

1 THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 2020

2 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Well, let's call this
3 meeting to order. So we're here for this Advisory Board Meeting
4 for the Jobs and Education for Texans Program. Now that the
5 meeting's called to order, Emily, you want to take the roll?

6 EMILY: Absolutely. Chairman Brian Daniel.

7 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Here.

8 EMILY: Mario Lazoya. Will Connelly.

9 WILL CONNELLY: Here.

10 EMILY: Gerald Booker.

11 GERALD BOOKER: Here.

12 EMILY: Scott Norman.

13 SCOTT NORMAN: Here.

14 EMILY: Steve Leshlo.

15 STEVE LESHLO: Here.

16 EMILY: Chairman, we have a quorum.

17 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Thank you very much.

18 Does any members of the Advisory Board have any comments that
19 they'd like to make at this time? None. All right, we'll have
20 plenty of time for that throughout the meeting. Mr. Trobman,
21 has anyone signed up for public comment?

22 MR. TROBMAN: No, sir. No public comment.

23 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: All right, thank you very
24 much. Let's move them to Agenda Item 3, which is the Approval
25 of Minutes for the September 17, 2019 meeting.

1 EMILY: Yes. Members attached in your
2 Board book, you will see the minutes from the September 17, 2019
3 JET Advisory Board Meeting. Unfortunately, there was a little
4 glitch in the recording of the meeting, so we did not have a
5 court reporter. So you--we do need to take action to approve
6 the minutes from this meeting in order to move forward. So if
7 you have any questions, please let me know, otherwise we will
8 look for a motion.

9 SCOTT NORMAN: Scott Norman. I'll move
10 approval.

11 WILL CONNELLY: Will Connelly. I'll
12 second.

13 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: It's been moved and
14 seconded to approve the minutes as presented. Is there any
15 objection to approve the minutes? Show that the minutes were
16 approved unanimously.

17 EMILY: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: All right. That'll take
19 us into Agenda Items 4 and 5. Four is Discussion, Consideration
20 and Possible Action Regarding Grants to public Junior Colleges,
21 Public Technical Institutes, Public State Colleges in the School
22 District.

23 And Agenda Item 5, which can follow or we
24 can take it up before is Discussion, Consideration and Possible
25 Action on Measures to [unintelligible] Covid-19 pandemic. I

1 bring them up this way because we're in some pretty interesting
2 times here. You know, we have both a statutory and, frankly, a
3 good obligation here to commit these funds to good use. I will
4 tell you that as a commission, we've been conserving a lot of
5 our dollars and pushing those forward to Covid-19 efforts.
6 Those can be training, can certainly be what we're considering
7 here today. But we're sort of looking at everything through a
8 new light. Understanding that the applications for these funds
9 were submitted long before anybody knew what Covid-19 was or
10 what the impact it was gonna have [unintelligible] stay.

11 And so what I would like for the Advisory
12 Board to consider as we go through this, if we like what we're
13 seeing here and we can understand that this will be beneficial
14 to the State's effort as we look out to the future and try to
15 understand how we'll bring economic development back to the
16 state, we're on the back side of this, if we think we see
17 something here that might not be exactly how we've always done
18 things, now would be the time for us to discuss that in this
19 meeting, so we can bring that forward.

20 On the other hand, if we just want to
21 consider the applications as they were submitted, and understand
22 that those investments will be made in both higher education
23 institutes and the ISDs, we think those are still beneficial,
24 certainly under all the authorities that we have, we can
25 continue to make that investment and let that go forward.

1 I just want to give folks the option.
2 We've been, at all of our commission meetings, talking through
3 how we're spending funds and how we think this is going to
4 benefit both job seekers and employers when the economy starts
5 to come back online. Hopefully soon, hopefully this summer and
6 hopefully an opportunity to move forward into the fall.

7 I would open it for discussion and if there
8 is none, we'll ask Ms. Hoffelter to lay out the proposals that
9 are before us. But certainly, this is an appropriate time to
10 discuss this and then we can also have further discussion after
11 Emily does her thing. Okay. I'm not seeing anybody unmute
12 quickly to discuss. Emily, why don't--why don't we lay out what
13 we have proposal-wise and then we can resume discussion after
14 that.

15 EMILY: Absolutely, Chairman. I would also
16 like to take a moment. I see that Commissioner Aaron Demmerson
17 has joined us, so I would just to thank Mr. Demmerson for being
18 here today and taking the time to join this meeting.

19 If folks will turn to page six of their
20 Board book to a JET application summary. We give you FY '16
21 through present just because, for historical information but
22 want to discuss the FY '20 information. It's tentative
23 [unintelligible] technically still open. But as you can see,
24 there were 82 applications received for FY '20, 23 IAGs and 59
25 ISEs. Out of those applications, 80 met minimum qualifications,

1 meaning 80--only two were disqualified this year. And then out
2 of those 80, 53 of those applications met the 60-point threshold
3 that the Advisory Board has set; 13 colleges and 40 ISDs. So
4 below that, the actual amounts requested.

5 And so as you can see moving down to the
6 requested amounts 60-point threshold, you can see that \$2.6
7 million was requested of those applications that met that 60-
8 point threshold and then slightly over \$8 million were
9 applications from ISDs [unintelligible] 60-point thresholds.
10 Meaning, we would have about--if we were able to, unlimited
11 funding, we could've funded \$10.7 million worth of application,
12 which is, of course, exiting to see the need.

13 I would like to highlight that last
14 Advisory Board meeting, the Advisory Board took action to split
15 the funding 50 percent between ISDs and IHEs. As
16 [unintelligible] during that meeting in FY '19, we had utilized
17 and gone down the list of those IHEs completely, meaning that
18 every IHE that had met that 60-point threshold was funded.

19 For this year, as I mentioned, those IHEs
20 that met that minimum point threshold, only \$2.6 million worth
21 of applications, which 50 percent is about 33 percent. However,
22 the ISDs, we would be able to fund the rest of the \$8 million
23 with IHE--ISE applications, excuse me and the ISDs have over \$8
24 million worth of eligible applications. I wanted to bring that
25 to your attention as we move forward with today's discussion.

1 So if you will flip to page seven, I
2 mentioned there were two disqualifications, One IHE
3 disqualification and one ISD disqualification. For the college,
4 it had been that one institution had submitted more--
5 application, so that additional application was disqualified.
6 And then for the ISDs, as you can see, that they did not include
7 that high demand occupation form that the local workforce board
8 is required to sign in their application [unintelligible] part
9 of their documents to turn in.

10 If we move to page 8, so this is the
11 beginning of the mass document list, mass applications that
12 you're used to seeing. In part with the ISDs, as you can see,
13 of those, 39 on this--excuse me, 41 on this list, we are able to
14 find 29 applications and that includes, of course, that is more
15 than the 50 percent of the \$4 million that we [unintelligible]
16 the Advisory Board had decided last round but gaining the
17 additional funding from the IHE amount, moving it over to ISDs.

18 And so of course this list gives you their
19 score, the grant amount, number of [unintelligible] students,
20 the occupation and then again, that license certificate or post-
21 secondary degree that this program and-or course is leading
22 these students to.

23 And again, I will reemphasize that every
24 application that you see on this list and every occupation has
25 been signed off on by the local workforce board saying, yes,

1 this is a high-demand occupation in this region. This is
2 needed. I always want to, you know, reemphasize that that is a
3 big part of these is that every occupation listed is a high-
4 demand occupation in the Workforce Board region where this
5 institution is.

6 So that goes through page 14 and on page 15
7 starts the IEG, the colleges, their mass application list. So
8 again, same information. Grant amount, unduplicated students,
9 occupation, title and that license certificate, post-secondary
10 degree for the program. And as I mentioned that we are able to
11 go down the list completely with the IHE to find every
12 application that was eligible or met that 60-percent threshold.

13 So with that, I will open it up for
14 questions, comments, discussion, anything that the Board has.

15 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Questions or comm--

16 SCOTT NORMAN: This is Scott Norman.

17 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Scott.

18 SCOTT NORMAN: Going through the list, I
19 notice, I mean, they're all essential services under the
20 Governor's order and under the CDC or Homeland Security
21 guidance, cites the 2.0 list, I mean, it's categorized and
22 they're all--they're almost all either medical or some kind of
23 mainly welding, construction related with some engine repair and
24 other things in there, as well. So I think they certainly fit
25 into the Covid times that we have.

1 And then a general--to your question, Mr.
2 Chairman, earlier, I think, as we hopefully get the economy
3 started back up here sooner rather than later, we're going to
4 have a lot of unemployed individuals and this may be more on the
5 higher ed. space, that are going to be looking for new careers
6 because their occupations either are not essential at this time
7 or they've been laid off or furloughed or what have you. And so
8 I think we may see an increase. I was on a call with TSTC this
9 morning on the exact same topic. We may see an increase in
10 adult--need for adult education as people look to change careers
11 or look for new occupations in the workforce. Yeah, we're
12 seeing the same thing, large, you know, across all the areas we
13 cover at the Workforce Commission. And that's certain, I think,
14 germane to this discussion in terms of, you know, what future
15 training will we need. Mario, were you--did you have a comment
16 or a question?

17 MARIO LAZOYA: Yes, I do. Thank you, Mr.
18 Chairman and good afternoon, everybody else. I understand that
19 we have this condition with Covid-19, however, for long term
20 perspective looking at the data and expecting similar data in
21 the years to come, again not considering the Covid-19, I've made
22 the request before about the consideration having the funds
23 split 50-50. And when you look at the--the data, it's clear
24 that typically, the IH--the community college IHEs request less

25

1 than what's allotted. And typically, the ISDs request much more
2 than what's allotted.

3 I'm requesting consideration to adjust the
4 50-50, to reflect the demand in ISDs, to increase it to maybe
5 60-40 ISDs.

6 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Okay. We took a vote on
7 that at the last meeting. If we want to--if we want to take
8 another vote on this, if you want to present that in the form of
9 a motion and you get a second, we can certainly put that to a
10 vote.

11
12 MARIO LAZOYA: Yeah, I was not present last
13 meeting and I do, would like to make a Motion for Consideration
14 of Adjusting the Allotment from 50-50 to reflect the data and
15 supporting the ISD's demand.

16 STEVE LESHLO: Yeah, I'll second that and
17 I'll also comment at the appropriate time. This is Steve
18 Leshlo.

19 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Right. It's been moved
20 and second and so it's open for discussion.

21 GERALD BOOKER: I have a question. This is
22 Gerald Booker. Emily, the amount of students served, is it also
23 about a 60-40 split? I mean, in other words, that's just a
24 estimate of what a split would be but is the amount of students

25

1 served that great of a difference in the eight million to the
2 two million?

3 EMILY: You know, we'd have to look--take a
4 deeper dive. You know, we've seen some ISDs have hundreds of
5 students enrolled in these programs and some of the community
6 colleges have, you know, much less. So it kind of depends. You
7 know, we do like to say--or I would like to reinforce that the
8 ISEs must be in partnership with their local community
9 [unintelligible] so the colleges are a part of every--100
10 percent of these grants.

11 GERALD BOOKER: Right.

12 EMILY: So I would like to--but as far as
13 the student distribution, we would have to look a little further
14 into the numbers. But, you know, we can definitely do that.

15 MARIO LAZOYA: I'd like to add to that
16 comment. You made a good point where the community colleges
17 need to be in partnership. I'll remind you that in alignment
18 with the 65-30 initiative as well as Lieutenant Governor Senate
19 Bill 22 PTECH, we've seen many more PTECH schools opening up
20 within the ISDs, so PTECH programs within the ISDs. And most of
21 these PTECH programs require high-end equipment which is right
22 in alignment with a JET grant. And in my opinion, I think the
23 PTECH program, Pathway for Technology and Early College High
24 school, provides that key partnership with the ISD with the
25 community college, provides that pipeline to the community

1 college. So the community college accredits that course at the
2 high school, so the high school students are potentially getting
3 a certification or a degree before they leave high school. So
4 we're seeing those programs even grow even further. So my guess
5 is that even this demand that's going to even increase in the
6 years to come. Dallas has, I believe, about 16 PTECH schools.
7 We're seeing it starting to feed down into south Texas here
8 where I'm at. We had, last year, had zero PTECH schools, this
9 year we have six. So when you start looking at those numbers,
10 you're seeing that increase and that demand at the ISDs that's
11 not even reflected yet. And we'll start seeing that coming up
12 in the years to come.

13 STEVE LESHLO: Mr. Chairman, may I comment?

14 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Please.

15 STEVE LESHLO: So my name is Steve Leshlo.
16 I've had conflicts the last few meetings, so I apologize about
17 that, for not attending. But I serve on the school board for
18 San Antonio Independent School District. We serve about 50,000
19 kids, 93 percent economically disadvantaged and 97 percent
20 students of color. My lens through which I view the service on
21 this committee is then necessarily--I've been on the school
22 board for seven years, I've been on this committee, I think,
23 four years. And so that--that's the lens through which I look
24 at this and I can remember conversations whenever I was first
25 appointed to the Committee by then Speaker Joe Strauss, it was a

1 new thing for ISDs. Historically, this has exclusively been a
2 program for community college districts. At that point, it was
3 a new thing for ISDs. Even then, I think we split--we agreed,
4 as a committee, to split the proceeds 50-50 and we saw kind of--
5 what I like to think in my non statistician mind, is like a--
6 the--the start of a Bell Curve where, in those first few years,
7 there was a lot of uncertainty from the ISDs about the
8 application process. My memory serves, a lot of the ISDs didn't
9 complete--their applications got kicked out or had to go back
10 for resubmission because they just weren't doing it right. But
11 over the years, as the ISDs have gotten more comfortable with
12 the process, with these partnerships, with the community
13 colleges, we started to see the numbers diverge where they're a
14 whole lot more highly qualified ISD applications. And so I
15 think Mario's proposition, proposal is timely at this point
16 because we have, I think, a full velocity of ISD applications
17 coming in.

18 Also, I'll share anecdotally, that ISDs are
19 starting this race far behind the starting line. The equality
20 of the facilities and the equipment that that many of--
21 especially urban school districts lower--more economically
22 disadvantaged school districts are using, are far inferior to
23 the facilities and the equipment that community college
24 districts are providing.

25

1 In my mind, so much of what we can do as
2 the committee is to help these school districts who have
3 historically thought of CTE career, technical education courses,
4 as a lower-tier track to place lower performing students by
5 using bad equipment, out-of-date equipment. It really wasn't
6 until HV4--and this is, again, just my experience, until HV4,
7 which was, gosh, in 2013-ish, where I saw in school districts
8 across the state, an epiphany about what career technical
9 education could be and should be. It should be a pathway for
10 every student, not just a pathway for those students who aren't
11 gonna go to college. That epiphany happened decades after the
12 epiphany happened--the same epiphany happened in the community
13 college districts.

14 And so all this to say I think ISDs are
15 still running from behind. We're still trying to catch up in
16 this--in this game of providing our students with incredibly
17 high quality CTE programming. And so adjusting our allotment
18 accordingly to account for that and to support these school
19 districts further I think would be appropriate this year and
20 maybe for the next few years.

21 SCOTT NORMAN: Mr. Chairman, Scott Norman,
22 I have a question.

23 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Sure.

24 SCOTT NORMAN: If we made this adjustment,
25 do we know--and not to put staff in a bind, but do we know--if

1 we apply--I guess we're talking about applying it now. If we
2 did that, how would that affect the applications in the approved
3 institutions?

4 EMILY: Mario, correct me if I'm wrong but
5 it sounds like the action that we're looking to take is to
6 change the allotment, the split to reflect applications
7 received, meaning we could go forward with awarding these grants
8 to reflect that approximately 37 percent for the IHEs and then
9 the rest for the ISEs. Mario, is that correct what you were
10 implying?

11 MARIO LAZOYA: Thank you for allowing me to
12 clarify. I'm not necessarily making the motion for this
13 particular round. I'm just generally making the motion based on
14 the data of the prior years and what I think is coming. So I
15 think I'm making more of a motion fo--since we're not gonna meet
16 probably for another month or two, so I'm making the motion for
17 follow-on applications. But should--what I see right now, it
18 looks like the IHEs are not going to use up their portion of the
19 funding anyway. Right. So maybe a separate motion would be to
20 use those excess funds to apply to ISDs.

21 But to clarify, my motion was just in
22 general for general purpose.

23 EMILY: Okay, great.

24

25

1 SCOTT NORMAN: Well, I guess that answers
2 my question. Would this free up some surplus funds to satisfy a
3 need if we applied it now?

4 EMILY: I think the motion that I was
5 infer--or questioning, if we could--yes, if we made a motion to
6 basically allow the split to reflect applications received, then
7 we would be able to award additional ISD grants utilizing those
8 additional IHE funds, physically moving it from that IHE pot
9 over to the ISD pot.

10 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Yeah, so we got two
11 issues kind of going simultaneously here. I think we've got
12 Mario's motion [unintelligible] which would, for the future,
13 based on his intent, would reset it to 60-40. It would not
14 apply today based on his intent for the motion. What I would
15 suggest is that we both, on this measure, to see where we want
16 to be moving forward. Then it would be perfectly in order to
17 take a motion to consider the current pool of funding to
18 reconsider our previous recommendation for a 50-50 split, fund
19 whatever portion of the IHEs we want and then any surplus funds
20 on the basis of that motion could definitely be awarded to the
21 other pool. We put these parameters on ourselves as an advisory
22 board, therefore by, you know, just a simple motion and a vote
23 of the Advisory Board, we can re-advise ourselves whenever we're
24 ready to do that.

25

1 So if there's not an objection, I'd say
2 that we should probably call the question on Mario's motion, go
3 ahead and take the vote on that and then if we want to come back
4 with this additional motion that I've alluded to, I think that
5 would probably be the best order that we could take these up in.

6 So if there's no objection, Emily, call the
7 roll and let's take a vote on Mario's motion.

8 EMILY: Mario Lazoya.

9 MARIO LAZOYA: Yes, present. And I made
10 the motion.

11 EMILY: Will Connelly.

12 WILL CONNELLY: Yes.

13 EMILY: Gerald Booker.

14 GERALD BOOKER: Yes.

15 EMILY: Scott Norman.

16 SCOTT NORMAN: Yes.

17 EMILY: And Steve Leshlo.

18 STEVE LESHLO: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: That's a unanimous vote.
20 We'll reflect this in the minutes and ask staff to include that
21 particular split as we move forward.

22 STEVE LESHLO: And, Mr. Chairman, I would
23 make the motion that you suggested in your last comment, and I
24 would make it in whatever way that you think is best

25

1 articulated. So if you could re-articulate what you suggested,
2 then I will so move.

3 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Okay. Well, what I
4 suggested was that, honestly, based on the totals, there was \$4
5 million available to IHDs. They only had--using the 60-point
6 threshold, I only see 2-point, roughly, 7 million, which would
7 leave 1.3 million and some change available that could then be
8 applied to applications that met the 60-point threshold on the
9 ISD side. That would be how I would articulate it.

10 STEVE LESHLO: So moved.

11 SCOTT NORMAN: Second.

12 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: We got Scott Norman
13 seconding it.

14 MALE: Question--I have a question
15 [unintelligible] does that affect--and I am for, I think, doing
16 what's been moved. But in the--based on your earlier comments
17 about needing to be maybe a little more judicious with funds in
18 light of the crisis we find ourselves in, does staff have any
19 concerns they want to articulate on making this move or spending
20 that money right now that we need to be aware of before we vote?

21 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: I'm going to take that as
22 a no.

23 STEVE LESHLO: Yeah, and the other thing
24 that I would say, Scott, and again, this is just from the
25 district's perspective, we know that we're going to--as school

1 districts, we're going to be hurting if not next school year,
2 whenever the next legislative session starts, in preparation for
3 the next biennium. And so while--what I would say is that every
4 dollar is going to help ameliorate the likely significant
5 impacts that Covid is going to have on the long-term funding for
6 school districts. And so even though it may be one more step to
7 get to--away from the direct impact on Covid, these dollars
8 would unquestionably help remove at least a little bit of the
9 strain by called by the pandemic from school districts.

10 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Other discussion?

11 Hearing no further discussion, let's proceed to a vote.

12 EMILY: So I would just like to remind the
13 Advisory Board, when making a Motion on allowing staff to award
14 grants according to the-- [audio cuts out 00:30:39 through
15 00:35:33].

16 STEVE LESHLO: --community has been touched
17 by the pandemic but to watch what it's done to the ISDs. I also
18 have three young kids and so, you know, living it from every
19 perspective and it's--it's something else. Really is.

20 SCOTT NORMAN: Yeah, I noticed they kicked
21 you out of the house.

22 STEVE LESHLO: Yes. Yes, they have. Y'all
23 don't want to go in there. I have a six year old and a three
24 year old at home and a wife that works full time. And so we are
25

1 constantly balancing who's taking a shift here and who's
2 wrangling or kids.

3 SCOTT NORMAN: Oh, yes. It's different.
4 It is very different. Unfortunately, my wife was raised by two
5 professors and it's right up her alley. But that said, you
6 know, challenging for her. She would've met, as well. I can
7 only imagine what a great deal of other parents are going
8 through, as they go through this challenge. So it's something.
9 And while we're here, you know, hats off to-- [audio cuts off
10 00:36:50 through 00:41:25].

11 EMILY: Go to--

12 SCOTT NORMAN: I think she just joined us.
13 Okay. It doesn't matter.

14 EMILY: Okay. So going through the
15 discussion and what's needed for action. The action needed, I
16 think, to make it a little bit more of a simple action is for
17 staff to move forward down--or to award the grants according to
18 the mass lists, move down accordingly and any additional funds
19 from the IHE amount maybe moved over to award additional ISD
20 grants.

21 SCOTT NORMAN: This is Scott Norman. I'll
22 make a motion to amend the motion that's on the table to reflect
23 that.

24 STEVE LESHLO: Second, the amendment.

25

1 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: It's been moved and
2 seconded on the Amendment. Is there any discussion? Hearing no
3 discussion, this vote is on the amendment.

4 EMILY: Okay.

5 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Call the roll.

6 EMILY: Mario Lazoya.

7 MARIO LAZOYA: Yes.

8 EMILY: Will Connelly.

9 WILL CONNELLY: Yes.

10 EMILY: Scott Norman.

11 SCOTT NORMAN: Yes.

12 EMILY: Steve Leshlo.

13 STEVE LESHLO: Yes.

14 EMILY: Gerald Booker.

15 GERALD BOOKER: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: All right. That vote's
17 unanimous. The vote's now--barring any discussion, the vote
18 would be on the motion as amended. Is there any discussion?
19 Hearing no discussion, let's proceed to vote. Call the roll.

20 EMILY: Gerald Booker.

21 EMILY: Mario Lazoya. Mario?

22 MARIO LAZOYA: Yes.

23 EMILY: Thank you. Will Connelly.

24 WILL CONNELLY: Yes.

25 EMILY: Scott Norman.

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

SCOTT NORMAN: Yes.

EMILY: Steve Leshlo.

STEVE LESHLO: Yes.

EMILY: Gerald Booker.

GERALD BOOKER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Okay. Is there any other item of business that needs to come forward?

EMILY: Under Item 4, no sir.

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Under Item 4. We, for the most part, have taken up Item 5. If there's any further discussion on Item 5, this would be the appropriate time to hear this. Hearing none, we'll move to Item 6. This is Discussion, Consideration and Possible Action on Future Board Meetings.

EMILY: So we--the next Advisory Board Meeting that will have planned is to come back together to discuss program parameters for the \$8 million available for FY '21. And we will have--that will--we do not have a date for that but I will reach out at a later date this year. Hopefully, it would be an [unintelligible] meeting but we will reach out to schedule that again and if there's any need for a special Advisory Board meeting, we will reach back out to that, as well. So no update at this time.

CHAIRMAN DANIEL: All right. Any further discussion on Agenda Item 6? Mario.

1 MARIO LAZOYA: Not necessarily on six but
2 just requesting an update since the prior motion was to move
3 dollars from IHE to ISD, will then the Board get an update of
4 what that looks like for ISD? So I think you mentioned 29
5 awards but I think that's gonna change.

6 EMILY: So after the contract nego--when
7 the RFA is closed and grants have been awarded, we, of course,
8 will give you the names and the grant am--you know, all of that
9 information but we will send an additional [unintelligible] so
10 you that you are aware of what that kind of split's like. And
11 again, that's going to include any recaptured funds, you know,
12 so if it's a--be a little bit more than the eight million. Um,
13 but we will make sure that the Advisory Board gets those final
14 numbers.

15 MARIO LAZOYA: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Questions or comments?
17 Any further business to come before the Advisory Board?

18 SCOTT NORMAN: I just wanted to say, Scott
19 Norman, one, welcome, Gerald. Sorry didn't get to meet you in
20 person but hopefully, we do soon. And two, I don't think you
21 were on the line, Mr. Chairman, but we were all talking about
22 what a fantastic job you all were doing in unplanned
23 circumstances.

24 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Well, thank you.

25

1 SCOTT NORMAN: I know it's a challenge and
2 very much so.

3 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: [Unintelligible] but
4 thank you.

5 STEVE LESHLO: Yeah, and one more shout out
6 to the staff for accommodating a virtual Zoom meeting when this
7 is not typical operating procedure. So to Emily and everyone
8 else at the agency who stepped up and made it run relatively
9 smoothly, I mean, this is, like someone said, the new normal and
10 it's appreciated to accommodate us and to accommodate the work
11 in that way.

12 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Yes, thank you.

13 SCOTT NORMAN: Absolutely.

14 EMILY: Thank you all.

15 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: ALL RIGHT.

16 MALE: Motion to Adjourn, Mr. Chairman.

17 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: It is very much in order,
18 a motion to adjourn.

19 MALE: Second.

20 MALE: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: It has been moved and
22 seconded to adjourn. Is there any opposition to adjournment?
23 Hearing no opposition, this Advisory Board Meeting is adjourned.

24

25