, that insertion, "business days"	7	That the foregoing meeting was then taken before me
8	was written except for in the very last sentence.	8	at the time and place herein set forth; that the meeting
9	Now it just says five days.	9	was reported stenographically by me and later
10	So we're just asking that it's clear that	10	transcribed into typewriting under my direction; that
11	not only the initial five days are business days but	11	the foregoing is a true record of the meeting taken at
12	that the additional five days are business days. Just a	12	that time.
13	very small insertion of the word "business."	13	
14	And one more and then we're done.	14	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name this
15	We also request that you delete the word	15	12th day of April, 2018.
16	"permitting" from the subheading of Section G because it	16	
17	incorrectly summarizes the law on this point. And the	17	
18	details of that are in the written comments as to why we	18	
19	believe the word "permitting" actually changes these	19	Marceline F. Noble, CSR No. 3024
20	the meeting here and it's involved elimination of that	20	
21	word, so that's the integrity of the sentence has not	21	
22	changed the legal meaning.	22	
23	That is all I have.	23	
24	CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you.	24	
25	MS. GLENN-LEISTOKOW: Thank you.	25	
		1	

12 (Pages 42 to 45)

٦

	amondments A.C. 5:44	10.10 00 45.44 00.0 0	15,10 16,7 05,0 40	40.00.05
Α	amendments 4:6 5:14 America 6:22	13:18,23 15:11 23:6,8 24:1,2 25:4 26:9,11,13	15:19 16:7 25:9,12 26:3 29:13 31:1 33:4	40:23,25 checks 7:13 11:4,19
a.m 3:2 8:10 15:8 26:4	Americans 35:14	31:12	44:3.7	16:11 21:3 22:20 23:1
32:14	amplify 18:10	avenue 30:2	Brothers 7:9 14:8,10	24:13 27:13 29:10
AB 18:11 34:6 38:4	ancestry 3:23	aware 7:23	brought 5:7,10 6:10	31:20 34:20 35:16,23
abetting 29:25	and/or 4:2 38:6		Building 1:14	36:5,18
ability 34:2	Angeles 1:17 3:1 5:5,6	В	business 8:19 17:19	child 19:14 21:9
able 21:5 22:13 28:3 30:21 31:21 32:3	11:16,17,18,23 42:6	B-o-n-e-y 17:19	27:8 36:6 43:4,5,7,11	children 7:16,17 9:19
34:11 36:22 37:23	annually 20:23	back 3:5 4:7	43:12,13	10:8 12:22,24 13:12
AC02DD0 1:24	answer 18:2 31:14	background 7:12,13,25	businesses 8:5	19:3,15,24
accept 4:25	answers 37:2	8:13 9:10,13,24 10:7		circumstance 22:12
accepted 15:25	appear 4:3	10:14 11:2,3,19,22	C	circumstances 10:1
account 21:1	APPEARANCES 2:1	12:5,9,14 13:4,5 14:5	California 1:5,11,17,21	15:20 31:19 41:7,10
acknowledges 11:19	applicant 18:12,20 43:3 applicants 41:8	14:9,10,13,15 15:16	3:1,8,19 4:4,19 5:6	Cisneros 2:3 3:15 city 11:17,18,23
acknowledgment 21:22	applicants' 40:10	15:18 16:11 18:12	7:21 10:16 11:9 16:4	clarification 10:11 13:16
acquiring 40:16	application 18:23 25:18	20:18 21:3,13 22:16	19:11 25:16 44:15	16:25 38:6,12
act 1:6,6,12,12 3:6,9,9	applies 42:16,19	22:20,24 23:1,2,3,5,17 23:25 24:8,13 25:8,20	45:4 call 8:9 15:7 24:11 25:3	clarified 42:23
3:19,19 31:20 42:16	apply 25:10,17 35:24	27:13,24 28:4,6,10,15	26:10,11,14,17,23	clarify 39:8,24 40:9 41:4
42:18 44:15,16 action 41:4	36:8	28:23 29:16 30:6,15	called 9:2 21:12 23:21	41.25 43.3
actions 42:11	appreciate 33:14 35:3	30:22,23 31:11,20,20	calls 9:14 13:22 26:4	clarifying 11:25 40:19
activity 19:15	appreciative 38:3	31:25,25 32:5,11	Canada 17:24	clarity 9:25 11:12 42:7
added 30:15	approach 8:22	34:20,22,23 35:1,15	candidate 39:18	classes 25:21
adding 10:15 11:11	appropriate 7:20,22 9:18	35:22,25 36:4,18,25	card 6:10,19	classroom 12:21 19:25
40:19	10:7 13:5	40:22,24	care 5:4	clause 11:7 37:20
addition 7:10	approve 31:24 approving 22:15	Bad 43:1	careful 34:25 35:8 37:19	clean 6:11 cleaning 36:12
additional 4:13 5:16	April 1:18 3:1 5:1 45:15	ban 29:11	caring 19:12	clear 27:13 39:3 40:15
12:8 13:25 14:5 18:8	ar 44:22	bar 40:9	Carmel 1:15	42:8 43:10
22:24 41:6 43:4,12	arbitration 21:20 28:13	bargained 21:17,23	case 4:15 8:7 37:25 cases 16:18	clearer 41:20
address 3:7 40:1 addressed 19:6 37:18	31:14	28:12,25 31:13 bargaining 7:5 8:15,23	Cases 10.10 Cast 27:10	clearly 36:5
adequately 38:9	areas 34:14	9:8 13:1,2 20:18 22:22	category 16:6	clients 36:21
administer 18:17	arrangement 11:16	24:20 25:23 27:23	CATS 9:10	coalition 34:6
ado 6:15	arrest 35:14	barrier 31:21	CBA 28:8 32:20,21	code 4:4 7:24 11:1 19:9
adopting 17:3	Artists 17:22	barriers 32:20 37:8	CBS 7:10	19:11 20:4 22:1 30:7
adverse 42:11	aside 24:8	based 11:5 22:24 36:6	Center 33:21	33:12
affect 37:20	asking 8:9 9:16 15:7 39:24 43:10	bases 39:10	cert 23:23	colleague 8:19 colleagues 3:13
affords 21:17	asks 13:22	basic 9:20 29:3	certain 19:19 27:1	collective 7:5 8:15,23
afternoon 8:9 9:15 17:12	asserting 11:7	basically 13:17 basis 39:20	certification 19:22 23:24	13:1,2 20:18 22:22
33:19	assessment 18:14 38:10	begins 27:15	25:13,20 26:1 45:1 certifications 25:7	24:20 25:23 27:22
age 4:1 19:14 agencies 34:19,19 35:12	38:10,13,19,23,25	behalf 27:19 29:15 33:21	certified 5:23 23:25	collectively 21:17,23
35:18,19 36:18 37:1	39:5 42:11	behest 29:18.19	25:16 45:3	28:11 31:13
40:24	assessments 39:7	believe 37:16 43:19	certify 45:5	color 3:23
agency 10:13 22:8,12	assignment 20:11	belt 12:25	Chair 3:12	come 6:6 8:5 15:8 16:11
35:6,9,24 36:8,16	assignments 20:12	benefitting 34:23	CHAIRMAN 2:2 3:4 17:1	comfort 14:14
40:23	assist 41:8 assistant 4:9 25:2	better 14:3 35:5	17:5,15 22:3 24:3	coming 33:23 35:17 commence 3:5
Agenda 1:2	associate 7:10	beyond 24:13 25:17	33:14 43:24 44:1,6,9	commend 37:7
agent 7:5 8:19 10:25	association 6:22,23 7:3	35:20 bit 10:11 12:25 14:3	challenged 21:20 challenging 40:1	comment 5:15,18 6:16
agents 32:16 ago 4:19	12:8	39:15 41:23 42:7,24	Chance 41:22 42:15	44:4
agree 8:20,22 9:9,10	associations 7:8	blanket 36:19	changed 43:22	comments 3:17 5:1,2,8
agreed 20:17 27:25	assurance 14:14	Boney 2:10 8:19 17:18	changes 5:13,17 43:19	5:13,16,19,19,24
agreement 12:18 13:3	astutely 34:17	17:19 22:19 23:13	character 41:14	33:17 34:2,4,8,9 37:25
22:22 24:21 25:24	ATKINSON-BAKER 1:20	24:17 25:11,15 26:7	charge 19:24	40:20 41:11,24 42:25
27:23 29:3	Attachment 1:8,9,10 4:8	27:7,12,22 28:19,22	Chaya 2:2 3:12	43:18 44:2,11,17,18
aiding 29:25	4:12 attachments 4:10	30:8,13,19 31:4 32:1	check 7:13,25 8:13 9:11	commercial 40:24 commission 7:21 10:17
Alliance 7:4 8:16 17:21	attending 19:13	32:18 33:18	9:24 10:14 11:2,22	10:20 11:9 16:5 33:7
Allied 17:23	Auditorium 1:15	Boulevard 1:21 boundaries 10:22	12:5,9,14 13:4,22 14:5	communicated 33:6
allow 34:17 35:22	availability 8:25 9:1,7,12	boundaries 10:22 box 29:12	14:9,10,13 15:16,18 18:12 20:18 21:13	community 33:25
allowed 9:23 13:7 21:3 36:4	10:2 11:20 12:11	Brand 1:21	22:24 23:3,3,5,17,25	companies 7:7 13:20
allowing 34:18 37:13,19	13:22 14:1,17 15:3,11	Brian 2:6 5:4,9	24:8,21 25:8,21 27:20	14:14 20:5,8,10 24:19
alternative 22:18	16:15,24 20:20 21:20	brief 37:24	27:24 28:4,6,10,16,24	24:24 25:1 28:2,3,3,5
Alternatively 10:23	23:18 24:18,22 25:10	bring 6:18	29:11,17,22 30:6,16	31:8,9
alternatives 32:25	25:14 27:18 28:1 29:8 29:20 35:20,21	broad 30:1	30:18,22,23 31:11,20	company 14:4 20:20
ambiguity 39:15	available 4:7 8:10 10:5	Brodsky 2:4 3:14 13:15	31:25,25 32:5,12	22:23,24 24:25 27:7,9 27:11,14,14 29:17
amended 3:20	4 4 4 1 4 5 4 5 4 5 4 5 4 5 4 5 4 5 4 5	13:24 14:16,24 15:13	34:22,24 35:1,25	21.11,17,19 23.11
	1		•	•

	1	1	1	I
31:10	CORRECTED 1:7	defended 33:8	eliminates 18:11	exists 42:13
competing 20:16	Council 1:1 2:2,3,3,4,4	defer 41:24	elimination 43:20	expertise 16:14
complaints 41:2	3:12,14 5:4,14,17 6:17	delete 43:15	employ 24:20	exploring 32:25
complete 32:21	10:1 11:11,24 12:2,7	deleted 42:10	employed 7:22 19:15	expression 4:1
complies 31:3	12:12 13:15,24 14:16	deleting 42:14	20:5	expressly 17:5
complying 22:9,15	14:24 15:13,19 16:7	delineated 17:7	employee 18:20	extend 20:11
concern 24:5 35:7 36:23	16:12 17:16,18 18:6,7	department 3:16 8:1	employee's 42:16,21	extra 10:15 13:13
concerned 15:21	22:4 23:9 25:9,12 26:3	10:21 12:13,17 30:11	employees 8:17 17:22	
concerns 7:16 34:12	27:5,12 28:15,20 29:5	department's 4:22	25:22 32:16	F
concludes 44:5,13,20	29:13,18 31:1,17 32:8	departments 16:10	employer 9:3,23 10:4,24	F 1:9,23 45:3,19
condition 3:25 27:25 conditional 32:4 35:6,7	32:24 33:4 38:7 44:3,7 Council's 4:15,23 5:20	deprive 18:25 21:7 described 10:2 19:7	15:17 21:2,5,13 22:8 27:8,10 28:16,25 29:1	fact 20:7 21:2
35:9,21 39:11 40:11	couple 28:5 34:14	describes 42:10	29:17,21 34:21,21	factor 8:3
40:18	course 6:3	designer 26:20	38:8,10,20 39:9,12	failed 38:9
conduct 9:10,23 10:13	court 1:20 5:23 6:10	detailed 41:21	40:21	Fair 1:1 3:6 10:21 41:21
11:3,22 13:3,7 14:5	38:16 44:5	details 40:20 43:18	employer's 10:24 32:13	42:15
21:3 35:22 38:9,13	covered 23:20 28:8,17	developed 8:24,24	employer/producer 8:13	fall 16:23 22:10 23:2
40:22	29:3 37:9	DFEH 38:16 42:15	employers 10:6 20:23	32:22
conducted 14:13 15:16	covers 23:14	DFEH's 5:5	21:15 29:7,10 31:18	falls 10:10 16:13 Family 1:5,11 3:8,19
20:19	crafted 20:25	DFEHCouncil@DFEH	34:18 39:6 40:5 41:9	44:15
conducting 29:16	Crafts 17:23	5:3	42:8	far 35:22
conducts 12:5,8	create 6:11 35:19 36:23	difference 36:1	employing 28:21,22	fast 43:1
confidence 9:17	created 38:22	different 8:21 25:2 31:7	employment 1:1,4,10	fear 40:22
confronted 18:24	creative 6:25 35:3	31:9 36:9	3:6,7,8,18,21 9:23	February 4:20
confused 42:3	credential 7:23 10:16	DIR 16:20	10:3,21 11:4,4 18:11	federal 10:25 11:3
confusing 40:5	11:8 12:14 14:23	direction 45:10	18:17,19 19:1 20:8	feel 12:18,19 23:1 28:10
conjunction 7:2 34:5	23:21 30:5,10 33:8,13	directly 26:17	21:2 33:22 35:10,15	31:11 39:4 44:16
consequences 37:5	37:10,14	director 2:5 3:16 26:19	42:11 44:14	FEHA 3:20,21 30:1 42:20
consider 5:18	credentialed 30:23	29:24 30:9,14	enacted 18:22	felt 40:2
consideration 11:11	credentialing 10:17 11:9	directors 25:3	encourage 30:2	field 36:3
17:14 34:15 37:3 38:6 41:17	16:5 33:5,7	disability 3:24,24	ends 18:19	figure 16:20 31:18
considerations 35:1	credentials 7:20,21 10:7 12:4 19:18 23:23,23	disadvantaging 18:19 disagreement 35:23	enforcement 29:25	FILE 1:24
considered 17:6 39:1	25:7,19	discrimination 3:22	engage 17:9 engaged 19:15	film 6:24
considering 36:24 37:5	creed 3:23	discussed 42:20	enjoyed 19:1	Final 5:20
construction 35:19	Crew 27:10	Disney 7:8	ensure 9:11 13:4,11	find 21:21
36:10	criminal 1:5,11 3:8,18	dispatch 26:10,14,24	entertainment 7:1 19:3	firm 15:10 first 1:15 24:9,11,21
construing 35:20	7:13 9:13 11:3,5 18:12	dispatched 16:17	19:16 20:23 25:22	26:15 30:5
contained 18:5	22:13 29:11 30:10	disqualifying 19:19	27:8,9	fit 15:6 19:8
content 6:25	36:13 39:17,23 40:6	30:10	entire 29:2	five 12:23 31:8 43:4,9,11
contest 20:25	44:14	distributors 6:24 7:6	entities 15:20	43:12
context 15:3 18:17	criminal-free 14:15	district 30:21	entitled 20:22	Floor 1:15,21 5:6
contract 9:2,3 11:21	critical 6:2	districts 20:6 30:24	enumerated 41:16	folks 31:23 32:9 34:5
13:3 14:12 15:16 22:8	CSR 1:23 45:19	DLSE 19:22 23:24	equivalent 10:2	35:13 36:24
22:20 23:4 25:23	current 9:21	document 39:16	erroneous 21:16	follow 31:23 32:17 35:5
27:24 28:11,24 30:16 31:12,22	currently 11:13 39:15,21 40:15	doing 28:23 29:21 39:7 39:19	especially 21:4 establish 38:8	42:1,3,4,5
contracting 12:8 22:12	cycle 42:17,21	DOJ 33:7 37:12	evaluated 24:14,15	followed 40:2
32:15 34:19 35:5,9		Doug 2:10 8:19 17:18	everybody 36:2	foregoing 45:7,11
contractor 16:18	D	dozens 21:15	evidence 40:12 41:7,17	formal 4:18 39:17 forth 19:9 45:8
contractors 32:17	d 4:8 10:23 19:10,10	draft 3:20 11:15	ex-officio 3:15	forward 33:16 44:17
contracts 28:25 29:2,4	Dale 2:4 3:14	draw 15:25	exactly 15:6 17:8 37:2	found 4:14
Contractural 20:22	danger 21:9	Dual 23:21	example 15:23 36:1	Fox 7:8
contrary 11:22	dangerous 34:17		39:18	frame 35:8
convenience 9:4	Dara 2:2 3:14	E	examples 41:7,12	framework 13:6 14:18
conversation 6:3	date 13:20	E 1:8	exception 10:11,23	framing 7:11
convicted 19:19 33:5	day 13:23 20:13 25:5	e-mail 4:21,22 5:2 17:12	11:13 17:6	Francisco 42:6
conviction 10:14 30:10	31:10 41:1 45:15	e-mailed 18:6 44:11	exceptions 10:10	freelance 23:15 24:17
33:9 36:6,11,13 39:10 39:13,17,23 40:6,10	days 43:4,7,9,11,11,12	easy 38:24	exempt 22:21 23:4,5 28:9 31:16	26:19 32:2
40:13	43:12	educate 7:17	exempted 32:12	front 6:6
convictions 33:11 35:14	deal 14:19	education 7:24 8:1	exemption 16:2,22	function 23:12
coordinators 25:2	decades 13:14,14	12:13,16 13:9,10	exemptions 19:8 20:4	functions 9:4
Copies 4:6	decertify 30:11 decision 24:10 38:16	14:19 21:10 30:7,11 educational 11:1 27:1	22:10 37:19,20	fund 9:2,3 28:24 fundamental 18:22
copy 5:7,13 18:8	39:11	EEOC 41:13,18	exempts 22:7	funded 28:25
correct 16:3 22:17 28:19	decisions 24:6 42:12	efforts 41:8	exist 42:6	further 5:17 6:15 21:12
28:21 30:7,8,12,13,15	defeats 18:21	either 11:12 32:6 38:16	existed 38:19	34:15 38:4 44:4
30:19	defendant 39:3	eligible 15:11 25:17	existing 37:9,12 42:15	future 23:8
	I		I	1

	1	1	1	I
G	HOLLY 2:6	international 8:16 17:21	legislative 17:9	13:15,24 14:16,24
G 1:10 4:12 43:16	home 7:1 33:23	18:4	legislature 17:2	15:13,19 16:7,12
G-I-e-n-n 33:20	hope 21:21	Internet 40:11	letter 17:11 18:5,9 19:7	17:16 22:4 23:9 25:9
gainful 19:1	hopefully 6:8 18:1	interpreted 16:21	38:17	25:12 26:3 27:5,12
gap 15:17	hours 8:7	interview 26:6,7 27:1,2	licensed 15:21	28:15,20 29:5,13,18
gender 4:1,1,1	Housing 1:1 3:6 10:21	introducing 6:9	licensing 15:24 16:8,10	31:1,17 32:8,24 33:4
general 29:7	hyphen 33:20	involved 43:20	life 42:21	44:3,7
generally 20:9 29:6		irregular 8:7	limitations 32:11	members 6:17 17:18
genetic 3:25	I	issue 8:21 9:20 17:2,17	limited 21:8	24:20 29:16
getting 38:17	l.e 31:23	40:2 42:2	line 16:1 35:10	mental 3:24
give 5:9 6:10 11:11 34:9	IATSE 8:16 18:4,6 29:3	issued 10:16 11:8 19:22	lines 32:9	mentioned 41:22
37:24	idea 39:2 40:21	issues 7:11 18:24 34:15	Lisa 2:3 3:15	merely 24:13
given 6:4 20:16 31:18	ideals 38:4	37:17	list 4:23 8:25 9:1,7,12	merit 24:5
gives 14:14 33:15	identify 39:9,25		10:2 11:21 12:10,11	messing 32:13
giving 34:10	identity 4:1	J	13:16 14:1,17 15:11	methods 40:16
glad 34:11	Iglesias 2:4 3:14	jail 33:23	16:17,24 20:20 21:20	microphone 6:7
Glendale 1:21	ignores 18:24	job 14:8,20 23:7,15 24:1	22:14,15 23:10,18,20	military 4:2
Glenn 33:20	immediate 33:12	24:2 26:19,21,24 27:4	23:21,21,22,22 24:7,9	minors 8:8
GLENN-LEISTIKOW	immediately 33:6 37:12	31:21,22 36:7,14	24:10,15,16,18,22	mitigating 41:7,9
2:11	impermissible 34:20	40:10 41:8 43:3	25:4,4,10,14 26:2,9,10 26:12,14,15 27:18,20	model 15:6 Monday 26:13
GLENN-LEISTOKOW	36:11 40:17 41:5	jobs 7:25 23:8,11 26:8	28:1,1 29:20 30:17	months 20:12
33:19 43:25	impermissibly 34:24	31:12 33:24 35:18	31:24 32:3,5,7,9,11	morning 8:6,11 9:16
go 13:24 25:20 30:2,6	implication 23:10	joining 3:13	33:11 35:21 36:1,2,20	26:5 32:14
34:18 40:25 44:21	implications 35:11	Joseph 2:3 3:14	listing 41:12	morning's 44:2
goes 14:17 24:9	implied 16:22	Junipero 1:14	lists 16:15 29:8 35:19,20	motion 6:21 7:4 8:2 9:5
going 6:18 15:18 16:1	implies 31:2		litigation 38:15	13:7 17:20
24:10 25:7 29:6,14,22	importance 18:23	К	little 10:11 12:25 14:3	movie 6:25
36:2	important 12:20 34:13	keep 9:7 37:4	39:15 41:23 42:7	Moving 17:22
good 9:4 33:15,19	37:17 39:6	kept 32:7	live 12:15 15:1	MPAA 6:23 7:10
Google 40:25 41:2	impossible 18:17	Kevin 2:5 3:16	local 8:17,17,20 10:12	multi-employer 7:5
Government 19:9 20:4	impractical 20:15 improve 33:25	kids 13:8	10:25 11:3,18 17:21	multiple 20:10
22:1	include 16:1 21:22 40:11	kind 24:5 29:6,22 30:9	18:1,3 20:2 29:2 32:18	
great 18:25 19:23	included 42:20	30:17	41:21 42:1	N
guess 16:25 28:20 29:9	including 10:15 11:7	Kish 2:5 3:16 29:24 30:9	located 5:5	name 6:9,17 17:18 26:1
29:22 32:1,4 guidance 41:21	41:14	30:14	location 36:12	33:20 45:14
guidelines 41:13,18 42:2	incorrectly 43:17	know 10:6,19 12:16 13:8	logically 39:3	narrow 7:15 37:16
42:5,19	increase 33:24	13:23 14:14,25 15:24	long 41:2	national 3:23
42.0,19	indicate 40:7	16:1,9,11,13,14,18	long-term 26:25	nature 18:18 21:1 31:5
Н	indicates 10:20	17:1 24:8 25:3 26:12	look 33:16 41:10 44:17	NBC 7:8
	individual 14:4 18:14	26:23 29:7 31:4,6 32:22 35:6 37:2 40:3	Los 1:17 3:1 5:5,6 11:16	necessarily 15:12
habit 43:1	25:1 26:17 27:18	41:2 42:19 44:8	11:17,18,23 42:6	necessity 36:6
hand 19:23 20:2 harassment 3:22	38:15,19	knowing 14:12	lot 14:19 15:19 16:9 24:4	need 16:25 19:4 21:10
hard 38:17,18	individualized 18:14	kilowing 14.12		26:4 27:20 32:19
harder 19:2	38:9,13,25 39:5,7		M	39:25 42:5 44:18
health 7:18 12:23 19:13	41:16 42:11		mail 5:4	needed 21:6
hear 6:13 8:18 34:11	individually 12:21	L-e-i-s-t-i-k-o-w 33:21 label 16:14	maintain 29:8,20 37:14	needs 44:8
hearing 1:4 3:6,11 4:17	individuals 4:22 16:16	laborer 16:14	maintained 9:1	negative 9:12 18:13
4:18 5:22,24 6:1 44:2	28:12,13,21,23 29:15	language 16:4 18:3	major 8:3	31:15,15 38:18
44:13,21	industry 7:16 8:2 9:5	32:21 39:23 40:19,20	majority 35:13	negotiating 29:15
heavily 37:11	19:3,16 20:23 25:22	42:10	Mandelbaum 2:2 3:4,13	never 23:11 34:22
help 6:11 11:17	informal 40:16 41:3	languages 43:7	17:1,5,15 22:3 24:3	new 1:6,12 3:7,9,19 18:4
helping 18:20	information 3:25 21:16	large 20:4	33:14 43:24 44:1,6,9	44:14,16
helps 33:23	28:14 34:21 37:11	last-minute 26:8,21 27:4	Marceline 1:23 45:3,19	nexus 36:6,14
high 36:24	39:10,12,20,25 40:4,8	law 9:21 10:13,22,25	marital 3:25	nice 6:11
highlight 34:16	40:17 41:13,15	11:3,15,19 22:9,14	materials 4:8,12	night 8:6 36:12
hire 24:21 36:19 40:24	initial 1:9 4:9 27:16	26:22 29:12 30:20,24	mean 13:20 14:20 15:23	Noble 1:23 45:3,19
hired 18:15 21:6 24:23	28:18 29:9 43:11	31:3 35:5,23 36:23	30:19 31:9 32:24	nonprofit 33:22
36:25	input 16:19 inguiring 40:10	39:6,14,21 40:2,15	meaning 43:22	nonunion 23:15,16,19 23:22 28:13
hiring 20:22 24:25 41:22	inquiry 16:23 28:20	42:1 43:17	means 13:21 20:8 38:13 mechanism 14:7	noon 9:16
42:12,19	inserting 43:5	laws 37:9 41:22	medical 3:24 15:23	North 1:21
history 1:5,11 3:8,18	insertion 43:7,13	layer 33:10	meeting 1:2 3:11 43:20	notice 1:2,8 4:9,12,19,24
7:13 9:13 10:14 11:5	integrity 43:21	leading 6:24	45:7,8,11	noticed 4:18,21 34:17
29:11 39:10,13,17,23	intent 35:23 36:23	Leave 1:6,12 3:9,19	Melissa 2:10 6:18,21	number 21:8 34:5 35:16
40:7,11,13 44:15	interfering 33:2	44:16	31:7	36:24
hold 7:20,24 19:21	intermittent 18:18 21:1	leaving 24:7	member 2:2,3,3,4,4 3:16	
holding 4:17	internal 28:7	legal 19:12 43:22	7:7,10 11:24 12:2,7,12	0
			,	

		1 00 00		
o'clock 8:5,6,9 9:15,15	people 7:16 15:20 22:14	presumed 38:23	qualified 19:25 21:9	removal 21:19
9:16 15:7	22:15 25:25 30:2,17	presumption 38:8,21	question 11:25 22:5	removed 32:6
obligation 12:17	31:21,24 32:15 33:23	pretty 20:21 41:2	24:4 30:4 44:3,7	renewal 12:15
obtain 39:12	35:16,17,22 36:5,17	previous 24:24 34:13	questions 16:9,12 17:10	report 8:10 9:15,17
obviously 33:2	36:20 37:13,21 40:23	principle 41:25	18:2 24:5 38:1	13:20,23 15:12 39:13
offense 33:6	42:1,3,14	principles 8:21,22	quick 41:1	39:17.23 40:7
offenses 19:20	perform 27:15	prior 20:20	quite 16:15	reported 1:23 37:12 45:9
offer 8:14 9:22 10:3,4	performed 14:13 27:19	Priority 20:22	4	reporter 5:23 6:10,20
14:18,25 15:4,9,10	30:16 32:6 40:12	prisons 33:23	R	44:5 45:4
20:19 27:16 28:18	performers 7:18 19:14	private 20:6 30:21,25		REPORTER'S 45:1
		•	race 3:22	
31:2 34:14 35:7,9,21	21:10	probably 14:4	raised 17:2 34:8 37:18	REPORTERS 1:20
39:11 40:11,18	performs 9:4	problem 30:23 32:2	raising 17:16	representation 7:3
offered 13:17 15:2 23:7	period 5:16	problems 18:22 19:6	reached 12:18	representative 17:19
office 5:5 26:11,14,24	periodically 9:11	procedure 21:17,23,25	read 22:9	represented 20:17
official 5:25	permissible 39:19	31:2,14,23	ready 3:5	represents 8:18 12:19
oh 40:6	permitted 43:4	process 4:18 8:15,24 9:9	real 41:1	request 42:9 43:15
okay 12:12 17:11 31:4	permitting 43:16,19	10:18,22 11:20,20	really 7:12,15 8:12 15:15	requesting 11:10
40:25 44:9,12	person 6:5,5 26:15	12:3 13:2,25 16:13		requests 38:5
once 8:13 13:16 15:10	27:15	17:9 25:6 33:5	29:21 31:19	require 11:1 19:18 28:6
ongoing 12:17 37:3	person's 33:8	producer 9:14,17 13:21	reason 15:15 30:20	30:20 32:15 33:12
online 40:12	personnel 15:24	producers 6:24 7:4,6 9:9	31:22 39:22	required 10:13,25 21:3
		•	reasons 1:9 4:10,13 5:21	
onset 7:17	perspective 29:25	13:10 25:2	21:21	22:13 24:21 25:22
opening 15:23	pertaining 19:16	production 8:3,3,7,8	reassurance 30:18	26:22 30:6,11 35:25
Opportunities 33:22	perversion 36:22	13:7,19 20:5,8,10,19	rebut 38:24	39:9 42:1
opportunity 5:15 6:14	photographer 26:20	25:2 26:18,20 27:7,11	rebuttable 38:8,21	requirements 19:9 20:16
8:12 18:13 19:1 22:23	physical 3:24	27:14 29:17 31:7,9,10	receive 5:13	21:25 27:1 42:10
28:13	picture 6:22 7:4 8:2 9:5	productions 23:16 25:1	received 5:19	requiring 10:16 11:8
opposed 32:12,19	13:7 17:22	26:14,16	recidivism 33:24	residential 36:10
oral 34:2	Pictures 7:9,9 17:20	prohibits 3:22		respond 18:13 28:14
order 7:24 12:4 16:16	place 30:6,16 45:8	projects 26:25	recognition 15:17	31:14 34:7
27:17,20 30:5 32:21	placed 14:1 27:25 36:22	promote 38:4	recognize 10:18 12:16	responded 5:20
			recommend 11:6	-
ordinance 11:23	placement 20:20 32:5	promotion 42:12,17,22	recommending 11:10	response 5:14
ordinances 42:2	places 36:9	proof 25:18,19	record 3:5 5:21,25 27:8	responses 21:15
ordinary 6:3	platforms 6:25	properly 40:3	44:21,22 45:11	responsibilities 19:24
organization 9:1	please 5:10 6:8 44:19	proposal 18:11 22:7	recorded 38:10	responsibility 19:12
orientation 4:2	Pleased 17:25	41:25	records 35:14	responsible 12:22,23
origin 3:23	point 11:14 13:15 15:9	proposed 1:4,8,10 3:20	redress 39:3	restrict 11:4
Ortiz 2:3 3:15 16:12	16:7 40:14 43:17	4.3,6,11,14 18:1,3	reduce 33:24	result 18:13
17:16 27:12 28:15,20	pointing 37:7	34:2 40:20 43:7 44:14	reference 11:15 35:7	reviewing 33:16
29:5,18	points 37:5,6 38:5 42:16	protection 21:18,24 33:1		rewriting 32:15
outside 42:15	42:21	protections 19:4 32:10	references 16:4	right 3:4 17:8 26:16
overlay 9:21 37:8	policies 22:25	protocol 18:16 21:19	referring 28:17	27:15,21 28:18 32:13
overlay 9.21 57.0			reflected 4:7,10	
	population 36:4	prove 38:18,19	regard 10:21 41:21	33:8,9 36:3 38:17
P	populations 37:15	provide 5:16 7:18 11:13	regarding 1:5,11 3:6,18	40:22
P-a-t- 6:18	portion 44:20	11:21 18:8 19:3,5	44:14	Rights 1:5,12 3:9,19
p.m 3:2 5:1,11 44:18,22	position 10:12,15,24	21:14 25:18,19 38:22	Register 4:20	44:15
page 4:15,23	11:8 13:17,19 15:2	39:16 41:20	regular 19:25	room 1:15 4:7
PAGES 1:25	16:20 22:19 24:18	provided 21:11 37:25	regulated 37:11	roster 20:21 23:6 24:19
Paramount 7:9 14:7,9	positions 24:23	provides 18:12 21:23	regulation 7:14 15:22	25:5 30:17
parent 1:6,12 3:9,19	possess 19:17	39:15	19:7 23:2	rosters 36:20
28:3 44:16	possibility 32:1	providing 13:9,10 41:6	regulations 1:4,10 3:7	round 5:14
	post 14:18,25 15:4	provision 7:13		rubric 16:23 29:11
part 4:17 5:21,24 7:15	posting 4:23	provisions 3:7 39:6	3:20 4:3,4,11,14 9:22	rulemaking 1:8 4:18
20:5 34:6	potential 35:11 36:14	public 1:4 3:5,17 5:15	11:15 18:5 19:11	5:21.25 18:1
particular 8:14 10:3	37:4 39:3	•	21:22 34:3 38:2,6	run 8:4 15:18 29:1
15:22 30:2 36:3,11		6:16 14:18 33:24 44:1	39:14,21 40:15 41:5	Tuli 0.4 15.16 29.1
37:21 42:18	potentially 10:10 21:14	44:4,13	41:20 42:15 44:14	l —
particularly 6:4	35:15,22 40:5	published 4:20	Regulatory 4:19	S
parties 9:9	pre 15:3	purpose 18:10,21	rehabilitation 41:8,17	S-a-r-a-h 33:20
Partners 27:10	precautionary 13:13	purposes 11:4 28:7	reinsert 42:9	safety 7:18 12:23 13:11
partnership 11:18	preemployment 16:23	Pursuant 4:24	rejected 17:6	19:13 25:21 33:24
passed 19:2 34:6	20:14 23:3	put 10:19 12:9 26:2 36:1	relate 42:2	San 42:6
•	preliminary 36:19	36:20 41:13		San 42.6 Sarah 2:11 33:20
passing 24:8	premature 10:19	putting 15:21 22:14	related 36:15	
Patack 2:10 6:17,18,21	preoffer 14:18 18:11	Patting 10.21 22.17	relates 3:21	satisfies 21:25
6:21 12:1,6,11,13	•	<u> </u>	relay 34:20	saying 6:12 32:4,25
13:18 14:2,22 15:5,15	present 17:25 34:2	Q	relevant 34:14	says 10:11,23 26:4 27:19
16:3 17:4,8	presentation 10:5	quagmire 33:16	religious 3:23	39:23 43:9
payroll 27:9,14	presented 34:12	qualifications 24:13	rely 14:22	scheduling 8:3
pays 9:3 27:5	presents 16:9	25:13,14	remember 5:10 13:19	scheme 22:6
· ·	1			1

	•		•	•
school 13:9 14:22 20:6	speakers 2:9 34:13	suspenders 13:1	45:12	want 12:2 26:25 32:9
30:21,21,24	speaks 6:5	suspension 33:12	timely 33:11	34:14,16,25 37:4,7,8
schools 20:6 30:20,25	specific 15:12 29:19	sworn 6:8	times 34:20	37:18,24 41:4
Schur 2:2 3:14 11:24	30:24 42:24	system 21:12	Title 4:4 41:14	wanted 37:23 42:22
12:2,7,12 22:4 23:9	specifically 41:15 42:20	ojotom 2 m 2	today 4:25 5:1,9,11,12	wants 14:10
27:5 31:17 32:8,24	43:5	Т	5:18 7:2 15:7 18:10	Warner 7:9 14:8,10
35:3	specify 39:21		34:7,10 44:18	warranted 13:14
screen 4:15 22:13 36:5	spelled 32:23	tactical 31:22	tomorrow 15:8 26:4,11	wasn't 17:5 39:17 40:2
screening 13:25 20:14	spelling 6:9	take 3:17 20:25 24:2	tools 36:19	way 8:4 9:14 15:25 21:22
22:16 23:12 36:19	Sperber 2:6 5:4,9	taken 45:7,11	top 30:22	35:4 37:12 38:3 39:14
searches 40:12	staffing 34:18 35:12,18	talk 7:12	totally 22:7 32:12	40:4
second 28:6 44:20		tasks 9:6	trade 6:23 7:3	-
section 3:10 19:9 20:4	35:24 36:8,16,17,25	teach 20:9	transcribed 5:22 6:1	ways 37:16 41:16 we'll 4:25 5:18 6:13
	Stage 8:17 17:22	teacher 7:21,23 8:8,14	45:10	
22:1 43:6,16 sections 4:4 11:12	stakeholders 4:22	9:18 10:5,6,17 11:9	transcript 1:7 5:23 6:12	33:16 34:9 we're 4:17 6:23 11:10,10
	stamp 10:20	15:8 16:5 19:5,19 20:1		
see 10:4	start 6:8,16 7:11 35:20	21:1,11,18 24:2 25:17	true 45:11	13:7,8,9 15:22 38:2,3
selection 24:6,16	state 10:12,25 11:2 12:5	26:1,17,21 27:3 30:5	trust 9:2,3 28:24	39:24 42:13 43:2,10
send 26:5 36:9	25:16 26:22 37:23	33:7	trying 14:16 15:2 31:17	43:14
sense 14:17 15:3 33:15	45:4	teacher's 8:10 20:11	two 10:9,9 19:17 23:23	we've 16:19
sensitive 33:3	state's 16:20	teachers 7:19,20,24 8:18	25:18 27:13 34:12	web 4:15,23
sent 4:21 26:24	statement 1:9 4:9,13	8:25 9:11 11:2 12:9,19	44:16	Wednesday 1:18 3:1
sentence 43:8,21	5:20 34:10	12:20 13:4,11 14:20	type 15:22 16:8	26:13
separate 23:20,21 25:21	States 17:23	18:18,23,25,25 19:8	typewriting 45:10	week 14:8,8,11 26:13
26:9,9 30:22 31:10	status 3:25 4:2	19:12,17,21,23 20:3,7		31:8,9
separately 5:8	statute 17:7 18:22,24	20:9,17,21 21:4,8,9,14	U	weekly 26:12
Serra 1:14	19:2 29:25 32:10,17	21:24 23:6,14,16,17	ultimate 22:8 28:16	weeks 20:12
serve 23:11	33:1	23:18,19,22 24:24	unclear 42:14	welcome 3:10
services 7:1 9:2,3 11:21	statutes 44:17	25:3 26:10,15 30:24	unconventional 13:8	welfare 7:19 12:24 17:20
13:3 14:12 15:16	statutory 20:3 21:19,25	Teaches 17:20	uncover 40:12	West 5:5
22:20 23:4 25:23	stenographically 45:9	teaching 12:22 19:17	undergo 7:25 11:2 35:25	WHEREOF 45:14
27:24 28:11,24 30:16	streaming 7:1	37:10	undergone 14:9	wishing 6:14
31:13	street 1:16 5:6 36:12	technical 6:4 41:23	understand 12:3,16 13:6	WITNESS 45:14
set 19:9 45:8	stricter 42:5	42:24	15:13 22:6 23:9 37:6	wonder 29:12
sets 8:4	strongly 12:18	Technicians 17:22	42:18	wondering 16:19 22:11
setting 12:21	studio 7:19 8:18 13:10	television 7:4 9:5	understanding 13:2 31:5	word 43:5,13,15,19,21
sex 3:25	17:20 18:18,23,25,25	tentatively 22:14 31:24	35:4 41:9	wording 42:7
sexual 4:1	19:4,7,12,17,18,21,23	term 20:9,12 25:5	Unfortunately 18:16	words 10:15
shared 7:7	20:3,7,9,11,17,21 21:1	termination 42:13,17,22	union 8:17 9:10 12:19	work 8:6,10 14:7 15:8
short 15:17 20:9,12	21:3,7,9,11,14,18,24	terms 6:4 17:6 22:9	18:4 20:17 23:13,14	20:7,10 21:8 24:1
Shorthand 45:3	23:6,14,16,18,19,22	territories 17:23	24:1,2 27:19,19,25	25:16 27:15 31:6,7,8
show 35:15 38:14 41:17	24:24 25:3,16 26:1,3	tested 16:16	28:12,21,22,23 29:14	31:10 36:16
showing 38:24	26:21 27:3 28:16	testifies 5:12	29:19 31:21	worked 11:16 13:14 21:4
shows 31:15 33:9	studio's 24:10	testify 6:7,14	unions 16:15 29:7 35:12	24:24 34:6 37:15
sic 20:25 32:12	studios 27:23	testimony 3:18 4:25 6:13	35:18	Workers 17:20
Signatory 20:22	subcommittee 44:8	thank 6:20 17:13,15,16	United 17:23	working 7:17 9:18 10:8
significant 23:12	subheading 43:16	22:2,3 33:18 34:1	Universal 7:8	12:20,21 13:11
similar 40:14	subject 20:3 21:13 23:17	43:24,25 44:12	urge 34:25 37:4,18	worlds 19:13
simply 40:19	31:24 39:4	thankful 38:2	use 23:16 28:4 36:18	worried 42:13
single 20:10	subjected 15:1	theaters 7:1	40:6	wouldn't 29:10,10
singling 16:8	submit 5:3,11 17:12	Theatrical 8:16 17:21	usually 24:25 25:1 26:7	wrapping 43:2
singular 18:24	submits 5:12	thing 33:4	26:8 27:3,9	write 39:22
sister 7:3	submitted 5:8 17:11	think 10:9,14 13:13 14:2	20.0 21.0,0	writing 37:19 38:11,22
situation 37:22 39:4	44:18	14:13 22:7,7 24:3 28:9	v	written 4:25 5:2,7,13,19
slated 4:3	submitting 34:4	29:5,13 30:1 32:16,18		5:24 33:16 34:4,10
slightly 8:21	subscribed 45:14	33:15 40:5,25 43:2	valid 37:6	39:15,16 40:4 41:11
slower 6:2	subsection 18:5	thinking 29:6 37:4	value 30:15	41:24 42:25 43:8,18
slowly 6:2	subsections 19:10	Third 1:21	vast 35:16	44:17,18
small 43:13	substitute 14:20 23:21	THOMAS 2:6	verified 23:24 25:7	, -
solicited 16:19	28:1	thought 29:9	veteran 4:2	X
somebody 14:7 26:4,5	Sue 38:17	thousands 4:21 36:17	view 20:2	
32:14 34:23 35:8 40:1	suggest 41:6		views 17:25	
Sony 7:9	suggested 16:4 18:3	thread 24:4	VIII 1:4	<u> </u>
sorry 4:11 36:25 43:1	suggesting 32:7	three 35:13 Thursday 26:13	vulnerable 36:3 37:15	year 17:9 20:10 21:15
44:6	summarizes 43:17	Thursday 26:13		36:17
sort 27:2	summary 34:9 37:24	Tim 2:4 3:14	W	years 19:14
sorts 37:21	supervision 21:10	time 6:5 8:2 9:16,17	W 1:16	yesterday 18:7
source 39:9,25 40:3,8	sure 12:1,3 28:2 32:19	13:21,21 14:21 15:12	wait 44:4	
speak 6:2,7 14:3 29:12	37:13,23	15:17,18 17:13 23:8	waiting 32:3	Z
		33:2 34:1 39:19 45:8	-	

0		
1		
1 1:25 19:10 34:16 38:7 10 36:9,21		
1008 18:11 34:6 38:4		
10th 5:6		
11:40 3:2 11017.1 4:5		
11087 4:5		
12:36 3:2 44:22 12952 19:9 20:4 22:1		
12952 19.9 20.4 22.1 12th 45:15		
15-day 5:16		
16 19:14 16th 4:20		
10(114.20		
2		
2 4:4 39:8		
2-C 43:6 2017 42:19		
2018 1:18 3:1 4:20 5:1		
45:15		
288-3376 1:22		
3		
3024 1:23 45:19		
320 5:5 328 1:16		
320 1.10		
4		
4 1:18 3:1 19:10 41:6		
45 1:25 45-days 4:19		
4th 1:16 5:1,6		
5 5 5:1,11 8:6,9 9:15 15:7		
41:19 44:18		
5:00 14:19		
500 1:21		
6		
6-6-18 1:7		
7 7 41:14		
/ -+1.14		
8		
8 8:10 9:15,16 15:8 26:4		
32:14 800 1:22		
884 8:17 11:18 17:21		
18:1,3 29:2		
884's 20:2		
9		
9 8:5		
9:00 14:19 90013 5:6		
91203 1:21		
97 4:5		