

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
TEXAS WORKFORCE COMMISSION
AUSTIN, TEXAS

PUBLIC MEETING)
FOR THE TEXAS)
WORKFORCE COMMISSION)

JOBS AND EDUCATION FOR TEXANS (JET)
ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 6th, 2018

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT at 1:45 p.m. on
Tuesday, the 6th day of February, 2018, the above-entitled
matter came on for hearing at the Texas Workforce
Commission, TWC Building, 101 East 15th Street, Room 244,
Austin, Texas, before ANDRES ALCANTAR, Chairman; JULIAN
ALVAREZ and RUTH R. HUGHS, Commissioners

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PAGE

PROCEEDINGS, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2018

AGENDA ITEM NO. 13
CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR

AGENDA ITEM NO. 24
EMILY CLODFELTER

AGENDA ITEM NO. 37
AARON DEMERSON

AGENDA ITEM NO. 411
AARON DEMERSON

AGENDA ITEM NO. 581
CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR

AGENDA ITEM NO. 684
CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 85

P R O C E E D I N G S

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2018

(1:45 p.m.)

AGENDA ITEM NO. 1

CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Good afternoon, everyone.
I'd like to call this meeting to order. Emily, Roll Call?

MS. CLODFELTER: Chairman, Andres Alcantar?

CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Here.

MS. CLODFELTER: Doctor David Gardner?

MR. GARDNER: Here.

MS. CLODFELTER: Scott Norman?

MR. NORMAN: Here.

MS. CLODFELTER: Steve Lecholop? Tony
Fidelie?

MR. FIDELIE: Here.

MS. CLODFELTER: And, Mario Lozoya?

MR. LOZOYA: Here.

MS. CLODFELTER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Very briefly, we have a
new member. Scott, do you want to introduce yourself to the
new folks here?

MR. NORMAN: Yes, my name is Scott Norman,
I'm the Executive Director of the Texas Association of
Builders, which is the statewide homebuilder, remodeler,

1 developer and associate (indiscernible) trade association,
2 with about 10,000, member companies around the state.
3 There's 27 local homebuilder associations. Obviously, what
4 this JET board does, is very important to us. Workforce
5 issues is the, along with water availability probably two
6 big limiting factors on our industry, and housing, moving
7 forward. So, it's something we've been focusing on for some
8 time, and I'm just glad to be a part of this and see how I
9 can contribute.

10 CHAIRMAN ALVAREZ: Well, thank you. We're
11 really proud to have you as a member of this Advisory Board.
12 You're joining a strong team. The individuals serving on
13 this board; really proud of the work that they're doing, and
14 the bring a lot of effort and some good ideas into it. I'm
15 sure you'll add to the overall equation.

16 AGENDA ITEM NO. 2

17 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: We're moving onto public
18 comments. We do -- do we have any public comments?

19 MS. CLODFELTER: No, sir, we do not.

20 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: At this moment, I'd like
21 to recogni -- recognize Commissioner Ruth Hughs. The
22 commissioner representing employers, to share some opening
23 comments.

24 COMM. HUGHS: Thank you, Chairman. I'm very
25 grateful to just get to be here today for the first JET

1 meeting; and to welcome all of you and thank you for the
2 work that you do here. We know that you take time out of
3 your regular routine and schedules to contribute your
4 talents to the group. And, I can tell you, having gone to
5 JET presentations in San Diego, (indiscernible), Laredo,
6 that we really see the impact that it has on these
7 communities, in terms of capacity building, and having the
8 ability to provide the equipment to their students; to
9 really help them for future careers. So, I want to thank
10 you all for that. Scott, thank you so much for agreeing to
11 join. If anyone listened to any kind of radio or broadcast
12 after Harvey, you probably heard Scott, because he worked
13 tirelessly after the storm, in addressing all the needs of
14 his members. And, it was just an overwhelming need, and
15 it's an industry that already was needing more assistance,
16 and more pathways towards those -- towards guiding students
17 in that direction. So, we're really excited that you're
18 serving. I also want to welcome Anissa (ph), and thank her
19 for joining us here today, and for learning more about what
20 JET does. Maybe she can later share her views on that.
21 With that, I'll turn it over to Commissioner Alvarez.

22 CHAIRMAN ALCANTER: Commissioner Alvarez
23 representing labor.

24 COMM. ALVAREZ: I'm the Commissioner here
25 representing labor, welcome aboard.

1 MR. NORMAN: Thank you.

2 COMM. ALVAREZ: So, you join a great group of
3 Board members; very energetic. Great things came off of the
4 first and second phase of our JET awards throughout the
5 state, so we welcome you. This past year, I had an
6 opportunity, like Commissioner Hughs, attend various events
7 where we not only present skills grants, but we also
8 presented JET grants. And, so I was joined by one of your
9 members, Mario Lozoya, in Harlingen, where we asked him to
10 say a few words. And, he did on behalf of the board. But,
11 one of the things that I found fascinating as we travelled
12 the state, was there was so much interest. Emily Clodfelter
13 and Aaron Demerson; part of the team, did a really good job
14 of marketing, with recommendations made by this board. So,
15 we look forward to your recommendations as well. And, so I
16 was so impressed with that, that we allowed members of the
17 WALMA (ph) team or Waco ISD, to be my super-session, where
18 we had opportunities for young adults to talk about the
19 importance of career technology, trade, P-TECH and all of
20 that. So, with that, I welcome you to being here. Welcome
21 higher ed, as well. My good friend David, here, and
22 (indiscernible) members. Thank you for allowing me to
23 participate.

24 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Thank you, Commissioner
25 Alvarez, and thank you Commissioner Hughs for your strong

1 support for this program. We really admire your leadership.
2 Now, with that, we'll get to the Agenda.

3 AGENDA ITEM NO. 3

4 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Aaron Demerson, good
5 afternoon. You're here to provide us an update; and
6 overview of the JET Program FY '16-17 JET grant Awards.
7 Thank you.

8 MR. DEMERSON: Let me see if this microphone
9 is working, but I'll talk loud, in case it's not. But,
10 again, thank you guys for the work that you've -- you've
11 done. This advisory board has been very important to us
12 here. The staff continues to be a heavy appetite for this
13 program; the JET Program. We've allocated about \$10,000,000
14 since it's come over from the Comptroller's office. And,
15 about \$45,000,000 in demand that's out there. So, we
16 continue to market the program. But, from the work that you
17 guys are doing when you go out and visit these communities;
18 it means a lot to them when you're out with the check
19 presentations; that they appreciate you being out there, in
20 a big, big way. So, we're going to allow Emily to come up
21 and talk about some of the updates; the legislative updates
22 that have happened over the sessions, and we'll move forward
23 with the agenda. So, I'll turn it over to Emily.

24 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Emily before you get into
25 it; for the record, we have one of our members, Steve who is

1 not with us currently. Unfortunately, he has come down with
2 the dreaded flu, and he sends his regards and regrets that
3 he's not able to join on these important discussions.
4 Please move forward.

5 MS. CLODFELTER: Thank you, Chairman. So,
6 since we had last met, just wanted to give a brief overview.
7 Since the program goals and statutory requirements for the
8 program have stayed the same. We're still providing grants
9 to purchase and install equipment necessary for the
10 development of CTE Courses and programs that lead to a
11 license certificate of post-secondary degree, in a high
12 demand occupation. During the 80th legislative session in
13 2017, there was one Bill that passed that does affect the
14 JET grant Program. House Bill 2431, which you will find
15 behind Tab 3, is -- allows and includes the public state
16 colleges as eligible offers. Which, public state colleges
17 would be the Lamar State College, Orange; and Lamar State
18 College, Port Arthur. So, two new eligible offers for the
19 JET grant Program. So, Aaron and I also wanted to give you
20 an overview and highlight the past biennium, in the past two
21 rounds that have happened in the JET grant Program, and the
22 \$10,000,000 that has been awarded. So, behind Tab 4, you
23 will see is their mission of proposal summary; which just
24 talks about the proposals received, versus what was awarded,
25 not to mention, for the \$10,000,000 that we had available,

1 we received about \$45,000,000 worth of proposals. Behind
2 that page, is again a refresher -- a reminder of the grants
3 that were awarded, to which institutions, the grant balance,
4 as well as the occupations. And, then behind those four
5 pages, I wanted to show you a map, which we have our
6 Workforce Development areas that contains the community
7 colleges receiving grants, as well as the ISD's. To give
8 you an idea of the spread, over -- around the state where
9 these grants have -- have gone. And, I also wanted to show
10 a couple quick videos just to -- we mentioned check
11 presentations, that we have done for these grants. And, one
12 school, in particular, has decided to do some YouTube
13 videos, actually, about their grants. Harlingen ISD
14 received a JET grant for their auto tech course, and they
15 did a video right when they got the grants about they wanted
16 to do, how excited they were and how they plan on using the
17 funds. Well, then they did the second video after they had
18 received the funds and after the equipment was installed,
19 and just how excited they were about what they were getting
20 to do. So, I wanted to go ahead and play -- we'll get this
21 started.

22 (VIDEO PLAYED)

23 MS. CLODFELTER: This was made by the
24 students at Harlingen ISD. And, so the second video, as
25 Commissioner Alvarez mentioned, a ribbon cutting at

1 Harlingen ISD; they actually played this video while they
2 were there. So, Mario, you explain this video. So, this is
3 a video that they -- after they had received --

4 (VIDEO PLAYED)

5 MS. CLODFELTER: So, this is one of -- one of
6 fifty-one grants that has been awarded. So, this is one
7 story of the fifty-one stories that we have. And, so just
8 wanted to give a little snap shot of -- you know we see it
9 on paper; which we can read what the grants are and what
10 they're going towards. But, it's about those kids, and
11 getting to see how excited they are; that's where these
12 check presentations that we always send the agendas for, are
13 so vital to these grants. Because we really get to
14 celebrate. Not only do the grants, the equipment, the
15 awards, but celebrate these students and what they're
16 getting to do, and the opportunities that they get to have;
17 because of these grants. So, we are excited that during
18 this legislative session, we were allocated another
19 \$2,000,000. So, \$5,000,000 per fiscal year. So, \$5,000,000
20 for FY '18, and \$5,000,000 for FY '19. So, we've only --
21 you know, we've had two rounds. We've allocated
22 \$10,000,000. I'm excited to see where this next \$10,000,000
23 could be -- so that is FY '16 and '17 update.

24 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Great.

25 AGENDA ITEM NO. 4

1 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Item 4, Discussion,
2 Consideration and Possible Action and Program Parameters for
3 JET grants to Public Community Colleges, Public Technical
4 Institutes, which is New. Public state colleges in the
5 school districts. We have Aaron Demerson. And, this is
6 where we actually have discussion.

7 MR. DEMERSON: Good, so let me draw your
8 attention to Tab 5. On Tab 5 we are going to talk about
9 taking action on three items today. I'd like you guys to
10 take action on three items today. One to be the allocation
11 of funds. The next is going to be the minimum and maximum
12 rent amount. And, then an overview of the RFA timelines.
13 And, Carol from our contracts team will come to the board as
14 well. So, the first item deals with funding allocations.

15 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Aaron before you go too
16 far, for the benefit of our new board member, for the
17 record, could you go over the -- some of the criteria that
18 we, that we've had in place in terms of the awards?

19 MS. CLODFELTER: The evaluation criteria?

20 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Yes, just as a reminder
21 for everyone.

22 MS. CLODFELTER: Absolutely. So, for the
23 proposals and applications that come in, there is a two-part
24 scoring; one part is that actual proposal which we take into
25 consideration the number of possible grants -- JET grants

1 that have been awarded to the institution, property wealth
2 rate for community colleges, the TEA economically
3 disadvantaged rate. We look at unemployment Rate. We look
4 at industry involvement. Letters of support from local
5 industry; whether that's your local EDC, local businesses;
6 and then we also look at -- a second part is the economic
7 impact section, which we look at the wage impact. Taking
8 that occupation, that entry-level, wage, that occupation in
9 that Workforce Development Board area, minus and entry-level
10 high school age. And, multiplied by the number of
11 students. And, then we also look at poverty -- the poverty
12 level, for TE -- by TEA, per ISD. We are also looking at
13 the ISD type, per TEA. Which is -- they're classified as a
14 rural ISD, an urban ISD, suburban ISD. And, so we look at
15 several factors like those when we're calculating and -- and
16 evaluating these proposals.

17 MR. NORMAN: Translate down in the school
18 works, I guess?

19 MS. CLODFELTER: Absolutely. And then they're
20 ranked according to those scores; on a 100-point scale.

21 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: And per the Advisory
22 Committee, there's a focus on the demand for those
23 occupations that are (indiscernible).

24 MS. CLODFELTER: Yes, and we, so, speaking of
25 the program goal and how we focus on high demand

1 occupations; we rely on our 28 local Workforce Development
2 Boards to tell us what those high demand occupations are in
3 the Region. And, those boards sign-off when a -- when an
4 ISD or colleges is submitting their proposal; those -- those
5 boards sign-off, if there's a yes. This occupation that
6 they're applying in there is high demand in this Region.

7 MR. TEMPLE: And, Emily, could you recap the
8 response we had from the first to the second; we did have
9 incredible response the second time the board had asked to
10 do an outreach. But, if it's very competitive we get a --
11 it's really growing in popularity.

12 MS. COLDFELTER: Absolutely. So, again those
13 are the top four; that proposal summary. So, the first
14 round we'll call it; the RTF was issued in May of 2016, May
15 of 2016. And, during that time, as you can see, 59 ISD's
16 were both 59 proposals for ISD's and 42 for community
17 colleges were received. Between the first round and the
18 second round, per the Advisory Board, they asked us to
19 outreach to ISD's. So, this program is very new to ISD's,
20 so we wanted to get the word out there. So, we not only sent
21 -- we sent a letter from all three commissioners, to every
22 single ISD superintendent, and CTE director; to all twenty-
23 education service and their executive directors. Aaron and
24 I got on the road, had a tour of Texas. We were out there
25 speaking to everyone that we could. There was one-time I

1 got a phone call from a gentleman -- a superintendent out in
2 the Panhandle. And, he's like; I live West of the Middle of
3 Nowhere. He's like; I knew about -- and I've heard about
4 this grant from three different people who live -- from the
5 CFC Executive Director, from a letter. And, then from one
6 other something. He was so impressed, he was like; What is
7 this? Like what, I'm getting this from every single angle.
8 So, we really, really tried to get the word out to ISD's.
9 So, for the next round of grants, from the ISD's, we
10 received, as you can see thirty-one more proposals; from
11 ISD's. And, so -- and the -- calls --

12 MR. NORMAN: You told me -- you all told me
13 this when we visited on the phone, that ISD's were only
14 recently added --

15 MS. CLODFELTER: Yes, they were -- dur the --
16 during the 84th legislative session, where the program has
17 moved over to TWC -- that's when ISD's were included as
18 eligible offers. So, -- and it isn't -- we have not rested
19 on our laurels. We have still continued to speak about the
20 program everywhere we go, and you know, the calls and emails
21 we get are a constant from ISD's; still finding out about
22 the program, and still inquiring and still very, very
23 interested to know more about this JET grant Program. So,
24 we're excited to see the numbers grow.

25 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Thanks. Go ahead, Aaron.

1 MR. DEMERSON: Okay, good, again -- so I draw
2 your attention again to Tab 5, and we'll talk about the
3 funding -- about allocation. In the past we've had fiscal
4 year '16, 50 percent towards IT within school districts and
5 then 50 percent towards the community colleges. Board took
6 action fiscal year -- fiscal year '17, and we followed that
7 same that. And so, we're here today to seek the board's
8 direction in regards to fiscal year '18, and the funded
9 allocation for that -- the \$5,000,000 here.

10 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: And, you recommend --
11 and, what we're looking at is allocating to proportionately,
12 evenly 2.5 million both to ISD's and the other 2.5 million
13 to institutes of higher education?

14 MR. DEMERSON: That's the boards -- that's
15 what the board can decide and determine.

16 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: So, you -- do we have any
17 discussion on that? Mario?

18 MR. LOZOYA: Yes, sir. Thank you. I think
19 we can use this data that we looked at; that Emily just
20 mentioned. We started with 59 ISD's. We did some -- we did
21 some marketing, some work in putting the word out. We went
22 to 90 ISD's. That's a huge improvement; really commend you
23 for that. However, we know that there's 1200 total ISD's.
24 Is that -- is that correct?

25 MS. CLODFELTER: Yes.

1 MR. LOZOYA: And then when we look at
2 community colleges; remind me, is it 53?

3 MS. CLODFELTER: It's 53 college districts.

4 MR. GARDNER: 50 districts.

5 MR. LOZOYA: 50 districts.

6 MS. CLODFELTER: The two technical colleges,
7 and then now --

8 MR. LOZOYA: Total 55'ish.

9 MS. CLODFELTER: 54.

10 MR. LOZOYA: 54, right? And, when you look
11 at the number that applied; 42, that's a pretty good
12 percentage. Right? Consider that. Then, when you look at
13 the requested amounts; the ISD has doubled the requested
14 amounts, and we're not even close to hitting the surface of
15 the total amounts of ISD's available, right, 1200. So, I
16 think based with -- based on these numbers, I would
17 recommend going 75 ISD's, 25 community college. That's my
18 recommendation based on the data that we're seeing right
19 now.

20 MR. NORMAN: I guess in regard to that text,
21 and I was sitting here thinking about all the school
22 districts myself. But, one thing to bear in mind is say for
23 example, San Antonio. We have Alamo Community College
24 District, we have multiple school districts. And then, some
25 programs place at the community college if this board pushes

1 in this direction. Should be serving some of the programs
2 are serving that receive money for all those school
3 districts. And, so you have a similar thing in Houston.
4 So, I do think your point is still a good one. But, in some
5 parts of the state, there are no -- there are no community
6 colleges whatsoever. And so, I think -- I think -- I don't
7 disagree with what you're saying. I think there should be
8 at least a little latitude in the thinking --

9 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Sure.

10 MR. NORMAN: -- into thinking to take into
11 account where there's some grants maybe, at a community
12 college; maybe even serving multiple school districts. And,
13 I think at -- wherever possible -- then do -- this isn't
14 nearly enough money.

15 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Yeah.

16 MR. NORMAN: To serve the audience, at all.
17 We really need several times this amount of money.

18 MR. LOZOYA: I would add -- that's a really
19 good point. I would add, however, that similarly in ISD's,
20 I can speak to one particular ISD in San Antonio that has
21 like ten high schools. Right? And, hopefully they try to
22 collaborate somehow, some way. And, then I get the
23 pathways concept between middle school, high school,
24 community college, partnerships. I get that too. You know,
25 I'm just trying to -- I -- think the issue here we're --

1 we're dealing with an amount of dollars that maybe are not
2 fitting to this kind of demand. But, I just think we need
3 to rethink the 50/50, is my point.

4 MR. NORMAN: Could -- I don't recall -- we
5 don't give extra points for partnerships, do we? If not, I
6 think we ought to consider extra weight to where there are
7 community colleges, and multiple ISD's involved. Or, in the
8 example you guys came out --
9 in a school district where multiple high schools were
10 involved. So, at least a little additional weight to
11 potentially serve more students.

12 MS. CLODFELTER: So, history -- per statute
13 the ISD's do have to be in partnership with a community
14 college. That is a requirement. However, historically, we
15 have not given -- given any weight to ISD's that are
16 partnered together. They are allowed to collaborate, but we
17 have not given any additional points to that.

18 MR. NORMAN: Part of what I should have said
19 is for community colleges is if they're partnering with
20 multiple, a little additional weight, if they're partnering
21 with multiple ISD's. Not just the required amount, they
22 were setting in San Antonio is there --

23 CHAIR ALCANTAR: Sure.

24 MR. NORMAN: Alamo is partnered with ISD's.
25 That that might be more valuable.

1 MR. LOZOYA: I agree with that too. And, and
2 I'd love to go into that conversation, but I think this is
3 -- this is a little different. Because, I do have some
4 input on the scoring matrix.

5 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Well, let's continue on
6 the discussion in terms of the split. I -- Scott has a
7 comment real quick and then I'll add mine in.

8 MR. NORMAN: Two questions I have, to follow-
9 up what y'all were saying about collaboration. I'm going up
10 there Friday for another ribbon cutting under construction
11 program, this Friday. But, I think that's 17 school
12 districts collaborating on this. So, that's certainly -- and
13 that's just at ISD level, so that ought to merit additional
14 points as well, I think. But, new guy question. You know,
15 Mario, you were talking about the numbers that have applied.
16 You said there's 50 or 60 higher ed? So, the percentage of
17 those applying is vastly greater than the number of ISD --
18 the percentage of ISD's who are applying. And then this --
19 the -- the dreaded obvious thing that I guess coming out it;
20 there are advocates for both of these groups over, across
21 the street at the capital. So, are we opening a can of
22 worms when we should really be thinking about how we should
23 grow the entire pie, going forward? Would be my question.

24 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: I think those are great
25 comments. The reality is the legislature just expanded the

1 number of applicants, or the type of applicants that should
2 be available under the community colleges category, by
3 adding our technical skills to it. In other words, they
4 want us to continue to focus on our community colleges by
5 the addition of our technical schools. They do that with
6 the understanding that when we expanded the eligibility to
7 include ISD's, we were reducing the amount available to a
8 program that had -- that was perceived of having great
9 value. In other words, there was great value associated
10 with the JET Program as it currently was; with this specific
11 focus. With the expansion to ISD's, certainly they were
12 hoping to do some of what we've been able to accomplish. I
13 think when we look at this, there are valid points. I'm not
14 going to vote on a motion once we have one. I'm not voting
15 on these, but from my perspective I think you're right,
16 Scott. Focusing on growing pots; there are some real
17 advantages from our perspective. We work with both
18 institutions. Our community colleges and technical schools
19 deploy vast solutions for our companies. They do it for
20 these workers who are in dual credit college models; which
21 do involve direct partnerships with our ISD's. And, they do
22 it for our response to solutions to construction; to
23 manufacturing; to these different sectors from our economy.

24 So, as you consider the split, whether to
25 keep it at 50/50 or not, I do ask that you remember that the

1 legislature just added the technical schools. And, at the
2 time that we're adding technical schools to community
3 colleges, we need to consider whether or not we're reducing
4 unavailable; for that group that was intended to benefit
5 from that split. But, with that, we may have a motion,
6 unless there's further discussion Tony, and think we need to
7 follow-up on those comments.

8 MR. LOZOYA: I do. I wonder -- and I know
9 that we can't figure it out right now, but I wonder what's
10 the percentage of those 1200 ISD's that don't have a
11 community college down the street. You know, that are
12 nearby, that they can partner with, right? I think we
13 should consider that too.

14 MS. CLODFELTER: Well, Mario, that's
15 interesting. So, when we were speaking about the scoring I
16 did forget one in the proposal packet, one score, or one
17 question for the ISD's; is whether or not they have a --
18 their partnered community college has a physical location
19 within their county. So, they do receive more points if
20 that -- if they do not have a community college physically
21 located within their county. So, --

22 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: They also have a rule of
23 focus; that's with part of the scoring. So, we kind of
24 address it in terms of the criteria that this board adopted
25 last time.

1 MS. CLODFELTER: Doctor Gardner, following up
2 on your comment about collaboration; so, again we have
3 language in there for the ISD's to collaborate. The ISD's
4 are required to partner with their community college. The
5 community college is not required to partner with their
6 ISD's for the purpose of this program. But, is that
7 something you're interested in seeing how the community
8 colleges are partnering with the ISD's?

9 MR. GARDNER: Well, I think it would make
10 sense in terms of the discussion so far; would give perhaps
11 a little more extra weight, if that would encourage them to
12 do that. One of the problems that this whole program
13 addresses, is to provide equipment that's necessary, and to
14 keep them up to date. And, I think we can't necessarily
15 provide that in every high school. If you have something --
16 some location where the high schools in the area can -- all
17 their students can be benefitting, sometimes I think that
18 might be a single community college where multiple people
19 can take advantage, I think you can take -- the money
20 stretches further and you could potentially use that to
21 whatever, purchase more hours during the day. And, I know
22 that many of our higher education institutions tend to be
23 either focusing morning and the evening, or the afternoon
24 and the evening. And, there's time for many of the
25 facilities could use other times during the day, or on the

1 weekends. And, if we could encourage them to take advantage
2 of it -- that's -- I thought it was important, and so, this
3 is -- don't assume this is well thought out.

4 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Well, and I'd rather not
5 move forward to something that isn't well thought out, so --
6 but I do think that's a valid point.

7 MR. GARDNER: I think that's true with as
8 many people as possible, right? That's what were trying to
9 do -- as many school training opportunities as possible. I
10 think is the ultimate goal here. And, have the equipment
11 that is at least equivalent to what you'll find in industry.
12 There's many places where they're using equipment that's
13 out-of-date and we're training people to use equipment that
14 nobody in the industry is using anymore.

15 MR. FIDELIE: Does staff see any issue, or
16 with putting that in there? Say, if you're community
17 college and you're requesting -- you're needing preferential
18 treatment if you have school districts that are on your
19 side; if you will, or that you partnered with. I don't see
20 a downside to it, but it just all it does is incentivize
21 collaboration, right? And, it's like --

22 MR. GARDNER: When you consider the 50/50,
23 then, it would be easier to do that if you were encouraging
24 the them to work with more schools.

25 MR. NORMAN: Stretches those resources.

1 MR. GARDNER: Right, yeah.

2 MR. FIDELIE: School districts can use a
3 higher ed facility.

4 MR. NORMAN: And, so it's (indiscernible) the
5 school districts have to do with them, but the community
6 college (indiscernible) after that we encourage.

7 MR. FIDELIE: Because my additional thought
8 coming to the meeting was more in line with Mario. You've
9 got a thousand plus school districts in the State of Texas,
10 that are competing, and we're actively marketing to them to
11 apply more. And, then you have 50-ish of the higher
12 education, and you think, man, it seems disproportionate to
13 give them both same pot of money to work with. But, I
14 appreciate also the comments that the Chairman, regarding
15 what's the legislative intent? I mean, obviously, they've
16 amended it to now include two more public state colleges.

17 MR. NORMAN: The pots of money that the
18 school districts have available -- the different avenues for
19 funding, are much broader than higher education as well. I
20 mean this isn't the only -- seem to be related funding, that
21 the school districts have available.

22 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: As we heard yesterday,
23 during our discussions on internships, there are different
24 resources, there are different tax basis; if you look at a
25 college like Lynn, that has almost no taxable base; those

1 are issues to consider. They're -- the dollars, we're not
2 talking about a significant amount of money. 2.5 million
3 doesn't go very far, and so, that's the bottom line. So,
4 with that, do we have any further discussions?

5 MR. LOZOYA: Well I think if we're not going
6 to move on the 50/50, I think it makes sense then to ask if
7 there are college in partnership with any high schools.

8 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Well, I'm not suggesting
9 -- if you still want to make a motion, Mario; as I've
10 indicated, I've just presented the options. But, let me
11 know if you want to do -- if you want to think about it
12 before you move. Then if you're going to split, you're
13 prepared to go forward and change the criteria, to encourage
14 more partnerships with our ISD's.

15 MR. LOZOYA: Right, so in -- just looking at
16 the staff for guidance here. I do want to have a
17 conversation about criteria. This would be one of them.
18 Because I have another data point I'd like to talk about,
19 but if -- right now if we're talking about the 50/50, then
20 we'll just stay with that. But, with the understanding that
21 we are going to discuss the criteria, I'll wait on that.

22 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Oh, absolutely. We're
23 going to have a discussion on everything before we approve
24 final posting of the RFA.

25 MR. LOZOYA: So, then I'll wait on the

1 criteria conversations, to make a motion on that.

2 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Do you want to move the
3 50/50 for now, or do you want to move that at the end?

4 MR. LOZOYA: Well, I -- I'm still in the
5 opinion that we should change the 50/50. Maybe 75/25 is not
6 right, but maybe 60/40. I just think that the ISD's need a
7 little bit more than 50/50.

8 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Well, we need a motion on
9 this.

10 MR. LOZOYA: I motion that we -- that we
11 adjust on the 50/50.

12 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Aaron?

13 MR. DEMERSON: Before he motions, I want to
14 make sure that in this motion is allocation of funds that
15 include any de-obligated or unused funds from prior rounds.
16 I want to make sure that --

17 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, when we do the final
18 approval, absolutely.

19 COMM. HUGHS: And, I'm sorry, I'm just an
20 observer, based on the legislation that just passed; does
21 that mean less money will go to CTV's if you switch up your
22 percentages? I don't want to make the legislature mad. I'm
23 not voting on either so, just think about that when you make
24 your official motion. Although, I agree you can ask Staff
25 to look at weighing things differently.

1 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: The fact that, again, I'd
2 have a vote, but I don't (indiscernible) putting on this.
3 The fact that there remains a focus on making sure that our
4 community colleges have the flexibility to acquire this
5 equipment, and the fact that our imports are working
6 directly with these college for fast track solutions, is a
7 key part of the overall economic strategy of this state.
8 And, the fact that they just added technical schools is
9 something that we need to consider.

10 MR. FIDELIE: Let me ask one more point of
11 clarification. When it all started in the Comptroller's
12 office, was it just to community colleges initially? And,
13 then was --

14 MR. GARDNER: There was only community
15 colleges.

16 MR. FIDELIE: Then it became technical
17 institutes.

18 MR. GARDNER: Well, then it became ISD's,
19 which --

20 MR. FIDELIE: So, community colleges in Texas
21 (indiscernible).

22 Mr. GARDNER: Split the money up a lot.

23 MR. NORMAN: Non-profits in the beginning.
24 That's from the first round.

25 MR. FIDELIE: Oh, yeah, I forgot about that.

1 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Yeah, the first year,
2 they were reporting to be non-profits.

3 MR. GARDNER: Technically, community colleges
4 were getting less money.

5 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: At the very end --

6 MR. NORMAN: Most recently the legislature
7 has added a different higher ed.

8 MR. FIDELIE: And, those will be the two
9 public state colleges. That's what your referencing?

10 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Yes. So, then it's TFTC
11 and Lamar.

12 MS. CLODFELTER: Lamar State -- those two
13 Lamar State.

14 MR. NORMAN: And, that was a big deal to the
15 advocates of that legislation (indiscernible) -- would be
16 similar --

17 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: That's actually a fair
18 amount of typing. So, the year that was that it was
19 operating before it came over, the funds were going to the
20 community colleges, specifically, right?

21 MS. CLODFELTER: And technical colleges.

22 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Is that correct?

23 MR. FIDELIE: And technical colleges.

24 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: The year it came over,
25 the legislation that moved it over here, made it eligible

1 for ISD's. And, the intent, generally; our observations
2 were that there was expect -- expectation there would be a
3 split. And, that's -- I guess been the way that we've
4 operated. And, with the addition of the -- going into this
5 fiscal year, we have the added eligibility institutions
6 under the -- that would fall under the community college
7 side of this.

8 MR. LOZOYA: And, I'll add that we also
9 passed Senate Bill 22 P-TECH. And, the P-TECH Bill allows
10 for ISD's to graduate people and go straight into the
11 workplace. You know, so it also added programs to
12 legislation for high schools to have the ability to have a
13 pipe-line straight into industry, right? So, we've actually
14 had it changed on both sides.

15 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Well, we actually had the
16 -- a direct appropriations for that to TEA. There was
17 already a direct appropriation of 2.5 million to TEA, that's
18 going to our ISD's. So, we are -- in addition to, as Mario
19 indicated, it did provide some legislation for P-TECH, but
20 there's also 2.5 million going directly to our ISD's, to do
21 more of these. So, with that P-TECH funding, they actually
22 have another pot of money; our ISD's from which they can
23 create these type of programs, with -- under the P-TECH
24 model. And, in addition to that, we've partnered up with
25 the TEA to provide another 3.2 million. Was it 3.2 million,

1 Larry? 3.2 million that is also available for innovative
2 academies. And, through that money, that's also going to
3 the ISD's. We have the new 2.5 tied to P-TECH, going to our
4 ISD's. The 3.2 that we're making available that goes to our
5 ISD's, and then the other T-STEM dollars that are over
6 there. So, if you consider other funding streams as Scott
7 indicated, we have this other pot of money that we're about
8 to release through TEA, totaling 7.2 that goes directly to
9 these partnerships with between our ISD's and community
10 colleges.

11 MR. TEMPLE: Mr. Chairman, I believe, when we
12 briefed our LAR -- Senate Financial Appropriations, we
13 agreed on what the split of 50/50 was. So, just getting
14 back to the legislature --

15 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: The intent. Expectations.

16 MR. TEMPLE: The intent. When we did present
17 our LAR, and all the testimony, it was based on 50/50 split.

18 MR. GARDNER: I would second the discussion
19 on (indiscernible). Not all about the changes
20 (indiscernible) be reminded that it was exclusively
21 community colleges. And, also remembering community
22 colleges, actually train and retrain people, as well. So,
23 that there's continuing role. And, people might be
24 effectively training high school a few years later that will
25 be going to a community college for a different kind of

1 training, as industry changes. And, so then they -- they're
2 almost a life-long accessed the training. It goes beyond
3 their -- enrollment numbers at any one point in time, and
4 it's well -- about 700,000 in any one point in time. And,
5 it's actually much more than that over a given year in terms
6 of who would come in, in different semesters for training.

7 MR. NORMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'll be speaking,
8 sir, on the creating of bringing a problem on ourselves
9 here, that we may not need to. I mean, again, the problem is
10 funding. The total amount needs to be a lot larger, and I'm
11 going to work on that to the extent I can. Uh, but I think
12 anything that we do, is through, indirectly by encouraging
13 the school districts to work together with community
14 colleges. Maybe even you know, rescinding that money back
15 to the school districts even though it's going through the
16 higher education allotment.

17 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: There is a --

18 MR. NORMAN: By redoing the criteria.

19 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: There's a center in
20 Lubbock much like WALMA, preceded WALMA, called the Byron
21 Martin Training Center. And, if you go to Lubbock, and if
22 you go to Levelland, or Shallowater, or Wolfforth, or any of
23 those small communities, they use that center for a lot of
24 their continuing education programs. And, all the Lubbock
25 ISD's go to that center. That center is South Queens

1 College. It's operated by them. They host the Career and
2 Technical Education Program, from the Lubbock Schools, but
3 also from these rural areas, and that's how they've been
4 able to develop. The other advantage for that is that many
5 of the instructors there, have been secured through the
6 college, because of the flexibility on salaries, and so
7 forth. And so, those are -- I understand what we're trying
8 to do here in terms of giving more momentum to our ISD's,
9 but this is a really small pot of money. And, we're really
10 -- we're shrinking it even more in a way that is not going
11 to materially increase the number of possible institutions
12 on one side; at the -- with the consideration given to the
13 comments that Scott just made in terms of expectations. So,
14 --

15 MR. NORMAN: Have the -- have the
16 applications on the higher ed side of the total dollars
17 always have exceeded the allocated?

18 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Yes, they have, on both
19 sides.

20 MR. LOZOYA: Do we know the other funding
21 streams you mentioned are -- if that's equipment specific
22 like JET is.

23 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: They can use it for any
24 number of things, but certainly with our money, that's an
25 (indiscernible) expenditure through the Innovative

1 Academies, correct, Reagan?

2 MR. MILLER: Uh-huh, yeah.

3 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: And, that's actually
4 something that we've encouraged. We encourage them to build
5 curriculum to acquire and secure the equipment that supports
6 that curriculum. And, then to add mentoring internships and
7 other components. So, it's actually not just equipment,
8 it's everything else that we know what works. So, we allow
9 them to purchase the big piece of equipment, and the smaller
10 pieces that really elevate the experience of that. So,
11 that's -- so the answer is yes, so --

12 MR. LOZOYA: So, based on that, Commissioner,
13 I'd like to wait for the criteria portion.

14 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Well, let's keep going,
15 and we'll come back to the split. And, then we'll take --
16 we'll have motions on all three.

17 MR. DEMERSON: Okay, the next item deals with
18 minimum and maximum rent amount of fiscal year '16. The
19 minimum is 50,000, and 350,000, kind of falling, we're
20 falling in line with the attainable from the Comptroller's
21 office. The board took action in fiscal year '17, to reduce
22 that from 50,000 to 40,000. To allow the possibility of
23 more applications, or funding appropriations availability.
24 And, so we're seeking direction for fiscal year '18 on the
25 minimum and maximum amount for the rent program.

1 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: So, there are currently
2 40,000 and 350?

3 MR. DEMERSON: That's right. 40,000 minimum,
4 and 350,000 max.

5 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: So, they -- so -- in
6 interest of this Advisory Board per the discussion that
7 we've just had, is to increase the number of awards that are
8 given. Certainly, one of the most effective way to do that,
9 percentage wise, is to consider the maximum award made to
10 these institutions. Is that something else that you might
11 want to contemplate as we have that so -- we started off a
12 little bit -- a little bit higher on the minimum. And,
13 we've been pretty -- we've been flat on the higher end
14 award, of the maximum amount awarded. How many grantees
15 have we awarded at the maximum amount? Do we have that in
16 front of us?

17 MR. LOZOYA: I saw three.

18 MR. NORMAN: Yeah (indiscernible) as a median
19 broken down or, do we have a break-down?

20 MR. LOZOYA: You have -- you have -- the
21 awards.

22 MS. CLODFELTER: Go to the grant amount.

23 MR. LOZOYA: On page 4.

24 MR. NORMAN: Oh.

25 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: If you turn to page 14,

1 15, and look at the broad range of --

2 MR. FIDELIE: I count 10 over 300,000.

3 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: 10 over 300,000.

4 MR. TEMPLE: Mr. Chairman? One of the things
5 that we've seen, kind of across the board; but some of the
6 costs have come in much lower than what colleges and high
7 schools, in particular came in at the beginning as an
8 estimate. Some computers and some of the equipment, so some
9 of the money that we were capturing, we were overestimating
10 what the costs would be.

11 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: So, this --

12 MR. TEMPLE: I'm not sure to what degree,
13 what percentage. If that was one of the small ones or
14 larger ones, or a little bit of both.

15 MR. DEMERSON: It's getting more on the ISD
16 side?

17 MS. RAMOS: Actually, it was a mix of both.

18 MR. LOZOYA: Did you say that they over-
19 estimated?

20 MR. TEMPLE: Yeah, they over-estimated the
21 costs. And, when they got their bids in they were
22 considerably lower. Sometimes, as much as 50 percent.
23 Particularly when they were getting into IT type things.
24 Computers and stuff just got so much cheaper.

25 MR. NORMAN: I understand the rationale for

1 the maximum, trying to stretch the dollars. But, where did
2 40,000 come from?

3 MR. LOZOYA: From prior requests, I believe.
4 When, there was a lot of them around that.

5 MR. FIDELIE: I think -- I'd asked that same
6 question a couple of meetings ago. But, -- and, I recall
7 part of maybe part of the answer to me was, look if you have
8 no minimum, then you're going to get a lot of 1,500, \$2,000
9 requests, that's just going to bog down the system. And,
10 the staff's comment, wanted to make sure they were
11 substantial to some degree. And, that's -- I think even --
12 dropped to get back to that page 10,000.

13 MR. TEMPLE: It's 40,000.

14 MR. FIDELIE: To 40,000.

15 MR. NORMAN: Do you ever get you know,
16 someone who says, you know, I wish I could apply for 25,000,
17 but I can't. Have you all gotten any inquires?

18 MR. TEMPLE: It's a lot of work
19 (indiscernible) for something that something that small.
20 So, the 50 seems to be --

21 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: We had -- we've approved
22 one at 48,000, if you look at the list. But, to Tony's
23 point; we have 10 of the -- how many awards have you made
24 Tony?

25 MR. FIDELIE: I counted 11 at 300 plus.

1 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: 11. How many awards have
2 you made; 31, 51? So, 11 and 51 have actually been funded
3 over 300,000, so that's something for the board to consider
4 if they wanted to increase the number of potential grantees
5 that might be funded under this. Who's good at math? I
6 don't think that's even 1 percent.

7 MS. RAMOS: If you look at both -- yours
8 combined together, the average award is \$195,000.

9 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: \$195,000.

10 MR. LOZOYA: (Indiscernible) to consider a
11 minimum -- max -- a minimum, and a maximum; a different
12 amount between our ISD's and community colleges? And, we
13 just move the ISD's and give the community colleges a loan?
14 Would that be okay?

15 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: The Advisory Board, can
16 consider whatever -- you just -- and the staff will do that.
17 You just create some you know, where there might be a
18 partnership of ideas. So, we typically -- have we done
19 that? I can't think of where we've done that.

20 MS. MILLER: Typically, we've had a cap
21 that's been the same for either eligible (indiscernible).

22 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Because the equipment is
23 going to be the same. If it's a welding piece of equipment
24 at the ISD level.

25 MR. LOZOYA: Yeah, but if we're talking about

1 you know, my point earlier; about the number of ISD's. Can
2 we agree to a couple more?

3 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: I think the lower end
4 achieves the same objective for both. You could lower it
5 for both entities and be able to fund another one or two
6 every cycle. Depending on the averages moving forward. So,
7 if you take off the -- if we did 10, that's an average of
8 40,000 over, that's an extra 480,000, would be allocated
9 around two, and so that give you --

10 MR. LOZOYA: This is not programmed
11 (indiscernible).

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: Around (indiscernible).

13 MR. FIDELIE: I'll make the motion, Chairman,
14 if you're ready for -- my thought would be 40,000 and
15 300,000 across the board.

16 MR. LOZOYA: I'll second that.

17 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: We have a second.

18 MR. LOZOYA: I'll second.

19 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Everybody agrees. You got
20 one -- you got one answered. The motion passes.

21 MR. LOZOYA: 40/300?

22 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Thank you, Larry.

23 MR. DEMERSON: And, so again, the next item
24 we'd like to discuss about the signature on the RFA timeline
25 so that we're going to have a published application issued

1 soon after this board meeting, depending on the decisions
2 that are made here. Karol Huntmoses will forward the
3 timeline; and that's included in your booklet behind Tab 6,
4 of the timeline associated with (indiscernible). Karol?

5 MS. HUNTMOSES: Yes. Yes, once all the
6 details are finalized, we do plan on publishing the
7 (indiscernible) after the 14th of February. It's going to be
8 out 45 more Calendar days. During that time, we'll be
9 receiving questions -- going to do a Q & A, for publishing
10 the question and answer documents. We'll receive documents
11 as a (indiscernible) to review (indiscernible)
12 disqualifications or anything that are (indiscernible).
13 Then we'll send it to an evaluation team (indiscernible)
14 with the initial proposal. And, then we'll have another set
15 of evaluators doing the impact. We'll be combining scores
16 to reach a final score of 100 percent. Once that is done,
17 we will come back to you approximately in June, or so. To
18 read the final list for approval. Once that approves, we'll
19 go into the contract development phase. (indiscernible)
20 (indiscernible) executed and signed by both parties
21 (indiscernible) Executive Office?

22 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Any questions on the
23 timeline? Would it be too uncomfortable if -- do we have a
24 motion to approve the timeline?

25 MR. LOZOYA: Do we have a motion to accept

1 the timeline?

2 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Provide for a
3 modification if necessary by Staff.

4 MR. LOZOYA: Yes, I will provide a
5 modification if necessary.

6 MR. GARDNER: I'll second.

7 MR. NORMAN: Aye.

8 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: We have four Aye's.

9 MR. DEMERSON: Mr. Chairman, so we -- last
10 item marked before this board goes in another direction, we
11 can talk about the criteria, as well.

12 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Okay, let's talk about
13 the criteria and the impact to the 50.

14 MR. DEMERSON: Ok, can you pull it up?

15 MR. DEMERSON: Here to give you the scoring
16 criteria, we have Mike from (indiscernible) MCI Team, who
17 worked with David Townsend, who is no longer with us. Mike
18 has been picking up the (indiscernible).

19 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Go --

20 MS. CLODFELTER: Could you turn on the
21 (indiscernible).

22 MR. DEMERSON: That's good.

23 MR. GUZMAN: Aaron, do we have it up here?

24 MR. DEMERSON: I don't think it's in your
25 (indiscernible).

1 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Yeah, we can read that.
2 Or, I can. Can you guys read it? (indiscernible) glasses,
3 and (indiscernible).

4 MS. CLODFELTHER: Do you want me to do
5 (indiscernible).

6 MR. DEMERSON: Okay, so Mike do you want to
7 take over with this one? So, this is the scoring criteria
8 behind the JET Program. 50 percent of the score for each
9 proposal will be based on the program evaluation as found in
10 Tab 2 of the technical proposal. This will be an RFA, and
11 then for the remaining 50 percent, economic impact
12 evaluation will be scored utilizing the following metrics
13 that are listed here. That's kind of the thing that Emily
14 talked about. The Wage Impact Score, plus the community
15 size, counts with 50 percent of the total score. And, both
16 of those categories will weigh equally. And, then the wage
17 impact score is calculated by multiplying the wage
18 differential. The program -- approximate wage for high
19 school graduates, subtracted from the entry level wage, for
20 that occupation. Multiply that by the number of anticipated
21 and lubricated students. And, that's dealing with the
22 amount of folks' number. Folks that they're actually
23 training. And the community type that defines the --
24 community type defines the area being served by the
25 applicant; is either urban or rural. So, if you go back to

1 that community college level. So, that's public junior
2 college and technical institutes. And, scoring a matrix
3 behind that particular area. Mike, anything you want to add
4 to that, or anyone?

5 MS. CLODFELTER: I was going to say Mike and
6 his Team are -- do you want to cover the community type; how
7 the urban and rural is calculated?

8 MR. GUZMAN: Oh, sure, sure. Basically, the
9 wages that we used were from an PLS program. Basically,
10 those are the OES program, looks at metropolitan statistical
11 areas, which is what we consider, urban. So, if they're a
12 county, if they're within a county, that belongs to a
13 metropolitan statistical area, then that's considered to be
14 urban. Rural are those counties that do not -- are not part
15 of the mine faults physical area. Stuff that lies, you
16 know, in the rural part of the state. So, that's how that
17 was separate. Those wages are different. So, the urban has
18 specific wages that apply to them. And, then the ones that
19 don't exist in a metropolitan statistical area, they're all
20 pretty much the same, as far as rural. So --

21 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Any questions?

22 MR. DEMERSON: So, that's associated with the
23 public and community colleges, and then we'll go to the
24 independent school districts, and the items -- the areas
25 that we're looking -- the areas of wage impact score,

1 community type score, property wealth score as well. And,
2 we're trying to get it to a point where we're hitting both
3 the urban, and the -- where it all gets slanted towards
4 either urban or rural, in any particular case. And, so
5 those are the three criteria that we think make an impact --
6 wage impact, community type and then the property of wealth
7 scored that kind of adds in that category. So, the wage
8 impact score, plus the community type score, plus the
9 property wealth score, counts for 50 percent of the score
10 and the wa -- second wage impact score is calculated by
11 multiplying the wage differential. Again, approximate age
12 -- wage for high school graduates, subtracted from the entry
13 level wage, for that occupation, by the number that you're
14 looking at being trained. And, then the third bullet;
15 community type as defined is based on the Texas Education
16 Agency District type glossary terms. And, that's dealing
17 with, again, urban, suburban, the different type of schools;
18 as they categorize them at TEA. And, then lastly, the
19 property wealth is defined as the total taxable property
20 value, divided by the total number of students. And, taking
21 that into account, again, so that we're not having
22 applications that go to those districts that are affluent,
23 and maybe not the ones that are less affluent, in that
24 regard. And, so those -- all those criteria over the past
25 two rounds, we've implemented it that way to try to create a

1 fair balance score -- scoring system. Mike, Emily, anything
2 with wage impact?

3 MS. CLODFELTER: So, the department evolved
4 data does come -- comes from TEA's as well. They have that
5 divided out by each ISV.

6 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Any questions? Okay.

7 MR. DEMERSON: Okay, so that pretty much
8 covers the areas that we were going to look at taking action
9 on. I talked -- speaking on criteria, associated with the
10 program. So, with that we'll go back to the funding
11 allocation for the questions associated --

12 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: I think Mario had some
13 comments. Or a comment.

14 MR. LOZOYA: Yes, I -- were recently, I was
15 in a meeting where Commissioner Morath presented the work
16 that he's doing around certifications, a certifications
17 list. The name of the initiative escapes my mind. But,
18 what it is the TEA is putting out a list of certifications
19 that they're encouraging ISD's to pursue. And, TEA will
20 then support those; try to recognize those. So, I'm -- I
21 was thinking that to support the Tri-Agency partnership,
22 that we should consider what TEA is looking as -- at
23 certifications that the TEA's interested in, and if any of
24 those programs would provide -- any of these JET programs --
25 these applicants will provide a pathway to these

1 certifications that TEA's have tied to would merit the
2 points? So, my ask is for the board to consider including
3 TEA's effort in stream-lining certifications to the JET
4 program.

5 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Do you have questions or
6 comments? And, this would apply, obviously to the ISD's not
7 to create post-secondary institutions. The -- there is a
8 list. Emily, do you happen to have that list?

9 MS. CLODFELTER: Is it the one that you sent,
10 Mario? Is it the --

11 MR. LOZOYA: I think so. If it's the wrong
12 list, don't shoot me.

13 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: We -- I have the list,
14 but I don't have confidence. You can't -- if it's -- if you
15 don't have any, you can find it on the website.

16 MR. LOZOYA: My understanding is that there
17 will be two lists. The list that's been completed, are
18 those certifications that an ISD alone can accomplish. The
19 second list will be published eventually, was will be those
20 lists that and ISD and a community college together would
21 have to accomplish. Right, so --

22 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: The -- the effort here is
23 to over time, for TEA to, as they're working on the
24 accountability system, and Commissioner Gardner, you've been
25 in some of these discussions (indiscernible). Larry,

1 (indiscernible). As a build-out the accountability system;
2 the Texas Education Agency has reached out and talked to
3 different groups. They've identified also in working with
4 the Workforce Investment Council; they have reached out to
5 us to work with our local Boards, to look at their -- at
6 their list to date. But, if you look at that -- at this
7 list, this is their initial list of what they would count as
8 a part of the accountability system. It is going through a
9 validation process with Importers. And, Larry, is there
10 anything you want to add to that?

11 MR. TEMPLE: Well, we do have some criteria
12 that our Workforce Board sign-off as their demand. This may
13 or may not be lined up with what the boards demand
14 occupation. My guess; this list is much longer than what
15 the boards have (indiscernible). So, that may be --

16 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: I agree. Well, it's
17 actually only 88 -- it's less than 80 here, so it's probably
18 smaller, because you're not looking at different Sectors of
19 the economy, in total. So, factors to consider there are --
20 we have a define list; the initial define list. It'll ex --
21 it'll grow over time. But, if you look at it, it likely
22 leaves out some of the occupations that are becoming --

23 MR. NORMAN: Especially the less regulated,
24 are not on there. So, I know there's been a lot of
25 conversations going on in construction trade. And,

1 particularly for those that aren't licensed. And, I know
2 there's certifications that we and others have been working;
3 stone masons, carpenters, roofing. All of those kinds of
4 trades. And, so, I just -- I don't know. I'm not familiar.
5 I know some of those are on there, and some aren't.

6 MR. LOZOYA: Right, but that -- the
7 discussion is that -- I mean the list -- the list will
8 evolve.

9 MR. NORMAN: Right, Right.

10 MR. LOZOYA: So, the discussion is whatever
11 the list looks like; this year, next year and forever. In my
12 opinion, it should include the content of the list, in
13 partnership with TEA strategy.

14 MR. NORMAN: But, if you're not on the list,
15 you're at a disadvantage, though.

16 MR. FIDELIE: Being on the list gives you the
17 advantage.

18 MR. LOZOYA: I don't know listing it that way
19 -- I wouldn't put it that way, I think it puts you at an
20 advantage.

21 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: So as an advantage to
22 somebody else's list.

23 MR. NORMAN: Right, right.

24 MR. LOZOYA: So, I also initially, ignorant
25 me, complained about this list, because our advanced mining

1 crafting certification are not on the list. But, the answer
2 was those kinds of certifications, you would need a
3 community college partner. I said, okay, I get it. So,
4 there's going to be another list that includes that kind of
5 certification. So, that's a different level.

6 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: How many certifications
7 are on this list, Emily? Can you scroll down to the number,
8 again?

9 MS. CLODFELTER: Yes, 74.

10 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: So, 74. And, if you look
11 at the first page; of the 74, 26 are automotive, which is
12 great, because we have a great demand for technicians and we
13 are working to increase the number of technicians.

14 MR. LOZOYA: But, to Larry's point is if the
15 work -- the local Workforce board does not have it on their
16 list, then it's not going to get -- it's not going to pass
17 the list. It's not going to come this way.

18 MR. TEMPLE: I was thinking you were saying
19 possibly a bonus-criteria if on this, which may not align
20 with what the board --

21 MR. LOZOYA: No, no, I think the board
22 supersedes everything. The board says, yes, this is in high
23 demand, then the package continues this way, right? And, if
24 it doesn't, then it doesn't get here. Whether it's on this
25 list or not.

1 MR. TEMPLE: Correct, correct. I had it
2 backwards.

3 MR. LOZOYA: Maybe I just (indiscernible) to
4 describe it. So, this is what I'm saying; it could be on
5 this list. But, however, if it doesn't get to the board's,
6 you know, litmus test, it doesn't get here anyway, right?

7 MR. TEMPLE: Yeah, that's the first -- almost
8 the first cut, there to the boards criteria.

9 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: And, if you look at those
10 -- so there -- it's heavy on automotive, and it's pretty
11 heavy on (indiscernible) yeah, on construction. And, then
12 if -- but if you look at some of the other things, that are
13 out there; (indiscernible) equipment, they're not reflected.
14 In terms of high demand occupations.

15 MR. NORMAN: I'm just not familiar. I
16 wouldn't want to disparage (indiscernible) then -- you know
17 from successfully getting on the list.

18 MR. LOZOYA: And, like I said --

19 MR. NORMA: If there's needs in the
20 community, but if --

21 MR. LOZOYA: And, like I said, this is not
22 final. I think there's going to be opportunities for it to
23 be adjusted.

24 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: But, from the perspective
25 of this RFA; this would be all that the applicants would

1 potentially get an extra point for. If we were to add any
2 bonus points to it. So, I just want you all to think about
3 that. And, some of those things are software related. I'm
4 not sure that the -- if we want to include the software in
5 some of this. We have -- are we having any discussion on
6 this?

7 MR. TEMPLE: The software -- if it was
8 required for the equipment that would be involved, is what
9 at the time -- if I remember correctly.

10 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: If you were buying a
11 robot, no but if it were robotic welding --

12 MR. TEMPLE: Then the software went with it.
13 But, buying Microsoft and this and that --

14 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: If you look at 47-48, 49,
15 those are all Microsoft software's that are not necessary
16 for a bigger piece of equipment.

17 MR. GARDNER: So, there -- some of these I
18 don't think really require equipment, to fit the profile of
19 what the real --

20 MR. TEMPLE: They would match with an
21 equipment.

22 MR. LOZOYA: That's my point. They shouldn't
23 make it through the Workforce board, letter. It wouldn't
24 make it this way. Right? This is not, it doesn't meet our
25 requirement of equipment and high demand jobs.

1 MR. TEMPLE: It wouldn't go with this
2 initiative for -- certainly wouldn't go with this initiative
3 for purchasing equipment. It wouldn't match up with
4 equipment. We have some skills grants that some of the
5 businesses have some of their employees getting
6 certifications in Excel or something like. And, the boards
7 sign-off on that. But, I don't really think those would
8 complement an equipment purchase. So, I guess that's what
9 we're looking at; to the degree that these would complement
10 a -- we wouldn't be funding buying office -- buying
11 computers to do an Excel and Word certification. I don't
12 think with the JET Program.

13 MR. LOZOYA: Agreed.

14 MR. TEMPLE: So, and this goes back to the
15 very beginning when you guys were discussing what it's going
16 to be and really what is going to be the hard equipment type
17 of purchase.

18 MR. FIDELIE: So, then to put it in
19 (indiscernible) to someone's who's head's not in this every
20 day; this is a list put of TEA of jobs that are high demand?

21 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: It's certifications that
22 they believe can take people towards a job, that equip them
23 with a certification that will ultimately lead to
24 employment. And, so that's one of the fundamental goals
25 there. Again, that's going through a process of validation,

1 in partnership with TWIC. And, it obviously needs to be
2 expanded to reflect the different sectors of the economy,
3 because they are not equally represented there.

4 MR. NORMAN: Is there any AG stuff on it?

5 MR. LOZOYA: Is there any AG certification?

6 MR. NORMAN: Well, I mean there could be
7 (indiscernible) -- I just, I don't know. I just -- I don't
8 know, I'm not familiar enough. I just don't want to be
9 limiting -- to limit at all, but --

10 MR. GARDNER: So, more or less, it's kind of
11 what TEA wants to do. I mean these examples you brought up
12 Microsoft. Some of these things, certainly are available
13 free online, through (indiscernible) Academy. And,
14 (indiscernible) and several things like that, where people
15 don't even have to pay. Some even pay a minimal amount of
16 money. And, you get a formal Microsoft certification, and
17 just, seems like there are other avenues; even if there's a
18 small cost associated with the school. I think it's
19 probably good to list for what TEA is trying to do. But, I
20 don't know that it's a good list for reference for programs,
21 and a good grant finder; if this were out here I'd say well,
22 okay, I can do this. And, even though they may or may not
23 check with their local folks in terms of what's needed
24 locally; it could end up spending time writing a proposal
25 for something that, you know, you guys, might have reached

1 (indiscernible) because.

2 MR. LOZOYA: Yeah, that's my point. It
3 wouldn't get here. (indiscernible)

4 MR. GARDNER: No, I'm saying that they might
5 spend their time, because they see this as a reference list,
6 we're going to -- this is one of the areas that they are
7 emphasizing, because you put out the list. I would think.
8 That's what I would do.

9 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Yeah, and there's great
10 demand for automotive and again, we're going to do all that
11 we can to make sure that more of our students get those
12 endorsements. But, there's also a great demand for many of
13 the occupations -- many of the companies that you represent.
14 And, you know, there's a lot going on in manufacturing that
15 maybe isn't captured there. There's certain health care
16 occupations that aren't getting captured there. And, so the
17 equipment, they were looking to buy for these programs, is
18 intended to build out the overall program. And, these
19 certifications are a key part of our strategy. We're big
20 supporters of it. I'm just not sure that it's --

21 MR. LOZOYA: So, then maybe we don't have to
22 adopt the whole list. We can adopt those lists that are --
23 that we know are in those industries that we're -- you know,
24 IT, and --

25 MR. TEMPLE: Are you talking about --

1 Cristina? When we were talking about the laptops, it would
2 -- laptops that require to run the -- our -- a computer --
3 it would require to run the equipment, application for the
4 equipment. But, we weren't looking at computer labs for --
5 buying computers for computer lab, let's say for Microsoft,
6 Excel. And, so it wouldn't be that type of equipment, so --

7 MS. RAMOS: That's correct.

8 MR. TEMPLE: To the degree -- yeah.

9 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: I think that an applicant
10 -- you know, there's two ways to go about this; one, you can
11 adopt it as the criteria, where you're working on points,
12 that has the effect of leaving out certain Sectors, and
13 certain -- many occupations that aren't on the list yet,
14 that we know are in demand in different regions. On the
15 other hand, if somebody is submitting an application, if
16 they're working on this they can highlight the fact -- in
17 terms of their high demand occupations, this -- narrative,
18 and highlight that, and that through the investment of this
19 wonderful equipment, for automotive, will be able to provide
20 these certifications to our students.

21 And, that just naturally strengthens their
22 arguments for a high demand kind of occupational design.
23 So, I'd love for that to be a part of it. I'm not sure that
24 the overall framework yet is fully developed to keep an
25 equal opportunity for the different sectors out there. So,

1 that was your point, right?

2 MR. NORMAN: Definitely, yeah, but I think it
3 definitely should be referenced to the materials.

4 MR. LOZOYA: So, how with that -- how will
5 that look? Will the staff then kind of have a lens for
6 this? For this TEA list, as the applications come in?

7 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Well, again, that's up to
8 the Advisory Board. There's, and I'm not sure what you're
9 proposing, Mario. There's the proposal where you're
10 (indiscernible) additional points be given for those
11 investments that lead to these certifications. And, you
12 understand the advantages and disadvantages based on what
13 sectors and occupations are covered there; that we know are
14 in demand, and that are not yet reflected there, versus
15 reminding them that these are some of the things that are
16 out there.

17 MR. LOZOYA: Maybe, maybe I don't know
18 exactly where it fits. My idea is to find a way to be in
19 alignment with the Tri-Agency Initiative. And, the TEA is
20 working on something. I think we should -- we should
21 support.

22 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: And we do.

23 MR. LOZOYA: And, then the TEA's should
24 support us, right, on other things. So, this is another one
25 of those times -- this opportunity in my opinion for us to

1 show that -- hey the JET Team here is also supporting TEA,
2 past the, you know, streamline certifications, by
3 considering those applicants that have certifications on the
4 TEA list. How that goes, I don't know?

5 MR. GARDNER: I would think that school
6 districts, and this is with final adoption TEA, are
7 imminently aware of this, and this is probably going to be
8 the starting point in most cases, without us having
9 (indiscernible), because TEA will be pushing them in that
10 direction.

11 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: They'll get points for
12 it. So, it'll be reflected in their grant. And, so there's
13 def -- there's definitely going to be an evolution towards
14 this, if the -- as we support TEA towards those efforts, I'm
15 really hoping that their successful, because again, just
16 looking at the bullets we're looking at right now at the
17 very top, we need more students pursuing that bill. But, we
18 also need to respond to the students in these other sectors,
19 who keep reminding us that we need to get them excited about
20 those careers. (indiscernible). Larry, do you want to add
21 anything else to this?

22 MR. TEMPLE: No, just this, as it relates to
23 the purchase of equipment, I think is where the difference
24 is. Going back to the grant writers, can be very creative,
25 and the message that this is about equipment and whatever it

1 needs to support it. But, keeps you away from Certified
2 Patient Care Technician. Not sure how much equipment; we
3 could very well be buying mannequins and that sort of thing,
4 which would fall into that. But, as opposed to Microsoft
5 Word and Excel. We wouldn't be buying computers for labs,
6 with this grant. We just need to make sure that if we do
7 reference something like this that it's in the context that
8 it.

9 MR. LOZOYA: It still has to be a qualified
10 program. Just because it's on the list, doesn't mean we're
11 going to -- yeah.

12 MR. TEMPLE: Maybe as this list expands could
13 be --

14 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Mario, do you have any --

15 MR. LOZOYA: So, maybe not in a motion, but
16 maybe a request that the next time we meet, the staff, maybe
17 provide us with a proposal of how we can include --

18 MR. TEMPLE: I have an idea. Maybe the next
19 time we can look at the list as it is developed now. And,
20 have it bump up against what we have -- the Workforce
21 scores, as on there (indiscernible) just say, where the gap
22 is, if any. And, knowing that that's going to be growing as
23 time goes on.

24 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Well, the -- when you
25 look at these things, a number of these loop back into one

1 or two occupations. Right? And, so, it's not a line for
2 line. It's not 22, is one occupation. It could be the 22,
3 23, 24 --

4 MR. TEMPLE: Sure.

5 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: -- feed into one
6 occupation, and so that's another issue when you look at
7 this. Certainly, when you look at 28, Certified Dental
8 Assistant, that's a clear occupation, right?

9 MR. TEMPLE: Yeah.

10 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Yeah, and some of these -
11 -

12 MR. NORMAN: (Indiscernible) on 23 is --

13 MR. TEMPLE: Yeah.

14 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: I was looking at the
15 dental occupation. Is that what you mean?

16 MR. LOZOYA: Yes, it is. Okay, so fair
17 enough. (Indiscernible).

18 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: I do think that we need
19 to do all we can to support these certifications. We have
20 such strong demand for that group of 28, in terms of those
21 certifications at the very top of this list. And, we're
22 certainly going to work as an agency to support more
23 students getting these. And, we will see if there's a way
24 that we and build into the narrative, that over time, we
25 would need something like that over the narrative; we intend

1 to keep look at the work of our partners at TEA, and the
2 Cohort. And, through our local boards, to make sure that
3 they reflect support and provide more opportunities for in-
4 demand certification; to reaffirm that goal. We can do that
5 sort of thing. We'll write that into the preamble to the
6 (indiscernible).

7 MR. TEMPLE: For instance, if we -- if TEA
8 had this list, at an ISD would look like the program here,
9 and the college doesn't have this yet, and they work with
10 the board to where I'd sign off on this; this would be a
11 capacity building right there for a start-up. So, I can see
12 that happening. We can just make sure that our narrative
13 would cover something like that. But, that would be -- you
14 know, it could take a while for the local college to catch
15 up with this list. I'm sure you guys are working together.
16 But, just because it's on this list, doesn't mean that all
17 the community colleges -- (indiscernible) certainly, all
18 these ISD's, have caught up with this list yet. We could
19 help and support that -- this list as it goes.

20 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Oh, yeah.

21 MR. NORMAN: The fact this list is growing is
22 a very good thing, due to historically the lack of
23 certifications and the challenges on the CTE side of it.

24 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Oh, absolutely.

25 MR. NORMAN: And, so in various industries

1 have worked to get the support, and continue to do so in
2 others. Like you said, this is evolving.

3 MR. TEMPLE: Mr. Chairman, one of the things
4 we had last time was that some of -- we could tell that the
5 timing -- that some of the boards do in say quarterly
6 meetings; or annual re-evaluations of their local demand
7 occupations. And, some of the programs we had, the board
8 signed off on, but they had not had an official meeting to
9 change that. Of course, we balked but the board said it
10 did; we went with it. So, I think was kind of thought of
11 that same type of thing. The board could certainly sign off
12 on this and then not be on their list yet. Because, it's
13 not out there and whatnot, and like I said this JET Program
14 could be something that could help.

15 MR. LOZOYA: So, it makes sense to wait for
16 the next round and send this out to the board, and get their
17 feedback.

18 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Well we can, we can
19 actually (indiscernible) it ourselves. We have the item,
20 and data, yeah, so --

21 MR. LOZOYA: Okay, sounds good.

22 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: And, then we'll try to
23 fit those in with-in the occupations and see how many of
24 those fit within. How many occupations are we talking
25 about? How many sectors would benefit. You have welding

1 only gets a number of different Sectors, right? And, so we
2 just need to look at it from that perspective, and at the
3 consent of the Advisory Board, that's what we'll do.

4 MR. NORMAN: I have a scoring question. Post
5 Harvey, in community meetings up and down the coast that
6 have changed, in the wake of the storm; how does that factor
7 into the community schools for scoring?

8 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: We certainly have not
9 factored that in.

10 MR. NORMAN: This is going to be the first
11 round.

12 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: This will be the first
13 round.

14 MR. NORMAN: I don't know if there's a way
15 they can insert that in. I'm not saying that we necessarily
16 need more priority, but I think it's something that we need
17 to be cognizant of. Because, obviously, the workforce needs
18 to change in all these communities.

19 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Larry, can you tell us
20 how many investments --

21 MR. TEMPLE: Yeah, one of the things that we
22 did as kind of, you all were (indiscernible), we met with
23 our Workforce board, whether we did the meetings all around
24 the area; and what we heard, particularly from home builders
25 and the remodel; not so much the big contractors.

1 Petrochemical type sized as; but there was a shortage of not
2 necessarily license, but plumbers, painters, electrical
3 helpers, weld -- you know, that sort of thing. Roofers that
4 do certification in the storm area, and they're either --
5 everything down there was on a semester type basis. It was
6 longer than what the employers of builders said they needed,
7 the contractors needed. So, we worked with the colleges,
8 and we invested about \$3,000,000, I think. Reagan, was it
9 about \$3,000,000 we invested with the Colleges in hurricane
10 area?

11 MS. MILLER: Yes.

12 MR. TEMPLE: To identify those areas, signed-
13 off by the board.

14 MR. NORMAN: In an unbelievable amount of
15 time.

16 MR. TEMPLE: We went out pretty quick.

17 MR. NORMAN: The governmental (indiscernible)
18 involved; it was amazing.

19 MR. TEMPLE: And, so, they shortened the
20 curricula, you know, what was needed. Six to eight weeks at
21 the most. And, a lot of it was equipment that we paid for.
22 About a \$3,000,000 investment there, and those. We're re-
23 looking at this now, for allied health, and IT needs. The
24 money that we spent isn't restricted to people that just
25 qualify for the dislocated worker type grant. General

1 public could come in for these courses. They'd have to --
2 the school would collect whatever the tuition would be. We
3 would pay for the ones that are eligible for that. But,
4 that -- we did have that out there. And, but, so we've got
5 an investment as far as those. And, it's mainly
6 (indiscernible) construction. But, we have gone out now and
7 asked for them to let us know, in the (indiscernible) for
8 this grant, for IT and allied health.

9 MR. NORMAN: (indiscernible).

10 MR. TEMPLE: You know --

11 MR. NORMAN: Well, I mean not even
12 construction, I mean (indiscernible) especially lower coast,
13 or middle coast. A lot of those jobs are gone, so these
14 peoples are looking at, man, I'll be starting new careers.
15 Not just men, I mean obviously, there's a lot of work in
16 construction now, you know, whatever. I just wondered if
17 this factors in, somehow.

18 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Well we don't have -- let
19 me answer the ask -- answer the question so we can keep
20 going. The Advisory Board has the flexibility to add
21 criteria. And, if one of the factors we want to consider is
22 adding -- added weight to those communities that are in
23 those hurricane impacted communities. The answer is yes.
24 The Advisory Board can elect to provide some added weights
25 to ISD's and community colleges, that are serving

1 individuals in the impacted Hurricane Harvey areas. It's up
2 to this board to direct Staff whether or not they -- we want
3 to develop a factor, and the percentage points that they
4 would like to award, based on those considerations.

5 MR. TEMPLE: That would be 61 Counties, I
6 believe that was declared by the governor, and about 10 less
7 than that that actually qualified for it federally. But,
8 for the purpose here, I think you'd go with what the
9 governor had declared; those 61 or 2 Counties.

10 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: And, that includes
11 counties like -- how far -- central Texas?

12 MR. TEMPLE: Well, it comes up in to the
13 lower part of San Antonio.

14 MR. NORMAN: Fayette county. La Grange.

15 MR. TEMPLE: Yes, uh huh, La Grange, those
16 areas. Probably 7 work -- 8 Workforce (indiscernible).

17 MS. MILLER: Yeah, rural cap had one county.

18 MR. TEMPLE: Right. So -- (indiscernible)
19 population of the state. Collective, yeah, it was about --

20 MR. LOZOYA: What is that? Is it certain
21 designation, disaster zone, or what is it called?

22 MR. TEMPLE: Well, the governor's declaration
23 was larger than what FEMA -- did, by about 10 counties, or
24 so.

25 MR. LOZOYA: Well, then, that's what we

1 should use, instead of Harvey. Is like, if --

2 MR. TEMPLE: We could go with the governor of
3 Texas.

4 Mr. LOZOYA: If the county is --

5 MR. NORMAN: If the county is declared as a
6 disaster.

7 MR. LOZOYA: Right. Right. Because it could
8 be something else next year.

9 MR. TEMPLE: Right. A tornado and then --

10 MR. LOZOYA: Right, and then if it's declared
11 whatever it is zone, in the last you know, three to six
12 months, then, you don't know --

13 MR. TEMPLE: There's fires, floods, Hurricane
14 Harvey, I mean it could be anything like you said. I mean
15 the timeline is from last year so --

16 MR. FIDELIE: We kind of see this as a one-
17 time thing; not an ongoing thing. Because, I mean if you
18 look at the map, I mean all those areas are pretty well
19 served already, by the grant, where of course, the more
20 rural Texas; there's nothing up there. And, so if there's a
21 one-time deal, if we want to give a little preference this
22 time, obviously, they're trying to rebuild. I'm okay with
23 that, but long-term, and I want to talk about this is, how
24 do we get the word to rural Texas? Which --

25 MR. NORMAN: Are those holes in the map more

1 because they were one applications; militaries?

2 MS. CLODFELTER: Some are, some aren't.

3 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: They weren't working.

4 You know, they are part of the (indiscernible). And, so one
5 of the considerations in terms of Tony's comments, are you
6 know, is it one time? And, two; you know, is there other --
7 some other -- is there some form of (indiscernible) that
8 they're impact -- impacted? But, you know there's one thing
9 to be in the area --

10 MR. NORMAN: I mean, is there special, I
11 mean, that's kind of broad. Is there special circumstances
12 (indiscernible) expand on the situation in the community or
13 something. It's hard to quantify.

14 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: It's hard to quantify,
15 you know, to give special circumstance. So, in other words,
16 there's an ISD forty miles from here, or eighty miles from
17 here. They're in the zone. They are in the proclamation,
18 but there is no damage.

19 MR. LOZOYA: But there is no rain.

20 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: But there was no damage
21 to that school; to that program; to that -- to the
22 equipment. You go into Rockdale. Safe to say that there was.

23 MR. NORMAN: Rockport.

24 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Thank you, Rockdale is
25 the further than 80 miles. I was talking (indiscernible).

1 Thank you

2 MR. NORMAN: Yeah, there's still schools --

3 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Yeah, Rockport, Port
4 Aransas, you know, (indiscernible) and then it kind of keeps
5 going. And, then a certain point, it's harder to document
6 the --

7 MR. TEMPLE: We had some counties that made
8 it into the declared zone. But, out of 130 people that
9 qualified for the unemployment insurance.

10 MR. NORMAN: Might be one neighbor but --

11 MR. TEMPLE: Yeah, and so, right. Now,
12 obviously what we were looking at was based on the
13 Department of Labor funding and the funding for getting
14 proper education for the rehab program. But, there's still
15 issues with bridges and infrastructure, and there could be
16 schools -- that we would not have been involved with.

17 MR. NORMAN: You know, the town of Port
18 Arthur where 85 percent of the structures had significant
19 flooding. You know, 85 percent of those --

20 MR. DEMERSON: Mr. Chairman?

21 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Yes, sir.

22 MR. DEMERSON: We can place special emphasis
23 if we don't want (indiscernible) trying to allocate points
24 of the Staff is going to be directed to go out and emphasis
25 the importance of this JET grant to those communities that

1 have been --

2 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Well, once we post, we're
3 not on the road.

4 MR. TEMPLE: Yeah, once we post, we're not on
5 the road.

6 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: We're not on the road
7 anymore, after today's meeting. We're posting.

8 MR. TEMPLE: We knew our (indiscernible) last
9 cast that it's out and all that but we, as a rule, for
10 members of seat, once we put an RFP out, we don't to be
11 accused of playing favorites by hitting this part of the
12 state and not that part of the state and that sort of thing.

13 MR. NORMAN: Yeah, I just, you know first
14 time (indiscernible) I wanted to bring it up, I don't know.

15 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: No, I think, so a number
16 of ways; one you can (indiscernible); two you can do it, you
17 go with the proclamation counties; and then three, tying it
18 up by -- the points where there's an additional five. Or,
19 whatever the Advisory Committee would recommend. They would
20 recommend that there would be -- there would be in a
21 designated county; and then also have documented damage to
22 the ISD. That way you can kind of -- so, if you want to do
23 that, you could do a motion on the points or --

24 MR. NORMAN: I don't have enough context to
25 know the point number.

1 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Which -- well, what's the
2 what are your thoughts, for the advisory committee? Should
3 we give preference during this rank year, to provide some
4 additional points; 5 percent, 10 percent. What criteria do
5 we have for rural areas?

6 MS. CLODFELTER: Kind of who's benefitting
7 for it?

8 MR. LOZOYA: How many points for a rural
9 area?

10 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Is it 20 points?

11 MS. CLODFELTER: So, for the Community
12 Colleges for the -- (indiscernible) impact. The -- the 50
13 percent -- the (indiscernible) reduction is worth 15 points,
14 25 -- and then we took 25 points for being rural. And, then
15 the Urban areas get 12.5, (indiscernible).

16 MR. FIDELIE: So, they get an extra 12.5
17 points out of 100 total. 50 in that section?

18 MS. CLODFELTER: Correct, yes.

19 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: So, you could -- zero in
20 on 5, 10, whatever --

21 MR. NORMAN: I will defer to fellow board
22 members on that point amount, but I will say, I will
23 restrict it more; must be in affected counties, and there
24 (indiscernible) must have had damage.

25 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Documented damage.

1 MR. TEMPLE: And, they're going to have that
2 for a back-up. They will submit that -- they're going to
3 have --

4 MR. NORMAN: That takes care of a lot of
5 those counties.

6 MR. TEMPLE: They would -- I mean they would
7 be able to submit that, the schools --

8 MR. NORMAN: They're probably already --

9 MR. TEMPLE: -- Survey's and ISD's that
10 they've surveyed, I'm sure.

11 MR. GARDNER: We've had a survey of higher
12 institutions, but the experience has been, that those
13 surveys actually understate the previous hurricanes that
14 they're always concerned about submitting those figures,
15 because they discover damage that could be wrong, until much
16 later. So, I'm not sure how accurate those are at this
17 point. That is what the government's office has been using;
18 we do have that.

19 MR. DEMERSON: We've can look at this. We
20 can look at adding 5 extra points.

21 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Well, what's funny --
22 Tony has some comments. Let's go (indiscernible)

23 MR. FIDELIE: I think you know, we're being -
24 - kind of what I'm hearing, tell where right now is -- so
25 I've got the motion that if you are a county -- if you're

1 application falls in a county that the governor declared, a
2 governor's declared county, and you have substantial
3 documented damage to your facility, that you get an extra 5
4 points on the application.

5 MR. FIDELIE: I'll second that.

6 MR. NORMAN: (indiscernible)

7 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Is that doable staff?

8 MR. TEMPLE: Yeah, I think we -- that's the
9 easy ones. But, that doesn't negate for rural areas for
10 rural areas. Well, I think that's fair.

11 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: And, you have a motion
12 and it's been adopted unanimous. (indiscernible)

13 MR. LOZOYA: We're voting for this -- for
14 this year.

15 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Modified, to this year;
16 is there an agreement, for only just this grant year?

17 MR. TEMPLE: First and second rounds. Both
18 rounds. First and second rounds.

19 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Okay, (indiscernible).
20 Thank you, Mario. Thank you, Scott. Thank you, board
21 members. Aaron, we're just going to get back to the split.
22 And, Mario, you had something else?

23 MR. TEMPLE: Mr. Chairman?

24 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Were the allocations --

25 MR. NORMAN: (indiscernible).

1 MR. TEMPLE: Both rounds? For this year's
2 funding, for the entire \$10,000,000? Or just the first --

3 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: No, I think the request
4 was for \$5,000,000, for the first round.

5 MR. TEMPLE: \$5,000,000, for the first round.

6 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Yes.

7 MR. TEMPLE: Okay.

8 MR. NORMAN: (indiscernible).

9 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Yeah, this fiscal year.

10 MR. TEMPLE: Got you, okay.

11 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: This grant year, this
12 fiscal year. That's what they voted.

13 MR. TEMPLE: Yeah, yeah, thank you.

14 MR. LOZOYA: Did we agree that --
15 (indiscernible) motion that the community colleges would
16 have to partner with an ISD?

17 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: We haven't gotten back to
18 that discussion.

19 MR. LOZOYA: Right, because I think if we go
20 that direction, then I'm fine with the 50/50. Because
21 you're right, the point of that is they would have then
22 share the assets with ISD's. That makes sense to me.

23 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: David?

24 MR. GARDNER: I would suggest that they get
25 extra weight for that. Because the legislature didn't

1 require that. I think it might be for the rural part be,
2 maybe fundamentally if we gave them, say, an extra 5 points
3 by virtue of --

4 MR. NORMAN: In various (indiscernible).

5 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: But partnering -- and
6 partnering can be demonstrated to a dual credit partnership,
7 a dual credit partnership, or other alignments.

8 MR. NORMAN: Sharing agreement, facility
9 sharing. facilities sharing.

10 MR. GARDNER: Yeah, it might be that. So,
11 it's the typical high school partnering with the use of
12 facilities at the community college.

13 MR. NORMAN: Or, the other way around. I
14 mean, it goes both ways. If the school district wants to
15 build something with the community colleges.

16 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: So, you'd have the same 5
17 points applied both to ISD's and community colleges?

18 MR. NORMAN: I would say. I mean, don't you
19 want to encourage it both ways?

20 MR. FIDELIE: Well, it's mandated by statute
21 the comm -- the school district has to partner with the
22 community college. Is that right?

23 MR. GARDNER: For the community college, do
24 it the other way around.

25 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Okay, you want to give

1 them the language, Mario and David combined?

2 MR. LOZOYA: I think it's David's idea, from
3 --

4 MR. GARDNER: I guess I -- you'd know how it
5 would fit into the application. Essentially, the community
6 colleges would get 5 additional points, on the virtue of
7 having a clear agreement with this one local ISD.

8 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: And, that could be -- it
9 doesn't have to be formal, right? It could be demonstrated
10 through dual credits.

11 MR. LOZOYA: To resource --

12 MR. GARDNER: Resource sharing equipment.

13 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Career pathway alignment.

14 MR. GARDNER: They'd have to make that clear
15 in the proposal.

16 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: So, they still need to
17 demonstrate in any number of ways; including -- so that I
18 think what David and Mario said; to include, but not limited
19 to, these examples. Dual credit, resource sharing, early
20 college models, career pathway developments.

21 MR. GARDNER: And, it does say
22 (indiscernible) related to the equipment they're wanting to
23 buy.

24 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Yeah, related to --

25 MR. LOZOYA: (indiscernible) related to dual

1 credit period. It has nothing to with --

2 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Yeah, related to the
3 pathway program being developed.

4 MR. LOZOYA: At the grant writer
5 (indiscernible)

6 MR. TEMPLE: Can I ask you a question?

7 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Yeah, yes.

8 MR. TEMPLE: If the school had damage to the
9 gymnasium, and certified that in a declared area, does that
10 qualify? Or does it have to be damage to the CPE program,
11 or something like that?

12 MR. LOZOYA: That's equipment.

13 MR. GARDNER: I would argue damage to the
14 school, because these are their resources.

15 MR. NORMAN: Their resources are harmed.

16 MR. TEMPLE: Just wanted to clarify that.

17 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Our intent is for having
18 to launch new career pathway programs.

19 MR. TEMPLE: Yeah, I understand that.

20 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: And, many of these ISD's
21 just don't have the equipment to do it.

22 MR. NORMAN: And, if they're having to spend
23 significant resources to rebuild, that's going to be that
24 much less they have to spend on this equipment.

25 MR. TEMPLE: Just to clarify so when we get

1 in in --

2 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: If we want them to build
3 new programs, we can't disadvantage those who didn't have
4 the program to begin with.

5 MR. TEMPLE: Just helps them when they start
6 getting, when they start evaluating.

7 MR. GARDNER: You know it might be the case
8 where it would help to have a little narrative in terms of
9 what you just said, saying this is really what we're trying
10 to resolve this. We're still trying to --

11 MR. TEMPLE: Well, this takes away from
12 (indiscernible). I understand, yeah, that, and we're still
13 waiting on payment. We're still waiting yada-yada. They're
14 tasked, I don't -- I get that --

15 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Did you get the --

16 MR. TEMPLE: That's a meeting that they're
17 going to call me and go, okay, so here's what we got; now
18 (indiscernible) --

19 MR. NORMAN: (Indiscernible) they have one
20 bus blow over.

21 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Cristina, do you have what
22 you need from the --

23 MR. TEMPLE: That's when they come in and
24 they go applicant number 22.

25 MS. RAMOS: I do have a question on the

1 second request.

2 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Okay, the second one.

3 MS. RAMOS: Regarding the collaboration from
4 -- with the community college and the ISD. What if that
5 college is the partner for the ISD that is submitting an
6 application, and it is the right program that they are
7 requesting equipment for?

8 MR. GARDNER: So, you're saying the community
9 college and the ISD are requesting the same thing? That's
10 double dipping. Wouldn't that be --

11 MR. NORMAN: Yeah, wouldn't we just want them
12 to do it once?

13 MS. RAMOS: Yes.

14 MR. GARDNER: So, I think the intent would
15 not be to fund the same thing twice.

16 MS. RAMOS: Okay, all right. Because I have
17 seen it.

18 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: You're point is valid, we
19 might be creating a situation.

20 MR. TEMPLE: Oh, where they do two
21 applications.

22 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Or where they don't work
23 together, they don't want to work together, because if the
24 ISD submits it; they're the ones that are getting funded,
25 and when the community college submits it, the ISD doesn't

1 get funded. That's a problem.

2 MR. TEMPLE: And, we've had that.

3 MR. LOZOYA: That's a community that doesn't
4 have a strategy. When they're (indiscernible) --

5 MR. GARDNER: They can submit for different
6 types of projects. We just don't want them both submitting
7 for that same automotive program. But if one's for
8 automotive and another is for nursing, that's a different
9 situation.

10 MR. TEMPLE: And, it's different if it's an
11 ISD, but a separate campus. And, working in an area -- so
12 there are ways that -- I know these have come up. This
13 discussion is really helpful for the evaluators to kind of
14 what your intent was. So, thank you for the discussions.

15 MS. RAMOS: We just wanted to clarify
16 because, there's just collaboration, and then there's the
17 collaboration that's going into the proposals.

18 MR. NORMAN: There's collusion.

19 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: (Indiscernible).

20 MR. LOZOYA: So, procedurally, was there
21 supposed to be a motion for that?

22 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: We need a motion. We
23 need you or David to offer a motion, and then it needs to be
24 adopted.

25 MR. LOZOYA: So, the motion is to add to the

1 criteria in the community college segment that if they
2 partner with an ISD, in areas, such as, but not limited to;
3 and you listed them there, would then acquire a 5-point
4 advantage, or 5-point --

5 MS. CLODFELTER: Additional -- to add 5
6 additional points.

7 MR. LOZOYA: 5 additional points.

8 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Do we have a second?

9 MR. GARDNER: Aye.

10 MS. CLODFELTER: Sorry, could I read off the
11 -- to include or be limited to? We have dual credit,
12 resource, early college model and career pathways. Anything
13 else? Okay.

14 MR. LOZOYA: Yes, perfect.

15 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Anything else that any of
16 the other members have? Not limited to? Including, but not
17 limited to. All right, so we have unanimous adoption show
18 me not voting. Aaron, what other business do we have?

19 MR. DEMERSON: On funding allocation.

20 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Okay, funding allocation.
21 Go back to the question of the amount available to community
22 -- post-secondary institutions and ISD's. Previously, we've
23 been at 50/50. Mario, do you have a motion?

24 MR. LOZOYA: I do not, now that we've made
25 that adjustment with the community college to extend the

1 resource sharing to ISD's, I do not have a motion.

2 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Tony, do you have a
3 motion to move to 50/50.

4 MR. GARDNER: I move 50/50.

5 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Okay, who was second?
6 Tony? Aye? Okay, we're 50/50, unanimous. With the -- and
7 with that motion, we -- the board, do we have a motion to in
8 addition to the \$5,000,000, any unspent balances from the
9 prior grant year, be spent and made available for this grant
10 year at the same allocation level. Do we -- do you amend
11 that motion, David? In other words, any recaptured funds be
12 reinvested, in the grant program at the 50/50 level.

13 MR. GARDNER: (Indiscernible).

14 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Okay, second? Okay, do
15 you have a motion to do all that?

16 MR. GARDNER: Aye.

17 MR. FIDELIE: (Indiscernible) table clearly.

18 MR. TEMPLE: One of the things that maybe
19 you've got to -- just a -- sometimes once we deal with the
20 negotiations, with the score, sometimes that budget comes
21 down, we have additional dollars available.

22 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Did we get that kind of
23 award last time?

24 MR. TEMPLE: And, so what we'd like is your
25 direction if we could then take -- as it comes in each

1 category, down to the next high score coming down, where we
2 could fund them all, get that money out, without having to
3 come back to you for --

4 MR. GARDNER: I'll make that a motion.

5 MS. CLODFELTER: Yes, and we'll go over that
6 when we're going over that.

7 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Do you need that motion
8 now? We do it at the end, right? Aaron, what other
9 business do we have?

10 MR. DEMERSON: I think that's -- covers the
11 business under the action items here.

12 AGENDA ITEM NO. 5

13 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Okay, can we get to the
14 timeline real quick?

15 MR. DEMERSON: The timeline.

16 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: For the benefit of the
17 Advisory Board. If you look under tab 6, back page of the
18 timeline, we're scheduled to meet sometime around June, to
19 approve the winners, and to do what Larry just recommended
20 that we do; to give authority that funds an additional --
21 just for your benefit, my intent is that we shortly
22 thereafter, take action to approve the posting of the next
23 fiscal year awards so we can get that money out sooner. So,
24 right about the time that we're wrapping this up, we'll go
25 ahead and have the discussion on moving forward with the FY.

1 What's the second year of the FY? FY '19 grant awards so
2 that we can get those posted, and follow a timeline that
3 gets us with the money going out, end of the year; beginning
4 of the next calendar year. That's just more of an fyi.
5 Anything else, Aaron?

6 MR. NORMAN: And, you know that we don't know
7 that we don't know that date.

8 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Generally, we're looking
9 -- staff believes to be around June 18th, when we have the
10 meeting to select the winners. And, we may in fact, decide
11 to take action to go ahead and move forward. We'll have
12 that discussion, and Emily will brief you on if we want to
13 go ahead and try to have the meeting on the second grant
14 year, during that time. Emily will get back to you sometime
15 around May with all of that. Is that fair? Anything else?

16 MS. CLODFELTER: No, you covered number 5.

17 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: All right, do we have a
18 motion to adjourn this meeting? Any final comments board
19 members?

20 MR. LOZOYA: I always have comments.

21 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Okay, please.

22 MR. LOZOYA: I want to thank -- I want to
23 thank all the support here, and you guys are doing a great
24 job. It means a lot to Texas, means a lot to the under-
25 served communities that haven't had opportunities to get

1 these kinds of credits. And, you can see the data; that
2 it's working, it's helping, and I'm looking forward to
3 continuing to working with you. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Tony?

5 MR. FIDELIE: I just kind of want to tail on
6 that; I'll just say, you know, the proof is in the pudding.
7 We've set a charge last year to saying go get the school
8 districts involved. And, they've gotten involved; they're
9 getting involved. There's a lot more to get involved, but
10 that goes to the travel team, of all those that are going,
11 but also the back-office team who are staying here any
12 processing it all. It's being run very professionally, and
13 I'm glad to have a small part in it.

14 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Thank You, Tony. On
15 behalf of the staff, I thank you. Scott?

16 MR. NORMAN: Glad to be working, glad to be a
17 part of this great discussion. Staff appears to be doing a
18 wonderful job. Again, my hats off to your team, Larry, for
19 your all's turn around, and all the work you all did post-
20 storm. It's exceedingly impressive. Our members around the
21 state, especially in those affected areas along the coast,
22 I'm very impressed.

23 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: David, do you have any
24 final comments

25 MR. GARDNER: This is an important program,

1 and I think -- I admire the hard-working staff. And, I know
2 that it's a little harder after today's meeting, but I
3 appreciate your efforts.

4 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Well, we thank you for
5 being here. Thank you all for your service to Texas.
6 Mario, I really appreciate all the extra work in terms of
7 the ideas. They are really good ideas, and we'll keep
8 working at different angles to make sure that we connect
9 that. But, not just for this program; for the other work of
10 the tri-agency partnership. Tony and Scott, appreciate all
11 that you're doing, thank you for your time today.

12 AGENDA ITEM NO. 6

13 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Do we have a motion to
14 adjourn this meeting?

15 MR. LOZOYA: motion to adjourn.

16 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: Second?

17 MR. FIDELIE: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN ALCANTAR: All right, we're
19 adjourned, thank you.

20

21 (Proceedings concluded at 3:45 p.m.)

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF TEXAS)
COUNTY OF TRAVIS)

I, Kimberly C. McCright, Certified Vendor and Notary in and for the State of Texas, do hereby certify that the above-mentioned matter occurred as hereinbefore set out.

I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT the proceedings of such were reported by me or under my supervision, later reduced to typewritten form under my supervision and control and that the foregoing pages are a full, true and correct transcription of the original notes.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 6th day of February, 2018.

/s/ Kimberly C. McCright
Kimberly C. McCright
Certified Vendor and Notary Public

Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC
1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165
Houston, Texas 77058
281.724.8600