



WORK SESSION OF THE  
TEXAS WORKFORCE COMMISSION

DATE

JUNE 23, 2025

Commission Work Session 6-23-2025

MARY YORK: There were two foster youth items. The conference is in the budget. One intended for foster youth attendance and one for our partners and so if you want to [inaudible].

RYAN CLINTON: Hello, Ryan Clinton, manager, uh, special initiatives with Texas Youth Commission, Texas, I'm sorry, Texas Workforce Commission. Old agency.

MARY YORK: Ryan, can you clarify so I know we have this year's Foster Youth Conference?

RYAN CLINTON: Correct.

MARY YORK: Scheduled for July.

RYAN CLINTON: For July.

MARY YORK: Uh-huh, and uh, can you clarify in the budget for 2026?

RYAN CLINTON: So we did not have—we talked about the conference for the youth? Is that correct?

COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: Yes.

RYAN CLINTON: I don't remember a budget for the youth in particular that was there.

MARY YORK: But the one for, uh—

RYAN CLINTON: The partners is still there, correct.

1 MARY YORK: So for the youth conference it  
2 was, we had tried to procure that I think were not successful  
3 securing that previously.

4 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: Because I think, uh,  
5 there were two. There was a Foster Youth Expo that was specific  
6 for the Gulf Coast, and I don't think they had the interest or  
7 they had lack of interest so they didn't have the, uh, the  
8 people. But what I was talking about is the one that's happening  
9 here in July, the Foster Youth Conference, uh, that's throughout  
10 the state and on the line item I saw that there was nothing for  
11 the operating budget for 2026. I just wanted to see if that was  
12 to say it was either a mistake and if there wasn't if we could  
13 put, uh, 65,000 in that for that.

14 RYAN CLINTON: So we do have a line item for  
15 the Foster Youth Transition Centers and from that we use the  
16 money for the conference. So we separate a portion out that's  
17 remaining from the transition centers and then we will use that  
18 for the conference or the transition centers.

19 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: OK, so there will be  
20 enough in that to put 65 for the conference?

21 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: What conference?

22 RYAN CLINTON: This is the conference that  
23 we hold for the Foster Youth Transition Centers. For instance,  
24 we do have that coming up towards the end of July. That is for  
25 the transition centers. Now a couple years back you did put in

1 65,000, I believe, just for foster youth and not the transition  
2 centers.

3 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: [Inaudible] just for  
4 foster youth?

5 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: No, well—I think the  
6 one that I put for the 65 was for the Foster Youth Expo, which  
7 was specific for the Gulf Coast Workforce Board area, and they  
8 announced it. There was not enough interest so they didn't have  
9 it and it rolled back in.

10 RYAN CLINTON: Correct.

11 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: What I was looking at  
12 was here on the line item, uh, there is for the Foster Youth  
13 Conference, over here it had—

14 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Sixty-two-five and then  
15 there's nothing.

16 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: And then there's  
17 nothing. So I was just curious if that wasn't funded or if it  
18 was an oversight. If it wasn't I was asking if we could put in  
19 65 for that.

20 MARY YORK: I think what I hear Ryan saying  
21 is the 3.2 million, uh, associated with the Foster Youth  
22 Workforce Transition Centers, that that is how we budget for the  
23 conference specifically for those partners. So it comes out of  
24 the 3.2 million, which is actually a slight increase over what  
25 we saw in the 25 budget.

1 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: So is the 62,500 that's  
2 listed on the budget, was that for the expo that failed to make  
3 the Gulf Coast Board?

4 RYAN CLINTON: That is correct.

5 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: That was rolled back  
6 over to—

7 RYAN CLINTON: I believe that was, correct.

8 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: Now we're using that  
9 fund to fund the Foster Youth Conference. Does that take away  
10 from the Foster Youth Transition Centers?

11 MARY YORK: This is how it's previously been  
12 budgeted in the past, so, no. It's part of the overall  
13 allocation.

14 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: So we'll have funds  
15 for a Foster Youth Conference.

16 MARY YORK: Yes, sir.

17 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Are those  
18 conferences, do they travel, are they in different parts of the  
19 state?

20 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: I think Dallas and  
21 Houston—

22 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: I think last year it  
23 was in Austin and this year it's in Allen, Texas.

24 RYAN CLINTON: Last year we did have it in  
25 San Marcos. That was the second year in a row we had that in San

1 Marcos. This year we are moving it and it's up by Allen, and  
2 then we are planning on moving those around the state so that  
3 people will have other opportunities. Correct.

4 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Anything on staff's  
5 package? Couple things, uh. First, we're going to look at this.  
6 It seems we've had some success over the last three, three  
7 years, consolidating programs into larger headings. So we took  
8 all of youth into one heading and all of our veterans programs  
9 under one budget heading and in doing that, we made some  
10 flexibility in money for staff going across those different  
11 programs that might fall under that category. When I started  
12 looking at this, I see some additional consolidations that I  
13 think might have some merit. I'm looking at, in particular,  
14 wildly fluctuating funding levels for Governor's Summer Merit,  
15 youth robotics, youth sports and Camp Code. They're all about  
16 STEM jobs and they are, at least in two cases, roughly the same  
17 kind of program given to different groups of students. I would,  
18 I would like to see us combine all of these STEM, at least these  
19 four, into one budget line item with a dollar amount that would  
20 equal whatever our staff has recommended for each of those and  
21 giving staff the flexibility to move money between those. So,  
22 give you a good example. Some years Camp Code does well, other  
23 years Camp Code does not have a lot of demand. And in a year  
24 where say, Governor's Summer Merit has more demand than we  
25 thought and, and Camp Code didn't, right now, it's a whole

1 process for staff to reprogram that money and send it over to  
2 Governor's Summer Merit. I'd like for us to entertain the idea  
3 that we would just whatever staff's recommended for the funding  
4 level, combine those into one fund, make that available to staff  
5 and let them make decisions within this form and parameters that  
6 are there. Does that sound like something that's workable for  
7 you or it doesn't really matter?

8 MARY YORK: So, chairman, if I understand  
9 you correctly, you're saying these four initiatives, Governor's  
10 Summer Merit, youth sports, Camp Code, robotics, that these  
11 would be separate initiatives or a combined initiative? We do  
12 have the ability, the way that the commission has directed the  
13 funds in the most recent years, as you indicated on your way  
14 out, the flexibility to, to reprogram, uh, to use that  
15 terminology, sometimes from one to another, perhaps that, uh,  
16 could be easier if, uh, there was a way for us to somehow  
17 combine these, to have some type of-

18 COMISSIONER TREVIÑO: [Inaudible] STEM  
19 category?

20 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Yeah. Something called  
21 STEM, or something other than that, come up with a good thing.  
22 But then, the answer to your question is I want to give you guys  
23 maximum flexibility and I think we've got several programs here  
24 that are all about one topic. Four programs specifically about  
25 one topic, which is STEM. I would like to, I would like to

1 stream all that even further and rather than lock you into youth  
2 sports, Camp Code, Summer Merit, what's the other one, robotics,  
3 youth robotics, that we take all that money that's been  
4 designated for that, bring that up into this larger STEM  
5 category and let you rebrand that in some appropriate way.  
6 That's what I'm talking about.

7                   MARY YORK: I think beyond the idea of more  
8 efficiency in how we reprogram the funds based on demand, it may  
9 help us more quickly solicit grant applications if there was  
10 some flexibility there, as opposed to happening potentially four  
11 different separate funding streams and four separate  
12 solicitations, that we could put out one solicitation with one  
13 call for applications, for let's just say, call it  
14 STEM programs, and then have [inaudible] maybe allowable-type  
15 activities within that initiative. That would save the agency  
16 time and hopefully gain some efficiency in terms of getting the  
17 dollars awarded.

18                   CHAIRMAN DANIEL: All right. I'll tell you  
19 what. We'll come back around to this concept when we vote some  
20 of these out. Uh, give you guys just a chance to noodle on that  
21 and then come back. Second, we have made a lot of progress when  
22 I look at materials that you prepared for this discussion. We  
23 have made a lot of progress on collecting and assessing outcomes  
24 data for the different programs that we have created and are now  
25 administrated through TWC. I don't think we've gone far enough



1 but I think we've made tremendous progress on getting the type  
2 of data that can help us really make better resource  
3 allocations. I want to see us get to the point where we outcome  
4 data on everything that we're doing to understand what funding  
5 levels would be, what impacts we're having, what the longer-term  
6 impacts on the workforce would be. I, you know, it's hard to go  
7 in and impose data when we weren't collecting data, six, seven,  
8 and eight years ago, and so it has to be kind of this work in  
9 progress. I think at this point it's my instinct to mandate that  
10 we can do this but I don't, I think that slows down our effort.  
11 I'm just encouraging you, whenever and wherever you can collect  
12 outcomes data, let's be collecting outcomes data. I'd like to  
13 see the commission move very soon to where we can make our  
14 future funding decisions based largely in part to what we're  
15 seeing in outcome data. So where it's appropriate to collect  
16 outcome data, where we have the ability to collect reliable  
17 outcome data, I encourage you to be doing that. I don't think  
18 we're to the point where we can make funding decisions about  
19 that but I think this is an important thing to us. And then  
20 thirdly, I would absolutely remiss if I didn't talk about this.  
21 I've been, last year during this process, I'm pretty sure I  
22 complained to Mr. Serna about how long it takes for us to go  
23 from we funded this to an application goes out. I don't think  
24 you have sped up any in the last 12 months. I think perhaps  
25 slowed down in the last two months. I've been looking at

1 initiatives from our last two work sessions and some of those  
2 haven't even launched yet. I know there's a lot of things that  
3 go into that and this is not criticism of staff. If anything  
4 it's a criticism of how we've structured some things within the  
5 agency. Business, job creation, economic development in this  
6 state, they move at the speed of business. We're not yet. And I  
7 hope that we'll continue to do the types of adjustments that  
8 we've been doing in an exponential kind of way so that we can  
9 move at the speed of business. I don't think there's anything we  
10 can do today. I would just say when we have this meeting next  
11 year, I hope we're not talking about any programs or initiatives  
12 that we discussed here next year that haven't gone out the door  
13 yet. I've seen some plans. You guys are very serious about it.  
14 You're taking it very seriously. You're doing good work relative  
15 to this. It's just not fast enough and to the extent that we can  
16 get everybody on board, general counsel's office, you know,  
17 Lowell's whole team, contract team, Mr. Serna's nodding his  
18 head. That's a good sign. But it's, it's one of things that the  
19 whole agency is going to have to move in this direction. When  
20 this commission says, hey, we think this is an initiative that  
21 will benefit business, we need to have a process in place that  
22 lets us get back on the street much more quickly. Mary, in  
23 particular, I commend you for what you have done. It's not an  
24 easy process changing any bureaucracy because the bureaucracy  
25 loves its own bureaucracy, and it's one of those things that

1 there's a lot of moving parts. I'm, I'm unfortunately the only  
2 one tasked to constantly complain about how long it takes us to  
3 do something. It is faster. I think if we'll keep that in mind,  
4 keep these data points in mind, particularly this outcome data,  
5 and continue to do innovations like we discussed in that first  
6 point where immediately you seized upon my idea of maybe we can  
7 combine these and speed things up. Anything we can do to keep  
8 our ability to run a good, trustworthy, fiduciarily responsible  
9 program and at the same time actually move stuff out to the  
10 people who are going to benefit from it, the more we can do that  
11 I think the better off that we are. I appreciate all that's been  
12 done today. Unfortunately, I guess I'm not through complaining.  
13 We'll keep moving in the future. On some specific initiatives in  
14 staff's package, I'm not, I'm not coming with a change today,  
15 uh, unless you want to, unless staff wants to entertain it today  
16 so I'm kind of springing this on you. When I look at high-demand  
17 job training, and I look at the balance on hand for economic  
18 development corporations throughout the state, typically  
19 speaking, high-demand job training we're matching what's  
20 probably Type B money almost certainly. It could be some Type A  
21 in there, Type B money, when we're matching that the balances on  
22 hand for EDCs across the state are in the billions of dollars.  
23 And I, I really think we should entertain lifting the  
24 limitations that have been placed on high-demand job training in  
25 terms of how many applications each board can do, how many

1 applications are available. If we want to continue to limit the  
2 dollar amount to limit our exposure. I understand that. But I  
3 think we should open this up and accept as many applications as  
4 any board wants to provide. Remember it's matching so they have  
5 to show up with real dollars. They can't just apply for it on a  
6 wish-for-it kind of basis. They're going to have to have a  
7 partner in mind to do that, and that might necessitate us at  
8 some point coming back and raising the dollar amount available  
9 for high-demand job training. But I, I, I'm going to put it to a  
10 question in just a second for the commission, but if we—I guess  
11 my question for you is did we set that limit or did staff set  
12 that limit for the number of applications a board can turn in  
13 for high-demand job training?

14 MARY YORK: At one time the commission set  
15 that one in. I'm sure that at the time, or I should say likely  
16 at the time the staff made a recommendation as to the dollar  
17 amount and the number based on trying to ensure that it was, you  
18 know, sort of multiple boards had an opportunity to participate.  
19 [Inaudible] in response to your question or your comments  
20 rather, regarding lifting the limitations on how many  
21 applications but not necessarily touching the dollar amount, I  
22 guess I would put back to you is there a scenario then where a  
23 board could submit an application with an EDC and then turn  
24 around and submit another application with the same EDC. If it's  
25 about the number of applications but not the dollar amount,

1 couldn't we theoretically have multiple applications from the  
2 same partner with that board area?

3 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Theoretically, yeah. I can  
4 see that. My comment would be they're doing job training and as  
5 long as they're passing audits and passing some sort of TWC  
6 monitoring, they're doing the work, I personally would not have  
7 an issue with that. I mean if someone wants to do a three  
8 million dollar high-demand job training grant and they want to  
9 match that with their three million dollars, I wouldn't have a  
10 problem with that either. But I think from a program management  
11 standpoint, I think there has to be some parameters for staff to  
12 do the very best job in managing that. I, I think that's, I  
13 think high-demand job training is something that we're probably  
14 underselling for whatever reason. I think that has the potential  
15 to unlock a whole lot of stuff in the rural part of Texas, it's  
16 closest to the exurban part of Texas, wherever that may be, you  
17 know. I think you're talking slightly west of Weatherford, if  
18 you're talking Fort Worth, I think all those communities,  
19 [inaudible] where they are, but particularly where they have a  
20 community college and particularly where they have a lot of  
21 growth pushing out in every direction, I think high-demand job  
22 training becomes a very effective tool to help a community  
23 unlock its sales tax money that they've already collected and it  
24 gives us an opportunity to do that. I'll circle back around on  
25 that one too. I think then the real question just becomes, uh,

1 whether or not we want to remove the limitations on how many  
2 applications submitted by—I don't think, I don't think I want to  
3 take away staff's ability altogether to kind of match the  
4 program. In other words, I don't think this thing works best  
5 when we are setting all the rules for it. I think staff has to  
6 have some latitude there to do that [inaudible]. I think this is  
7 something we did do a long time ago and perhaps it's time to  
8 revisit.

9 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Is it a concern that  
10 one EDC will dry up all the resources [inaudible]?

11 MARY YORK: I don't know that I have a  
12 concern. I was just questioning, you know, at the point is there  
13 a point having the limit or keeping the limit at the same  
14 amount—

15 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: You're talking  
16 limiting like a board area or something.

17 MARY YORK: Maybe I should lay out too the  
18 parameters of the current program. Each board area is allowed up  
19 to one high-demand job training and one Texas Industry  
20 Partnership Program grant annually for \$150,000 each. Now, it's  
21 a one-for-one match. That means that the partner needs to  
22 provide \$150,000 as well. So, in the chairman's scenario of the  
23 three-million-dollar request, we would have a problem with that  
24 because right now we're budgeted or the proposed budget is  
25 \$2,000,000 for both programs combined, but \$150,000 each, again,

1 I just wanted to get the commission's opinion at this point. As  
2 you're thinking through possible scenarios do you have any  
3 concerns about multiple applications from the same partners? I  
4 don't know that it's a concern of ours. I just wanted to make  
5 sure that there wasn't a different thought in terms of how we  
6 would want to see this implemented should the commission vote to  
7 take action.

8 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: Would there be like,  
9 uh, a time limit, like shorten the time limit to then open it up  
10 to the other boards to reapply again because they have another  
11 employer that's willing to match or an EDC willing to match.  
12 That way they don't, uh, waste time and staff doesn't have to  
13 get bogged down. They'll have a certain time limit where it's  
14 open from here. Whatever's not used—

15 MARY YORK: That's like a great point,  
16 commissioner, and it's kind of worked on some level that way in  
17 the past, actually, so I should have, I should have noted this,  
18 but in the last quarter of the year, typically if there were any  
19 funds available, we go out and say, hey, if there was another  
20 project that you wanted to fund. So, generally we will have a  
21 board receive more than one award in a year but those are not,  
22 certainly not guaranteed at, uh—it would be dependent upon no  
23 other boards coming to the table. It also is dependent on them  
24 being able to get in an application timely in order for it to be  
25 awarded before the end of the year, and I do think that that is

1 one thing we've experienced and had a little bit of trouble that  
2 whenever we have given boards a second, you know, bite of the  
3 apple, so to speak, is then for them, because frequently, you  
4 know, there's local business that has to take place as well, you  
5 know, local meetings and approvals and whatnot, so they have  
6 timelines that they're working with and work that has to be done  
7 on their end before they can even get us an application to  
8 consider.

9 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: And are there any  
10 stipulations that say that they have to be unique in that same  
11 board area? So like one board area can't do the same high-demand  
12 job.

13 MARY YORK: No, there is not a stipulation  
14 like that. In fact, I would say that, you know, the parameters  
15 that the commission has most recently approved indicate that the  
16 occupations funded must be, uh, high-demand occupations or from  
17 the boards' targeted occupations list or be part of the  
18 governor's current industry clusters. So, there is the  
19 possibility that you're going to see, for instance, health care,  
20 you know, in more than one application, but because we'll see,  
21 uh, you know, frequency of health care occupations on this  
22 targeted occupation list. I will also note that the chairman  
23 brought up community colleges. This is also a program where we  
24 see, uh, a high degree of partnership between the EDCs and  
25 school districts in their area as well. So, these funds have



1 also been used in recent years to expand CTE options, uh, you  
2 know, frequently in partnership with the community college, uh,  
3 also, but a lot of, uh, school districts. And so there's an  
4 instance where you may have duplication because students don't  
5 have the ability to be in one school district and just hop over  
6 to the other school district with the training grant.

7 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: One more thing about  
8 staff's package. On Upskill Texas, it appears that we have  
9 zeroed that out [inaudible]. Just tell us where we are with the  
10 funding and what's [inaudible].

11 MARY YORK: Good question. So, carrying  
12 forward the balance on Upskill Texas, the commission at the  
13 February, February meeting, approved, uh, five million in  
14 additional funding for Upskill Texas and we are just now about  
15 to close the application round on June 30<sup>th</sup>. I can tell you based  
16 on the volume of applications we've received so far, we have  
17 received far more applications than we have available funding  
18 though those applications are still being evaluated to ensure  
19 that they are meeting the parameters of the program. For  
20 instance, if they're for incumbent worker training, that it's  
21 technical training, that the, uh, employer's in good standing,  
22 those sorts of items, all the things the applications have to be  
23 vetted for, but it's not so much that we zeroed it out, it's  
24 just—

25 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: There was still money.

1 MARY YORK: There was still money.

2 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: There was still money. And  
3 if we have enough applications to use up all that money there's  
4 nothing really stopping the commission from kind of—if there's  
5 an available [inaudible] for that one?

6 MARY YORK: Yes, sir.

7 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: There's nothing stopping  
8 us from coming back at a later date if there's available WIOA  
9 balance [inaudible]. I think the money that's in there right now  
10 is money that came back in in part. There's other opportunities  
11 to revisit those. Is that correct?

12 MARY YORK: That is correct. I would  
13 envision that by the end of July, beginning of August, we'll  
14 have a better sense of, uh, how many applications we have in  
15 excess of the five million available and if the commission  
16 directs us to we are certainly happy to bring back another  
17 proposal for additional funds.

18 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Well, that's all I have.

19 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Chairman, could I ask  
20 for a quick update on the internship ch- website?

21 MARY YORK: The internship challenge?

22 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Yeah.

23 MARY YORK: Absolutely. Uh, so, uh, again,  
24 at the February meeting the commission had requested, uh, some  
25 changes to Texas Internship Challenge website. Those, those

1 changes included improving the disability and registration  
2 process. It also included, uh, adding some additional functions  
3 such as, uh, mock interviews [inaudible] AI-assisted mock  
4 interviews, uh, and then also, uh, looking at rebranding and we  
5 are, we have already completed some of the disability work. Uh,  
6 on the registration process, we are in the process of, uh, the  
7 development for the AI functionality and we expect to have that,  
8 uh, those job interview coaching functions available in the fall  
9 as well as working with our Office of Communications and Media  
10 to bring forth some recommendations on every grant.

11 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: OK, good.

12 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: Can you give me an  
13 update on the procurement for the Foster Youth Network?

14 MARY YORK: Update on Foster—yes. Uh, we are  
15 currently investigating, um, potential partners, higher  
16 education partners, uh, where we might be able to partner  
17 through an IAC, as opposed to—we had, uh, released a  
18 solicitation seeking a grantee, a corporate grantee, and weren't  
19 successful in that pursuit, so I think that this may be another  
20 viable option. There are the universities who are working with  
21 this population and those partners already, so we think that  
22 there might be some opportunities there.

23 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: All right, anything else?  
25 We still have time. So, here's one way we can proceed, uh. This

1 is probably a good time for us to stop the discussion, take a  
2 vote on the staff package, and then pick up our proposals from  
3 last week. This is probably not the best way to do business but  
4 it's the most expedient way to do business. I'm asking you to  
5 vote on both the STEM youth initiatives, the four, and the high-  
6 demand job training as staff presented it. We'll come back  
7 around and talk to my suggestions first for changing that.  
8 [Inaudible] the Commissioners, it's the fairest way to do this.  
9 Don't forget, uh, our discussion of staff initiatives does  
10 include the child care proposals that you saw, uh, last Tuesday  
11 as well. That's the discussion paper on child care proposals  
12 that was five pages that you saw there. There's also in that  
13 package, uh--so you've got child care, TANF, WIOA. Remember  
14 there's also AEL and employment services. I didn't see any  
15 significant changes in there. Any discussion on this? If not, I  
16 move we approve the statewide initiatives as part of fiscal year  
17 2026 operating budget as presented and discussed today with any  
18 edits reflected from our discussion and agreement today. There  
19 were none. So this would be a vote on staff's proposal. Is there  
20 a second?

21 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: I'll second.

22 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: All right. Moved and  
23 seconded. Is there any further discussion on staff's proposal  
24 including the child care proposals? Hearing none motion carries.  
25 All right. We can still amend this. Just keep that in mind. If

1 we get into some discussion here, uh, on these other proposals  
2 that leads down another trail, we can always come back and make  
3 amendments to what we've just done before we get out of here.  
4 Let's take this up then, we'll move into commissioner proposals.  
5 Commissioner Treviño, why don't we start with you?

6 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: Uh, last week I asked  
7 about, uh, nuclear energy as an important area for our workforce  
8 and we must ensure that we provide the necessary skills and  
9 training to maximize the potential of this vital industry which  
10 will serve the workers of our state by providing new jobs with  
11 higher earnings potential. Senate Bill 1535 recognizes this  
12 reality and has directed us to create, in collaboration with the  
13 Tri-Agency Initiative and Public Utility Commission, an advanced  
14 nuclear energy workforce development program. While no fundings  
15 were appropriated for program, I would like to propose a pilot  
16 program to identify ways in which we can support workforce  
17 development in this area. I'm requesting that we use 1.5 million  
18 dollars in WIOA statewide funds to create this pilot program  
19 which will work to establish a talent pipeline for this  
20 industry.

21 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Any comments or questions?  
22 Commissioner Esparza.

23 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: I support the effort  
24 actually. I think it's a—  
25

1 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: I have a couple of  
2 technical questions. Uh, Mr. Trobman, I think this piece of  
3 legislation directs us to do rulemaking on this before we  
4 proceed. Am I reading that correctly?

5 MR. TROBMAN: I believe that's correct.

6 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Also, um, there's two  
7 things on this particular one that I do think we want to keep in  
8 mind. One is the necessity to do this in collaboration with the  
9 Tri-Agency group, Coordinating Board and TEA, and then if I  
10 remember also correctly there was a statutory direction to work  
11 with the Public Utility Commission to, to do this as well. Am I  
12 right on all that? My point is we're going to, we're going to I  
13 think we all—I mean I'm supporting [inaudible] so there's—we're  
14 going to put 1.5 million for this today, um, but the  
15 commission's going to have to do a lot of work on this before we  
16 can proceed with that pilot program or not, and, um, I'm not  
17 sure if you're calling it a pilot program because of the amount  
18 of money but we don't really have to. We can just do it how we,  
19 how we want to lay this out but I think we just need to be  
20 cognizant of the fact that we have to work with at least three  
21 other agencies on this one and we have to go through rulemaking  
22 ourselves, and so, um, that will necessarily create a longer  
23 timetable than probably what we would like to see but I think  
24 that's how it's going to be.

25

1 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: I was, uh, just  
2 curious because I thought it would be uh—since it was a shorter  
3 program it would have, uh, like circumvent the rulemaking  
4 process for this so we could get like, uh, a basis for what we  
5 would work with, uh, especially going into, uh, the future  
6 years, uh, to make sure that Senate Bill 1535 along with the  
7 Tri-Agency and Public Utility Commission would have a good  
8 foundation for that. That was my philosophy.

9 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Yeah, that's a Mr. Trobman  
10 question. I don't know the answer.

11 MR. TROBMAN: So the question, yeah, here is  
12 that it would be sort of a, a, an initiative that's not needed.  
13 It's not designed to meet the, uh, 1535 requirements. Rather,  
14 it's—

15 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Correct.

16 MR. TROBMAN: An effort to, to—

17 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Right.

18 MR. TROBMAN: [Inaudible] whether or not we  
19 can—

20 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: We can already run  
21 the traps to see what will work and what, uh, our partners can  
22 come up with to make sure that when we do have to go to Senate  
23 Bill 1535 that we have a better understanding of [inaudible].

24 MR. SERNA: Could we use this pilot to  
25 determine what the final—what the rules need to, need to look

1 like so that it is truly a pilot, it's more just a feeler  
2 program that helps us establish what's workable from a rules  
3 perspective as opposed to crafting rules based on something  
4 theoretical and then running the pilot and then having to adjust  
5 the rules or adjust a future [inaudible]. Maybe actually use it  
6 as a real pilot, that would sort of—we'd scope it down some  
7 maybe but then be able to come back and inform the commission  
8 about the findings of the pilot, and then we could establish  
9 final rules and the final rules would be in place for  
10 [inaudible].

11 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: Yeah, like I don't  
12 want it to model exactly the legislature. I want have like a, a  
13 basis, a foundation so that we know when this comes up and takes  
14 a breath, that we have an idea what will work and what's the  
15 best course.

16 MR. TROBMAN: We'll just want to—and I don't  
17 think that's an issue. We'll see to make sure that we run the  
18 traps to ensure it's not running afoul of the statute itself and  
19 the spirit of the statute itself as well but that being said, I  
20 think, me, I feel like—thinking, you know, putting the, putting  
21 this funding for, uh, practical purposes allow us to, to run  
22 those traps.

23 MARY YORK: Commissioner, when I was reading  
24 your discussion paper, I know that you had referenced, uh, other  
25 emerging industries so I also took this to mean that potentially



1 this could be a pilot for other emerging, emerging industries,  
2 like renewable energy, advanced manufacturing, cybersecurity as  
3 well ultimately just starting with nuclear. Is that correct?

4 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: Right, right. So and  
5 there are, uh, others that aren't high-demand jobs like, uh,  
6 I've been talking to, uh, different companies that say that  
7 indust-industrial painters and blasters are going to be very  
8 important for not just the nuclear reactors but the LNG because  
9 they make sure that all of the containers are rust free and  
10 secure but we don't have enough here in Texas at this time, uh,  
11 due to the training and certification that it takes to get, get  
12 that. Most of them are on the East Coast so I think we need to  
13 start building that pipeline of workers that's not high demand  
14 yet but will probably be in the future so, uh, thank you for  
15 pointing that out. It's going to be also for different  
16 industries that fall under this, uh, this proposal or this  
17 legislation.

18 MARK YORK: So perhaps to the chairman's  
19 earlier comments if we were-initiate this as a pilot, come back  
20 and report to the commission outcomes and then, uh, based on  
21 those outcomes present some additional recommendations for other  
22 emerging industries like [inaudible].

23 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: To clarify, the, the,  
24 triggering rulemaking, is, does that affect the application of  
25

1 the pilot program or was the pilot program got-help establish  
2 rulemaking to push forth?

3 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: I think if we delink this  
4 money from 1535—

5 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: OK.

6 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: And just make this money  
7 about emerging industries.

8 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: OK.

9 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: And, and basically the  
10 point being we, we want to determine the best way to bring some  
11 money to 1535, I think, Joe, that becomes much—that becomes much  
12 less of an issue for us. It would link the 15—the more it links  
13 1535, the more I think—

14 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: [Inaudible].

15 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: I'm not comfortable  
16 proceeding without rulemaking.

17 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: OK.

18 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: The more the commission  
19 just had a great idea which it sounds like we did, the more the  
20 commission had a great idea and said we're going to get out  
21 ahead of this, I think the less they're linked, and the more we  
22 can experiment with it because I, I would tend to agree with,  
23 with Albert because I think that there are a lot of jobs that  
24 are on the verge of becoming high-demand jobs. I think there are  
25 a lot of jobs that are already high-demand jobs but the way we

1 count that is probably not the best, and so I think there are  
2 lots of opportunities here and I think the more we can get  
3 ourselves oriented along the lines of, OK, that job's hard to  
4 fill versus let's do some programming to help people get the  
5 nurses that they--help employers get the nurses they need. That  
6 helps everybody so I think to the extent that's what you're  
7 describing.

8 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: Right, and I think I  
9 put the Senate Bill just as an example, not that we're going to  
10 model it, uh. I guess in the future I won't put the Senate Bill  
11 I guess to--so that there's no really question that we're linking  
12 it to it, uh. I was just kind of referencing that. I know that  
13 that's what the legislature is thinking about for the future and  
14 I wanted to kind of get a jump start on that [inaudible] Senate  
15 Bill [inaudible]. It's the same concept but it's just to try to  
16 follow and get ahead of the work that's going to be happening.

17 MR. TROBMAN: One thing I'll just add that I  
18 think this conversation is helpful because, you know, the  
19 commission, you all will be coming back in a month or two to  
20 discuss rulemaking in general and how you want to prioritize  
21 those for the upcoming cycle next year [inaudible] and so, uh,  
22 recognizing that this potential rulemaking is on the horizon  
23 [inaudible].

24

25

1 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Anything else on this  
2 specific point? Otherwise, [inaudible] permission to roll over  
3 to the next one.

4 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: OK, the next one is  
5 rural workforce. Uh, the commission has recognized the  
6 challenges that rural communities face in workforce development.  
7 Rural school districts and community colleges often lack the  
8 resources to address these issues to properly develop the needed  
9 workforce. Senate Bill 2448 directed the creation of a rural  
10 workforce development grant program to provide grants to  
11 nonprofit organizations that will provide technical assistance  
12 and support to rural colleges and school districts but not  
13 appropriate funds for the program and requires formal rulemaking  
14 prior to the implementation. I believe that engaging in an  
15 eligible public or private research institution to develop a  
16 pilot program to assist these rural community colleges and  
17 school districts with grant applications, facility upgrades,  
18 partnership development, and aligning education with employer  
19 needs will help us identify skill gaps, training programs, and  
20 facilitate private partnerships, and I am requesting \$1,000,000  
21 in WIOA funds to create this pilot program.

22 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: [Inaudible].

23 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: So I'm back to my original  
24 questions. I think you've already stated your intent was not to  
25 link this to Senate Bill, what was that, 24-

1 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: 2448.

2 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: To link it to 2448. That  
3 really this is about rural programs. Now we have a number of  
4 rural programs from a year or two or three years but I don't  
5 know when we did that. Um, some of those have been implemented.  
6 I think all of those at this point have been implemented. Does  
7 this parallel any of those? I mean is this similar to something  
8 we've already done relative to rural training or is this unique  
9 enough that we can run this also as kind of a pilot program?

10 MARY YORK: I don't think that we have  
11 anything that meets the specific criteria that Commissioner  
12 Treviño laid out. It's now in a discussion paper. We'll—if I  
13 could ask one clarifying question now, I think, commissioner,  
14 you mentioned facility upgrades.

15 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: Yes.

16 MARY YORK: Are you envisioning that the  
17 research institution would make recommendations on facility  
18 upgrades to the institutions, the school districts, that they're  
19 assisting or are you recommending that facility upgrades be part  
20 of the actual funding, and the reason I bring that up is it may  
21 have—there may be some limitations related to WIOA funding but  
22 also, but really the timing, uh, could be problematic because,  
23 uh, specifically construction projects can take some amount of  
24 time so that may be a consideration, uh, that we would want to  
25 [inaudible].

1 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: I think the main  
2 thing is that some of these smaller rural community colleges or  
3 school districts don't have the space, and the private or public  
4 institutions that are helping them with this would allow them to  
5 look at, uh, different avenues or suggestions on how to make  
6 space available or use, uh, vacant strip malls that have become  
7 available and partner with, uh, city or county entities to get a  
8 space maybe donated to the school district or college so that  
9 they can use, uh, because some of the equipment that is being  
10 used to train the students is, uh, big and takes a lot of space  
11 and a lot of these school districts are bound in and don't have  
12 that capacity so that was the kind of thought process behind  
13 that.

14 MARY YORK: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Anybody else [inaudible]?  
16 Do you have any other additional [inaudible]?

17 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: No, [inaudible].

18 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: All right. Let's move to  
19 Commissioner Esparza. Um, you have the parent educator child  
20 care pilot program.

21 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: My one request for  
22 state initiative [inaudible] parent educator child care pilot  
23 program to expand access and workforce participation utilizing,  
24 uh, the child care development fund, uh, basically to test  
25 parent participation in child care models and I know we have,

1 uh, continued to talk to Rae yeah, Rae, you can sit next to me.

2 Uh—

3 MARK YORK: She's going to be over here

4 [inaudible].

5 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: I know. Uh, I know we  
6 have, uh, have similar types. Obviously, child care providers  
7 have programs to where they accept volunteers into the child—the  
8 classrooms, especially classrooms, allow volunteers to help and  
9 basically just kind of keep an eye on, on things as it were. Uh,  
10 this program also—I hope it addresses training for child care  
11 providers, caregivers, to be trained in what I'm thinking, I  
12 think we mentioned up to 30 hours of training, uh, and annual  
13 professional development to provide them—that helps them  
14 participate as parents but also makes them qualified for  
15 employment in the early child care workforce, uh, in that, uh,  
16 in that nature. Uh, I currently know there's a program in  
17 Houston that we've, we've talked with, uh, that I see how this  
18 works on a daily basis. It's positive and I feel that's what  
19 we're here for, is to go and look at different programs to find  
20 out what's working in different areas. I'd like the opportunity  
21 to, to, to highlight or provide the ability for other workforce  
22 development regions to, to take advantage of something like  
23 this, uh, get it off the ground and see how, how it goes so I  
24 definitely think this is specifically a pilot program, uh, to be  
25 able to afford the ability to address a certain population. Uh,

1 I, with that, it's we're asking 4.7 million dollars be put into  
2 that and I believe we are—that would be redirected from a pilot  
3 program from staff recommendation that there be the child care  
4 investment partnership program [inaudible] recommended  
5 discontinuation of that program to utilize the money that was  
6 allocated for that to form this program. Uh, forgive me, I don't  
7 know the details on the discontinuation of that program but if  
8 the monies are available, we want—we hope that this wouldn't be  
9 digging into, uh, to, uh, our current [inaudible].

10 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: We just discontinued that  
11 so—

12 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: OK. Uh, but again I,  
13 uh, I think this also, you know, obviously strengthens caregiver  
14 ratios, uh, and helps, helps, helps address a, uh, most of these  
15 programs, this program specifically addresses lower, lower  
16 income so it's not going to affect 100 percent change for the  
17 entire child care system because something like that we haven't,  
18 haven't untangled that knot yet but again, if it is able to help  
19 a certain population in different parts of the state and it's  
20 available to them, uh, I'd like to see if we give that a go.

21 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Comments or questions?

22 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: I mean I like this  
23 proposal. The only, uh, clarification I would ask is, uh, the  
24 parents that are participating in this program, uh, as to their  
25 TWC rights to the services, uh, for example if one of the



1 parents is, uh, on UI benefits, will that affect the UI benefits  
2 because their unavailability to work because they're doing the,  
3 the volunteer program or--?

4 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: If we talk about  
5 subsidies, we [inaudible] talk about UI.

6 REAGAN MILLER: So in the child care  
7 program, you can receive child care for up to three months while  
8 you're unemployed and looking for work but after that they do  
9 have a work requirement so I don't know that it would have a UI  
10 impact. If somebody was receiving UI and they were looking for  
11 work, they potentially could be enrolled in this program, um,  
12 and then these volunteer hours would count towards their child  
13 care work requirement, um.

14 MR. SERNA: If they're being--if they're  
15 getting paid or basic--if they're getting paid to do this, then  
16 they've got to report that income if they're receiving--if  
17 they're receiving [inaudible].

18 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Yeah, and in exchange  
19 for their actual payment I think that's, that's one day that  
20 they're doing, it's voluntary one day to, to subsidize the other  
21 three days.

22 MR. SERNA: Right, so they're really not  
23 getting paid, they're not getting a check that they would  
24 report, report income. [Inaudible].  
25

1 REAGAN MILLER: But they would be working  
2 somewhere else.

3 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Right.

4 REAGAN MILLER: So in addition to—so they  
5 have to volunteer one day with no pay but they also have their  
6 work requirement and so they would also be working for pay.

7 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Is that still 25 hours a  
8 week?

9 REAGAN MILLER: 25 hours for a single  
10 parent, and our current rules do not allow volunteer hours to  
11 count towards the 25 so we would need to waive our rules if we  
12 wanted to allow that one day of volunteering to count towards  
13 the 25.

14 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: [Inaudible] include  
15 volunteer work?

16 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: To give the access to  
17 this, you know, somebody with an eight to five Monday through  
18 Friday would—may not be able to access this program. There would  
19 be an idea that people, uh, that shift work, gig work, uh,  
20 restaurants, [inaudible], you know, you have to be available to  
21 provide one day to volunteer, uh, or if you [inaudible] work  
22 Tuesday through Saturday, that's just her normal given, uh, work  
23 week. That would be ideal for something like this so I do  
24 understand it's, it's kind of nuanced with the, the, the  
25 population that will be using this but I still feel that it

1 would be, uh, a good action to, to, to address that population  
2 [inaudible] ability to get to work and provide affordable child  
3 care.

4 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: So [inaudible] guidelines  
5 still apply. If they stop volunteering, does that three-month  
6 clause go into effect on them?

7 REAGAN MILLER: If they're still working at  
8 a different location.

9 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: So in other words, they  
10 stop volunteering and they pick up their 25 hours working, they  
11 still—they've leapfrogged their way into a spot off the wait  
12 list and they keep it because they have it.

13 REAGAN MILLER: Correct. Under federal regs  
14 we're required to provide 12 months of child care.

15 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Yeah.

16 REAGAN MILLER: As long as they're working.

17 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Yeah. On page one at the  
18 top of the page it says this will reduce the wait list. How will  
19 this reduce the wait list?

20 REAGAN MILLER: If we can serve 400 more  
21 children, then with a—I don't know if reduce the wait list is  
22 technically probably the right way of saying that. It will serve  
23 more children. Those children may or may not be on the waiting  
24 list. One of the other recommendations was the—we allow, we  
25 allow these children to skip the waiting list. If we, if we

1 implement this and follow the current wait list policy, then any  
2 board that wants to participate in this has to go down the wait  
3 list one by one and contact every parent in priority order and  
4 ask them, would you like to participate in a parent caregiver  
5 pilot project.

6 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Will they be able to  
7 opt into that? I mean we're, we're going through a very  
8 convoluted way of doing that. If, if you're on the—if you're  
9 talking to—we'll say the board has 100 people that don't—that  
10 are not involved in, in child care. If, if I'm somebody that,  
11 that works Monday through Friday and absolutely not able to do  
12 that, I could opt out of it and that would help alleviate the,  
13 the, the, the onerous task of, of calling every individual but  
14 as people start to, start to, you know, access the waiting list,  
15 they can, they could say I'd be interested, give me a call if an  
16 availability pops up.

17 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: As I understood on page  
18 three, we're—we would—we're seeking—you're seeking waivers to  
19 basically treat these parents as a, as a class of parents who  
20 would be equal to contracted slots. They would be equal to  
21 DFPS's must-have slots. In other words, they never actually go  
22 on the wait list. They just go straight to the child care. I  
23 just want to be careful about saying it will reduce the wait  
24 list because it won't reduce the wait list at all. They'll  
25 actually never go on the wait list, and even if they did and

1 came right back off, other parents will fill [inaudible]. It  
2 doesn't really do anything to reduce the wait list. It does,  
3 however, increase the available child care workforce, and we—in  
4 lieu of payment we are incenting parents to want to do this  
5 volunteer work by giving them another kind of benefit which is  
6 OK. I mean like we're trying to increase total capacity at the  
7 child care centers I think is what we're trying to do, and if  
8 parents are willing to volunteer and complete all the training  
9 that's necessary to do that because it's like, what, 30 hours of  
10 training plus criminal background check. I mean you don't just  
11 show up and start volunteering. You've got to do some stuff. Um,  
12 so 4.7 million would be 470 kids roughly?

13 REAGAN MILLER: Well, we would have to—the  
14 boards would need some money to—for, you know, to operate the  
15 programs. They're going to —they're going to have to have staff  
16 eligibility workers. They're going to have to do announcements  
17 to see if child care programs want to participate so there's  
18 some administrative and operational costs.

19 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Like, do we know the  
20 breakdown on those?

21 REAGAN MILLER: My estimate was maybe  
22 700,000 of this 4.7 which is about 15 percent I'm guessing would  
23 be admin ops which would leave four million.

24 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: So about 400 children.

25 REAGAN MILLER: Yes.

1 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: What would be the  
2 volunteer work for the parent if they have more than one child?  
3 I think it says one day per week for each child [inaudible].

4 REAGAN MILLER: Yes, sir. If they have two,  
5 then they have to volunteer two days.

6 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: Three, three days.

7 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Is it, uh, is there  
8 the, is there an opportunity for—is it solely the parent but we—  
9 we're also include a caregiver, right? Um, when you say parent,  
10 we're talking biological parent?

11 REAGAN MILLER: Whoever the guardian of the  
12 child is.

13 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: OK.

14 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: So it wouldn't be  
15 like a grandparent or—

16 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Could it be?

17 REAGAN MILLER: It would be—it's whoever on  
18 our CCS case is basically—

19 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: [Inaudible].

20 REAGAN MILLER: Attached to that child.

21 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Yeah, the program  
22 that I've looked, that I've watched is—they allow—if they're  
23 able to have, you know, a grandparent or somebody that's also  
24 [inaudible].

25

1 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: I don't think we can do  
2 that here because we're basing it off the rules we already have.

3 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Right.

4 REAGAN MILLER: And counting those hours  
5 towards their work requirement.

6 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Right.

7 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Yeah.

8 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Support basic eligibility.  
9 On page two we talk about flexible scholarships. What are these  
10 flexible scholarships?

11 REAGAN MILLER: I thought that that language  
12 had been removed. That was in an initial draft that we saw and I  
13 think we recommended taking that out. Did it not come out? I, I  
14 think it was referring to, uh, the 12-month eligibility subsidy  
15 financial aid scholarship, all meaning the same thing.

16 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Well, there's no--so  
17 scholarship here actually means subsidy? And there's no  
18 flexibility. It's just whatever the rules are [inaudible].

19 REAGAN MILLER: Scholarships are flexible  
20 insofar as a parent gets to select, uh, the provider of their  
21 choice.

22 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Subsidy is, yeah.

23 REAGAN MILLER: Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: On page three in the  
25 second bullet point, we get in--we get into a series of

1 exemptions and waivers but I went and read the child care rules  
2 in 809 and I can't see that we have the authority to do blanket  
3 waivers. So there is—there is a discussion about waivers but it,  
4 it requires someone to petition for a waiver. It doesn't say  
5 that the commission can on its own ability ask for that waiver.  
6 Somebody has to ask us to grant the waiver.

7 REAGAN MILLER: There is that section of the  
8 rule on waivers. There's also another section on special  
9 projects.

10 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Yeah, and I didn't see  
11 anything in that section about waivers. And then this—you're  
12 talking about 809.53.

13 REAGAN MILLER: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Which also specifically  
15 says that only non-CCDF funds can be used for a special project.  
16 Are these CCDF funds?

17 REAGAN MILLER: They are.

18 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: So another waiver and I  
19 don't know that we have the ability to grant that waiver. Now  
20 having said all of that, we're about to enter into a whole bunch  
21 of rulemaking and I actually think this thing has some merit.  
22 This is a very novel way to help us deal with the lack of, of  
23 available workforce in child care. I, that part is so intriguing  
24 to me. I just—I'm very concerned about us doing this in the  
25 framework that we currently have so this thing on non-CCDF



1 funds, perhaps the general counsel should look into that  
2 further. I don't see any ability for us to do, uh, blanket  
3 waivers, and then we can't just amend the definition of work  
4 without doing rulemaking. What I would recommend is that we do  
5 expedited rulemaking on making this a specific special project  
6 and just do rulemaking on this, put it in there. I, I absolutely  
7 would vote for the 4.7 million today but in my opinion, and I  
8 would certainly let Mr. Trobman contradict me but in my opinion,  
9 I think some of this would require either some novel legal  
10 interpretations or our ability to go ahead and do some fairly  
11 quick rulemaking on that. I'm perfectly content to vote for the  
12 money and wait for the answers to those questions to determine  
13 how to proceed.

14 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: This proposal is  
15 something that I wanted—I want to see. It definitely needs to  
16 still test the waters and I think that's part of the what we're  
17 talking about when it comes to waivers and the definition of  
18 work and availability so I, I would definitely like to see a  
19 little bit more work done so that we can iron out some of these  
20 issues and have a better product in the end to work with. Um, I  
21 don't know what—

22 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: No, I, this is what I  
23 think should happen, you know, figure out what we're going to do  
24 today but I think we just vote for the money, say we're going to  
25 earmark 4.7 million for this purpose and then we'll engage in

1 whatever activity this commission needs to engage in to make it  
2 happen. I mean unless you—I don't really disagree [inaudible].

3 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Yeah, no.

4 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: It's one of those things I  
5 don't think you've got any opposition.

6 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Yeah.

7 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: I think, I think we can't  
8 do it the way it's written in this proposal but that's what I  
9 think. Actually Mr. Trobman gets to think on this one so I, I,  
10 you know, I think let's find out what we need to do and then  
11 let's just do that. We'll come back and take a vote.

12 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: OK.

13 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Is there anything else for  
14 [inaudible]? All right.

15 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Was there anything  
16 else that was—

17 REAGAN MILLER: Yep, that's good.

18 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: I'm thinking those  
19 were pretty much all the flags we talked about when we  
20 [inaudible].

21 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: [Inaudible] addition to  
22 that?

23 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: None.

24 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: On Tuesday, last Tuesday,  
25 I laid out Texas senior military leader internship program

1 [inaudible]. 500,000 dollars. This is—I'll be real honest with  
2 you. This is, this is an issue that Joint Base San Antonio does  
3 encounter. I think that's meaningful because it's all branches.  
4 This is who raised the issue with us. Essentially in their  
5 market all the senior-level officers, jobs that they might get,  
6 uh, very backlogged in their marketplace. These officers need  
7 experience elsewhere. I think that an internship program much  
8 like a college internship program, uh. I only talked to the army  
9 [inaudible]. Bob, did we talk to just the army or did you talk  
10 to other branches on this one?

11 BOB GEAR: I talked to—spoke with the army  
12 and of course Sarah Finney [SP] with the air force, and then as  
13 she, they, they had the navy that goes through there, coast  
14 guard, and everybody.

15 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Bob talked to the air  
16 force, Joe. Do you understand the significance of that? Uh,  
17 \$500,000 really finances the administrative portions of this.  
18 Uh, it is my understanding, uh, that the military says they also  
19 have money to help with this effort for officers that are  
20 mustering out so our, our role here would be to formalize this  
21 process, give it a name, give it some shape but most importantly  
22 hand it over to the Veterans Leadership Program and let Bob and  
23 his, his squad do what they do very well, and any questions.

24

25

1 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Could I, uh, I don't  
2 know if we can open, if we can talk about the past initiatives  
3 in this [inaudible].

4 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Sure, we can talk about  
5 whatever we want.

6 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: The military to  
7 civilian employment, that three million that we proposed, that  
8 we brought up, uh, Mary and Bob, it was 1.4 million of that  
9 three was applied for and approved was one point, basically 1.4,  
10 just a shade under. Uh, that, that's all the—we didn't ask for  
11 any further funding for that transition. I think that was  
12 basically to meet a one-time gap between—

13 MARY YORK: The military transition civilian  
14 unemployment [inaudible].

15 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: OK. I just wanted to  
16 be sure because if there was any money to appropriate toward  
17 that, I didn't know if it would be helpful to, to make sure that  
18 we don't leave any money in the pot that hadn't been, been  
19 [inaudible].

20 MARY YORK: To your point and I guess to the  
21 chairman's point earlier, if the commission wanted to amend any  
22 of the amounts than what you just approved and allocated, that  
23 that is possible.

24 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Yeah, we can do that. I  
25 mean if there's, if there's a need.

1 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Is that—does it make  
2 it less complicated or [inaudible]?

3 BOB GEAR: Right now the last we have six  
4 board areas that have been funded, close to 1.4 million  
5 [inaudible]. I could tell you who those board areas, who's  
6 getting ready to submit another grant because of the size so  
7 right now—

8 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: We can basically say  
9 that money's going to be used for [inaudible] purpose.

10 BOB GEAR: It should be used, yes, sir.

11 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: OK, I'll withdraw my  
12 [inaudible].

13 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: No, it's a good discussion  
14 because you know what? Fort Hood and Fort Bliss, they have a  
15 different job placement issue.

16 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Right.

17 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Than JBSA.

18 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Massive amounts of  
19 four and done.

20 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Yeah, and they're an air  
21 force pilot base where it's all senior-level pilots there. Just  
22 two different things.

23 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Yeah, no, I agree.

24

25

1 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: And they—we need both of  
2 those like you raise a good point. Questions, concerns,  
3 comments? [Inaudible] move on.

4 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: I was just going to  
5 ask, uh, so the TVLP, the program, will the funds be outside the  
6 boards? Will it go straight to this program? Funding go to this  
7 program or—?

8 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: It will go to TVLP,  
9 right?

10 BOB GEAR: Funding would come to us but it  
11 was used to hold stakeholder, uh, stakeholder meetings, uh, and  
12 travel. In order to do this and I've talked with Serafina. This  
13 is going to be challenging but fun because of what we're  
14 targeting. This is something that has not been done on the  
15 state. [inaudible] Heroes at chamber of commerce has done some  
16 similar but not, not to the level we're trying to do it so  
17 that's where the money will be spent, commissioner.

18 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: Thank you, OK.

19 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: So the 500,000 is  
20 primarily if not all for TVLP to do their part of the work. They  
21 might—we might have to supplement a little bit about what's  
22 going on at the base. Anything else? [Inaudible] nominations for  
23 a better name, revenge of the career shifters [inaudible]. Nah,  
24 this is people who are making a shift in their career  
25 [inaudible]. These are people who are making a move in their

1 career, probably shifting from one career to another. One time  
2 someone at a silicon chip maker here in the state, they told it  
3 to me as a joke but I half think it's true. They said they try  
4 to target dental hygienists to come make silicon wafer chips  
5 because they're used to wearing a mask at work and in small  
6 confined spaces. I thought that was pretty funny. I also think  
7 it might partially be true. Um, this is an opportunity for TWC  
8 to, uh, basically supplement our career exploration initiatives  
9 by focusing a million dollars on people who are simply shifting  
10 from one career to another. It's going to necessitate some sort  
11 of additional training for them. This isn't necessarily about  
12 advancing within the career track that you're in. This is making  
13 a shift to a different type of deal. It probably involves  
14 internships, likely will involve internships as a way to do that  
15 kind of, of career exploration. Um, a million dollars and we've  
16 run this through workforce the way we run other related types of  
17 projects. Comments, questions, concerns? All right, then I'm  
18 going to move to just our rotating industry. This is, this  
19 one's—

20 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: I was going to ask  
21 you real quick. Um, on the career shifters or the next chapter  
22 people, will they clarify, uh, if they're still employed or  
23 unemployed?

24  
25

1 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: To me it doesn't matter.  
2 If it matters to you, we probably ought to get it on the table  
3 [inaudible].

4 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: I mean I don't think  
5 it matters. I just didn't know if you clarified the fact that it  
6 was, uh, if the people who were making the career shift were  
7 still employed.

8 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: I think it can be both. It  
9 might, it might give us a platform to start looking at ways to  
10 blend in the RESEA stuff [inaudible].

11 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: Right.

12 MARY YORK: I was going to say, sir,  
13 unemployed men, they may be eligible for other—

14 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: RESEA [Inaudible].

15 MARY YORK: Services, other RESEA or WIOA,  
16 uh, through the boards so—

17 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: It's probably more about  
18 people who are, we would say in our parlance, underemployed  
19 because they need the training to make a change I would say. I  
20 hadn't really thought about it that way until you asked me that  
21 but, yeah. Mr. Serna's saying it just gives us more flexibility  
22 on how we help people. I mean this is hole act—this is just a  
23 hole we found in what's frankly getting to be a really  
24 comprehensive package of how people can do career exploration.

25 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Yeah.



1 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Right?

2 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Somebody currently  
3 looking into the world of pipeline welding [inaudible].

4 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Let the record reflect  
5 Commissioner Esparza's competence.

6 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Not looking.

7 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: About his pipeline  
8 [inaudible]. That's like a 3x pay raise for us. Um, my last one  
9 here that I presented last Tuesday is we just simply called it  
10 our rotating, uh, industry, uh, internship. This is, this is  
11 college students specifically. Uh, I make no bones about it.  
12 This would be us adding to our already robust college internship  
13 programs. I, I fully want this to be part of that package. It  
14 does not need to be standalone but what I would like to do is  
15 dedicate \$500,000 to a type of internship program that lets, uh,  
16 high school and possibly community college and even younger, uh,  
17 college students, particularly when they haven't really selected  
18 what they want to do yet, to be able to use this on career  
19 exploration for them to understand all the different jobs that  
20 are out there, and rather than get locked into their major and  
21 do like a junior/senior year of college internship, let's, let's  
22 think junior/senior year of high school possibly or second year  
23 of, of, of university or community college, either one.  
24 Obviously \$500,000, it's going to operate somewhat like a,  
25 somewhat like a pilot program but I, I want this to be

1 statewide. I want this to be available and honestly, it's a  
2 little light on details because we're going to leave it up to  
3 staff to put some parameters in place to run it to make it fit  
4 [inaudible].

5 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: I just kind of wanted  
6 to point out too, there was an internship initiative that was  
7 on, uh, February 4<sup>th</sup>. I think this is different because that one  
8 had a specific job, and this one is opening it up to—

9 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Agreed.

10 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: OK.

11 MARY YORK: [Inaudible] clarifying question.

12 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Please.

13 MARY YORK: [Inaudible] commented about  
14 folding this in to our other internship initiative, if there was  
15 a way for us to allow this as an option under a larger  
16 internship umbrella. Did that still meet the goals that you're—?

17 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: It does for me. As long as  
18 it's available to people. Administrative treatment of it—

19 MARY YORK: OK.

20 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: I just want to be sure  
21 that there's 500,000 available to help fund it not much—much  
22 like we're doing on senior military leaders. I just want to make  
23 sure there's administrative funds, and then as we get into it,  
24 if we need something else, she'll bring it back to us and we'll  
25 talk about it. All right, um, so I brought up earlier, uh, the

1 notion to combine the STEM youth programs all into one which  
2 would require renaming, I think. Um, if you're not quite there I  
3 can appreciate that. I'd say, um, we turn it over to staff and,  
4 and let them move along with it, bring it back to us at a  
5 subsequent meeting unless you—if you want to vote for it today.  
6 I'm game either way. I, I trust that we get it done and I'm, I'm  
7 willing to vote it out, but if you're not, I understand.

8 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Chairman, I have one  
9 question. Does that—do we—are we will, going to be able to, to  
10 earmark or I guess line item to each or is it just a big pot  
11 [inaudible]?

12 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Well, I, I'm leaning  
13 towards big pot.

14 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: OK.

15 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Yeah, so if earmarking's  
16 important to you, let's—

17 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: No, that's fine.

18 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: OK.

19 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: We'll consider.

20 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: And then whether or not we  
21 want to remove the prohibition on multiple applications on high-  
22 demand job training and potentially increase the dollar amount  
23 there. So, uh, I do not have a dollar amount in mind. My goal  
24 was simply to lift the prohibition on multiple applications  
25 which I guess could necessitate, uh, staff asking us for more

1 money at a later date. We're not going to get anywhere near, uh,  
2 the balances that are available to us today so leaving that kind  
3 of funding amount might lift the prohibition and move forward at  
4 this point doesn't propose a problem for us. If there's any  
5 opposition to removing the prohibition on the applications, I'll  
6 drop it for today. I'll bring it back later. It just won't be  
7 today but, but, uh, you know, I don't have a dollar amount in  
8 mind so I can't tell you why, you know, what I would even want  
9 to increase it to. Let's do this. Um, we need to vote on these  
10 individually. I'm going to do it this way just for expedience's  
11 sake.

12 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: That wouldn't take  
13 rulemaking to change it.

14 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: What's that?

15 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: But that wouldn't  
16 take rulemaking to change that.

17 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: No, no, we did that to  
18 ourselves.

19 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: OK.

20 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Um, let's do this. So, um,  
21 the—I'll go in order we heard them and we'll just take a quick  
22 vote on these, and then I think we may need a bunch at the end,  
23 may not. Let's see where we end up. So emerging industry  
24 workforce development pilot program. This is—Commissioner  
25 Treviño presented this to us. Is there any objection to his

1 proposal and dollar amount? Hearing no objection, uh, that one  
2 passes. Rural workforce development pilot program, one million  
3 dollars. Is there any objection to this proposal? Hearing no  
4 objection, that one passes. On the parent educator child care  
5 pilot program, 4.7 million dollars. Is there any objection to  
6 the dollar amount? No objection. The dollar amount passes, will  
7 dedicate 4.7 million. Mr. Trobman, you heard our discussion on  
8 concerns that we have about rules, rulemaking, and the related  
9 subjects. Can staff clarify that, and then whatever requires  
10 commission action they'll bring back to us at the appropriate  
11 time?

12 MR. TROBMAN: Yeah.

13 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Commissioner Esparza, is  
14 that OK?

15 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: That's great.  
16 Appreciate it.

17 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Is there any objection to  
18 doing it that way. Hearing no objection, so ordered. Texas  
19 senior military leader internship program at \$500,000. Is there  
20 any objection to what you've heard today, the proposal.  
21 Objection to the concept, no? All right. That one carries.  
22 Supporting career shifters at \$1,000,000. Any objections? No  
23 objections, that one carries. Rotating industry internship at  
24 \$500,000, is there any objection? Hearing no objection, that one  
25 carries. Uh, Commissioner Treviño, were you satisfied on the

1 answer you got on the Foster Youth Conference at \$65,000. You OK  
2 with where you are?

3 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Well, I have the concept  
5 to combine the STEM youth together into one effort. Objections?

6 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: Could that work also  
7 for the internship initiatives we've got going?

8 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Any objections to adding  
9 the internship initiatives.

10 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: I think it's-

11 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Good idea that we would  
12 collapse the internships into one perfect pot and let staff run  
13 the various components as, as they need to shift resources  
14 between them. No objection? Any objections? No objections? High-  
15 demand job training, removing the prohibition on one application  
16 per board, opening that up and revisiting funding at the  
17 appropriate time. That's the motion I would offer. Is there any  
18 objection to that?

19 MARY YORK: Chairman, [inaudible] question  
20 before-

21 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Mary says I object.

22 MARY YORK: I just want to clarify so high-  
23 demand job training is the one you specifically spoken about,  
24 Texas Industry Partnership is out-is funded here in the same  
25 bucket, you know, funding source and has the same limitations.

1 Is it your intent that only the application limitation would  
2 [inaudible] removed from high-demand job training?

3 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Only because I didn't  
4 think of it. Now that you mention it, no, I don't object to that  
5 but if these guys do. Here's what will happen if you don't lift  
6 it on both of them is all the money will go to high-demand job  
7 training and then industry partnership will be the one that  
8 suffers. That's your concern I think or one of them. Any  
9 objection? All right. Hearing no objection, high-demand job  
10 training removal of prohibition on applications and also Texas  
11 Industry Partnership [inaudible]. OK, that's all I have on my  
12 list. I actually think the way I did this—Mr. Trobman, I don't  
13 think we need another motion to clarify all that unless you want  
14 us to for clarity's sake.

15 MR. TROBMAN: No, I think what we're hearing  
16 is that your original motion earlier today is effectively  
17 amended by those two items.

18 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Adding those [inaudible].

19 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Chairman, can I get  
20 some clarification on, on, on adding the internship. I know we  
21 can do that.

22 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Yeah.

23 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Are we, is it the  
24 initiative, um, because I think we have two things. We have  
25 Texas Internship Network which we, we, we fund conferences,

1 engaging with employers, and then we have the website. The  
2 website is funded through the agency. Is there a difference  
3 between the use of the funding for the conferences that we put  
4 on?

5 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: The answer to the question  
6 is what we just did is we put all the funding into one bucket so  
7 we can pay for all the stuff that we already said we were going  
8 to pay for.

9 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: OK.

10 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: And, and, the, the  
11 practical reality of that is if something needs more money,  
12 they'll get it. If something needs less money, they'll give that  
13 up to something else that can use it without us having to come  
14 back and address it again.

15 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: OK.

16 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Now this is only possible  
17 because Mr. Serna selects the very best staff for the agency,  
18 and I trust that they'll use this in the spirit that it's been  
19 given, and I think they'll alert us if we start having funding  
20 issues on this. That's the only reason I was comfortable with  
21 doing it sort of on the fly.

22 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: OK.

23 MARY YORK: I will note one exception to  
24 that internship combination [inaudible] Texas Intern Network may  
25



1 keep that as a separate line item, um, based on how those funds  
2 are [inaudible] with the other internships.

3 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Thank you.

4 [Inaudible]. We've got [inaudible] planning events that are  
5 getting pushed into this [inaudible].

6 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: We were just trying to  
7 disrupt that for you.

8 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Yeah.

9 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Didn't want you to get  
10 bored. No, we definitely [inaudible]. I know you're busy but  
11 [inaudible]. That is furthest from my intent, is to disrupt  
12 something that you've already got.

13 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: OK.

14 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: That's not what we're  
15 trying to do. We're just trying to streamline the administrative  
16 side of this. Any other order of business to come before the  
17 commission until tomorrow at 10:00? Is there a motion to adjourn  
18 this work session?

19 COMMISSIONER TREVIÑO: I move to adjourn.

20 COMMISSIONER ESPARZA: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: It's been moved and  
22 seconded to adjourn and we're adjourned. Thank you all.

23

24

25