

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
TEXAS WORKFORCE COMMISSION
AUSTIN, TEXAS

PUBLIC MEETING)
FOR THE TEXAS)
WORKFORCE COMMISSION)

COMMISSION MEETING

TUESDAY, APRIL 10, 2007

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT at approximately
9:00 a.m., Tuesday, the 10th day of April 2007, the
above-entitled matters came on for hearing at the
Texas Workforce Commission, TWC Building, 101 East
15th Street, Room 244, Austin, Texas, before DIANE
RATH, RON LEHMAN and RONALD G. CONGLETON,
COMMISSIONERS, and LARRY TEMPLE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
of the Texas Workforce Commission; and the following
proceedings were reported by Janis Simon, a Certified
Shorthand Reporter of:

	TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
1		
2	AGENDA ITEM NO. 1	3
3	Chair Rath	
4	AGENDA ITEM NOS. 2, 3 & 4	3
5	AGENDA ITEM NO. 5	4
6	AGENDA ITEM NO. 6	No Action
7	AGENDA ITEM NO. 7	No Action
8	AGENDA ITEM NO. 8	6
9	Nicole Verver	
10	AGENDA ITEM NO. 9	9
11	Dale Robertson	
12	AGENDA ITEM NO. 10	11
13	Commissioners	
14	AGENDA ITEM NOS. 11 & 12	22
15	Jesse Lewis	
16	AGENDA ITEM NOS. 13, 14 & 15	No Action
17	AGENDA ITEM NO. 16	24
18	Larry Temple, Nicole Verver, Commissioners	
19	AGENDA ITEM NOS. 17 & 18	No Action
20	AGENDA ITEM NO. 19	33
21	Chair Rath	
22	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	34
23		
24		
25		

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 TUESDAY, APRIL 10, 2007

3 (9:00 a.m.)

4 AGENDA ITEM NO. 1

5 CHAIR RATH: Okay. We'll go ahead and
6 come to order, and I think we start with Tax Liability
7 Cases.

8 AGENDA ITEM NO. 2

9 Discussion, Consideration and Possible
10 Action Regarding Whether to Assume Continuing
11 Jurisdiction on Unemployment Compensation Cases, Wage
12 Claim Cases, and/or Tax Liability Cases and
13 Reconsideration of Unemployment Compensation Cases,
14 Wage Claim Cases, and/or Tax Liability Cases, if Any
15 No discussion.

16 AGENDA ITEM NO. 3

17 Discussion, Consideration and Possible
18 Action Regarding Tax Liability Cases Listed on the
19 Texas Workforce Commission Docket 15
20 The Commission discussed and took action
21 on all Tax Liability Cases listed on Docket 15.

22 AGENDA ITEM NO. 4

23 Discussion, Consideration and Possible
24 Action Regarding Higher Level Appeals in Wage Claim
25 Cases Listed on the Texas Workforce Commission

1 and I wanted to share with everyone. I had the great
2 experience last week to attend the National Meeting of
3 MAFO, which is the Midwest Association of Farmworker
4 Organizations, and was so proud to have our wonderful
5 migrant outreach, Francisco Cerda, recognized with a
6 national award for government employee leadership.
7 And this is the first time they've given it to
8 nonfederal people. So, it really made it significant.

9 And I think very often Francisco's work
10 goes unrecognized. He is extraordinarily committed
11 and very much appreciated nationwide for his
12 leadership, his commitment, the services he delivers
13 to a very difficult group with a lot of barriers. So,
14 I want to recognize and commend Francisco and ask you
15 to come up front so we can take a picture.

16 Very good. Y'all join me in applauding
17 him.

18 (Applause)

19 (Brief pause)

20 CHAIR RATH: Okay. And we'll go ahead
21 and continue.

22 AGENDA ITEM NO. 7

23 CHAIR RATH: We don't have any Matching
24 Funds today.

25

1 AGENDA ITEM NO. 8

2 CHAIR RATH: And that brings us to
3 possible adoption of our Child Care Service rules,
4 Ms. Verver.

5 MS. VERVER: Good morning, Chair Rath,
6 Commissioners; Nicole Verver, Workforce Development.

7 This morning we are bringing forward for
8 adoption the proposed Child Care rules, Chapter 809.91
9 of the Commission Rules. As you know, these rules
10 would require relative providers to list with the
11 Department of Family and Protective Services and, as
12 such, to undergo a background check prior to providing
13 Subsidized Child Care.

14 Staff has worked closely with DFPS
15 regarding how these rules would be implemented.
16 Through conversations with DFPS, they believe they can
17 fully implement these rules August 1st of this year.
18 However, there's legislation that is being proposed
19 that is -- although similar to our proposed rules,
20 would require a different process for the background
21 checks.

22 SB 206 would require relatives to
23 undergo FBI background checks, which includes
24 fingerprinting. There are also some minor differences
25 between our proposed rules and the legislation in

1 terms of who will have to undergo the background
2 check. Since SB 206 would be effective September 1st
3 of this year, a month after our listed home rules
4 would be implemented and SB 206 requires a more
5 comprehensive background check, staff recommends that
6 we postpone adoption of these rules and begin working
7 on a concept of implementing SB 206.

8 If you agree with staff recommendation,
9 we'll be bringing forward in a couple of weeks a
10 policy concept for SB 206 and begin working on
11 proposed rules. If for some reason SB 206 does not
12 pass, staff will bring the listed home rules back for
13 Commission adoption.

14 At this time I will be glad to answer
15 any questions.

16 CHAIR RATH: Thank you.

17 I want to really appreciate all the work
18 that staff has put into it. It's been very complex
19 negotiating the issues, not only within our agency and
20 with the board and the Child Care contractors, but
21 especially with DFPS. At the same time we're
22 navigating and balancing complimentary proposed
23 legislation, yet -- which would certainly affect this.

24 I'm really proud of the actions that our
25 system has taken in responding to a loophole, once we

1 became aware of it, that potentially could put
2 children in peril. I think that we have really moved
3 aggressively and taken appropriate action thus far,
4 but I certainly agree and concur that it would cause
5 tremendous confusion to begin implementation with the
6 pending legislation.

7 So, I -- I do support y'all moving
8 forward very aggressively with the development of
9 rules so that, as soon as that legislation passes,
10 we're able to publish so that we can implement the
11 legislation as quickly as possible to make sure that
12 we protect children. And if something happens and it
13 doesn't passes -- pass, then we're set to move forward
14 with consideration of this rule.

15 So, I -- I think y'all have a good
16 recommendation, and I really appreciate it and -- and
17 look forward to having the concept paper before us.
18 And -- and I think that's -- I think it's very
19 important that our boards and Child Care contractors
20 really understand that we are very committed to the
21 substance of what was proposed in the rule and in the
22 proposed legislation, that we are very committed to
23 preserving parental choice but recognize our
24 responsibility to protect children. And the only
25 reason we're not moving forward is to prevent

1 confusion at the implementation of it.

2 MS. VERVER: Yes, ma'am.

3 CHAIR RATH: Thanks.

4 COMM. LEHMAN: Well said. No questions.

5 MS. VERVER: Thank you.

6 COMM. CONGLETON: And I agree with staff
7 recommendations as a whole.

8 MS. VERVER: Okay. Thank you.

9 CHAIR RATH: And I don't think your mike
10 is on.

11 CHAIR RATH: There you go.

12 COMM. CONGLETON: And I still agree.

13 (Laughter).

14 CHAIR RATH: Very good.

15 MS. VERVER: Thank you.

16 CHAIR RATH: Then, we look forward to
17 you coming back with a concept paper and our being
18 able to move forward with arranging for implementation
19 at the earliest date.

20 MS. VERVER: Yes, ma'am. Thank you.

21 CHAIR RATH: Thanks.

22 AGENDA ITEM NO. 9

23 CHAIR RATH: Next, we have our Rider 22
24 before us. Anyone presenting it? Ah, Dale Robertson.
25 We have before us the Rider 22, and Mr. Robertson is

1 going to lay it out.

2 MR. ROBERTSON: Good morning,
3 Commissioner Rath, Commissioner Lehman, Commissioner
4 Congleton. My name is Dale Robertson. I'm with the
5 Workforce Development Division.

6 This morning for your consideration is a
7 Rider 22 Order Finding of Fact requesting
8 appropriation authority for the additional \$765,000 in
9 National Emergency Grant BRAC funds. These funds are
10 available to us through September 2008. The funds
11 will be used for the continuation of planning
12 activities and, upon approval from the Department of
13 Labor's Grant Officer, direct services to participants
14 who are affected by the Base Realignment and Closure
15 Commission's decision to realign or close military
16 installations in Texas.

17 We're requesting your approval and
18 signature for the Finding of Fact. Do you have any
19 questions?

20 CHAIR RATH: No, I appreciate your
21 getting it to us quickly, and I'm really pleased those
22 boards can continue preparing for the changes brought
23 by BRAC, particularly those that are gaining, which
24 have -- have not had the access to the funding they
25 need.

1 Coastal Bend Workforce Board nominee. I am going to
2 offer support for the South Plains nominee. I am
3 going to offer support for the second nominee on the
4 Cameron County Board, and I'm going to withhold
5 support for the first two Gulf Coast nominees, plus
6 the two ahead of the last one -- that is, I'll support
7 the last one, not the two immediately ahead of the
8 last one, on the Gulf Coast Board.

9 CHAIR RATH: Okay. May I ask one
10 question? Did -- what was your motion regarding
11 Coastal Bend?

12 COMM. LEHMAN: I do not support the
13 nominee for Coastal Bend.

14 CHAIR RATH: Thank you.

15 Okay. Commissioner?

16 COMM. CONGLETON: And I support all of
17 them, and I move that we appoint them.

18 CHAIR RATH: Okay. And I will give a
19 careful vote, too.

20 I also do not support Coastal Bend. I
21 support South Plains. I support the second Cameron
22 County. I, on Gulf Coast, do not support the first
23 two.

24 I support the reappointment -- of one,
25 two, three -- of the next four. I do not support the

1 last three from Gulf Coast.

2 And I will say that this is consistent
3 with my position about the last three or four years
4 where I believe that employers need to be representing
5 the private sector. So, I have consistently not
6 supported for appointment folks that have no employees
7 or no Tax ID number. I also do not and consistently
8 have not voted to reappoint those board members that
9 have the ability to use our system and have not done
10 so, and I also feel the demographic profile is
11 extraordinarily important.

12 And I just cannot affirm nominees that
13 don't reflect the demographics of the industry in Gulf
14 Coast. I will -- I said this last year, and I will
15 continue to say it this year. I think we badly need
16 retail trade, healthcare, energy, mining,
17 transportation -- when you look at the crisis in
18 transportation in Houston. I think all of those
19 issues very much need to be represented.

20 I see no reason to have such a
21 tremendous oversupply of professional and technical,
22 which is just continuing without abatement. They're
23 supposed to have two. They've got nine, and I do not
24 see how that can help this system move forward.

25 So, with that --

1 COMM. CONGLETON: Can I just clarify?

2 CHAIR RATH: Yes, uh-huh.

3 COMM. CONGLETON: That we have -- have
4 appointed Coastal Bend, South Plains --

5 CHAIR RATH: No, I don't believe --
6 (Simultaneous discussion)

7 COMM. LEHMAN: No, we have not --

8 CHAIR RATH: -- I don't believe Coastal
9 Bend is appointed.

10 COMM. LEHMAN: -- not Coastal Bend.

11 CHAIR RATH: Coastal Bend is not
12 appointed.

13 COMM. LEHMAN: I -- I did not support
14 Coastal Bend.

15 COMM. CONGLETON: Neither one of you
16 supported Coastal Bend? Okay. I wanted to clarify
17 that.

18 CHAIR RATH: We supported South
19 Plains --

20 COMM. CONGLETON: Both of you supported
21 South Plains, but I believe we have voted two-to-one
22 on both of the candidates from Cameron County, as each
23 one of you --

24 COMM. LEHMAN: I -- I supported only the
25 second candidate --

1 COMM. CONGLETON: -- and she supported
2 only the first.

3 CHAIR RATH: No, I supported only the
4 second. So, the second one from Cameron -- unless I
5 misspoke, the second one from Cameron is approved.

6 COMM. CONGLETON: And then we -- you --
7 two-to -- two-to-one voted against the first two of
8 Gulf Coast.

9 CHAIR RATH: Uh-huh.

10 COMM. CONGLETON: The next four are
11 okay. The next two are two-to-one, and the last one
12 is appointed.

13 CHAIR RATH: Two-to-one not appointed.

14 COMM. CONGLETON: No, he was appointed.

15 COMM. LEHMAN: No, the last --

16 (Simultaneous discussion)

17 CHAIR RATH: Well, those -- the --

18 COMM. LEHMAN: Commissioner Congleton

19 and I agree on the last one and --

20 (Simultaneous discussion)

21 CHAIR RATH: Yes.

22 COMM. LEHMAN: -- and you disagree.

23 CHAIR RATH: Yes.

24 COMM. LEHMAN: But the two immediately
25 ahead of that --

1 COMM. CONGLETON: You two voted against?

2 CHAIR RATH: Correct.

3 COMM. LEHMAN: Yeah, we're in agreement.

4 COMM. CONGLETON: Okay. The next four

5 are good, and the top two, the both of you --

6 CHAIR RATH: Correct.

7 COMM. CONGLETON: -- voted against?

8 CHAIR RATH: Yes.

9 COMM. LEHMAN: Correct.

10 CHAIR RATH: Yes.

11 COMM. CONGLETON: Okay.

12 COMM. LEHMAN: And I think -- and I want

13 to -- I want to add to --

14 COMM. CONGLETON: You know, I think the

15 first one at Cameron County we agreed on. Right?

16 CHAIR RATH: To not appoint --

17 COMM. LEHMAN: We do not support the

18 first nominee in Cameron County --

19 CHAIR RATH: -- by a two-to-one vote.

20 COMM. CONGLETON: Okay. And so the

21 second one is okay?

22 CHAIR RATH: Yes.

23 COMM. CONGLETON: Okay. Thank you, just

24 for my --

25 (Simultaneous discussion)

1 CHAIR RATH: And, again, from my
2 perspective, the first one has no employees and no Tax
3 ID, although it looks like an excellent individual,
4 but unfortunately doesn't meet the profile of what I
5 think our requirements are.

6 COMM. LEHMAN: And if you -- and if
7 you'll let me --

8 CHAIR RATH: Uh-huh.

9 COMM. LEHMAN: -- I'll -- I'll just
10 hitchhike onto that point.

11 I have no doubt that each and every
12 individual who is nominated to serve on a board, who
13 currently serves on a board, who has previously served
14 on a board was of high quality and well-intentioned.
15 I am also sure they will be or are or were good board
16 members. My concern is not about the individual
17 character or quality; it's about the role they're in,
18 the experiences they've had, and the perspectives
19 they've gained and the likelihood that the employers
20 of Texas will be better served because of their
21 service on the board.

22 The most frequent complaint I hear from
23 people who do serve on workforce boards is that their
24 board spends too much time on budgets, RFPs,
25 contracts, and sanctions and not enough time on issues

1 that lead to increased quality of the workforce and
2 issues of business retention, expansion, recruitment
3 and the resulting jobs that can be created. And, by
4 the way, that is my judgment that I applied to the
5 first nominee that falls in this remark.

6 The most frequent complaint I hear from
7 employers is that the workforce system did not send
8 them qualified applicants. In this regard, it becomes
9 more difficult for me to be supportive of private
10 sector nominees who are not currently operating in the
11 capacity of business owners or managers with
12 background that is applicable to the challenges of
13 developing and retaining a qualified workforce and who
14 have no previous background or experience in
15 addressing the challenges of developing and retaining
16 that workforce. It becomes even more difficult to
17 support nominees who, apparently, won't be assuming
18 these kinds of roles while serving on the boards.

19 Further, the requirement in the Texas
20 Government -- Government Code calls out for the need
21 for industrial and demographic correlation of the
22 board to the industries in a workforce area. It is
23 this requirement that I believe is not receiving
24 enough focus by some of the nominating entities in the
25 various workforce areas.

1 In particular, you highlighted Gulf
2 Coast. I notice that 60 percent of its workforce, it
3 falls in five industry groupings and is represented by
4 only five of 26 board members, while 8 percent of its
5 workforce falls into the professional/technical
6 category and has 10 board members. That disparity
7 does not serve the employers in the region well. It
8 does not serve the workforce boards overall well.

9 And those are the kinds of issues that I
10 see becoming more prevalent and which I will call
11 attention to through the chambers of commerce, even
12 though I will also observe that the last 12 chambers
13 I've talked to seem to have no real intimate
14 involvement in the board appointment process, which is
15 something I think we need to focus on more diligently
16 in the future. And I intend to do that as well.

17 The one nominee where you and I
18 disagree, Chair, is I did consult with the company and
19 they said that this individual was their designee for
20 workforce matters. And I choose not to second guess
21 that company, so that's why we disagree on that one
22 individual.

23 So, thank you for the time.

24 CHAIR RATH: No, I appreciate it. And I
25 couldn't concur more with your comments and only wish

1 I had been as eloquent in laying out the issues,
2 because I -- I think you summed it up very, very well.
3 And that is the dilemma that I think we confront very
4 often, and -- and -- and I appreciate your recognition
5 of -- of the individuals as being outstanding folks,
6 very good, very good in their respective businesses,
7 very good in their respective community activities,
8 very good backgrounds.

9 But I think people need to realize that
10 this is not the United Way Board, that there are very
11 specific statutory requirements and specific
12 expectations of our board members. And each board
13 member has a specific role to fill, that with that
14 defined interest group -- be it employers, be it
15 labor, be it literacy, be it education -- that for a
16 board to function well it needs the contributions and
17 the vision and the understanding of each of those
18 constituent groups.

19 And there's been times we've not
20 approved a labor nominee when it wasn't -- the
21 individual was not appropriately nominated. There's
22 times we have not approved education and some of the
23 nonprofits when the groups do not conform to the
24 statutory requirements, particularly the CBOs if have
25 they have workforce backgrounds. So, I do think that

1 it's important for all nominating organizations to
2 understand that we take the statutory requirements
3 very seriously and -- and -- and see the benefits of
4 boards that have vibrant, active, engaged board
5 members representing the -- the full continuum of the
6 requirements.

7 So, I -- I --

8 COMM. LEHMAN: I --

9 CHAIR RATH: -- very much concur and
10 appreciate what you said.

11 COMM. LEHMAN: -- and if I may add one
12 more comment, you triggered me to think one more
13 thing.

14 We -- we work diligently -- we, the
15 State of Texas and all the partners therein, have
16 worked diligently to position the boards as meaningful
17 and noteworthy players in the process of economic
18 development and job creation. In that, most economic
19 development folks use the term "primary employer" --
20 that is, the companies that actually create jobs
21 versus the secondary employers where the jobs follow
22 because the people are there.

23 And I think that, when I look at boards,
24 it troubles me that such a large percentage of
25 employers or representatives who are not employers,

1 are on the boards from industries that aren't actually
2 in the primary job creation role, they're in the
3 secondary or follow-on kind of a role. And while that
4 may be appropriate in sparsely populated areas and it
5 may be -- it may be appropriate in some unique
6 circumstances, it is not something that I want to
7 advance any more than necessary.

8 CHAIR RATH: I -- I agree. And I -- I
9 would just add that it's also very disheartening when
10 we work with some true business leaders who are ideal
11 board members who serve on boards and then resign or
12 actively refuse an opportunity to be reappointed
13 because they felt it was a waste of time, because
14 their skills and their talents and their leadership
15 is, in their opinion, not taken advantage of and
16 wasted. And that does not help our system at all
17 statewide.

18 Very good. Thank you. Okay. I just --
19 I just want to make sure that Workforce has the votes
20 and doesn't have any questions.

21 MR. JONES: We have them.

22 CHAIR RATH: Okay. Very good. Thank
23 you.

24 AGENDA ITEM NOS. 11 & 12

25 CHAIR RATH: And next we'll move to

1 legislative and federal and state issues, Mr. Lewis.

2 MR. LEWIS: Good morning, Chair Rath,
3 Commissioners; Jesse Lewis, External Relations, have
4 several bills moving at this time.

5 House Bill 550, which is the UI for
6 Domestic Violence is scheduled to be on the general
7 state calendar in the House tomorrow. Up this morning
8 in House Higher Education, House Bill 2371, the Cease
9 and Desist for Career Schools is up this morning.

10 Over in the Senate the UI Domestic
11 Violence Bill was voted out of committee, and -- and
12 the committee report has been distributed. Senate
13 Bill 679, which is the LBB Bond Bill allowing us to
14 pay down bonds has been placed on the intent calendar
15 for today. And Senate Bill 1096, the TANF Exemptions,
16 is up in committee today. So, we expect a -- a long
17 evening in Human Services.

18 I also wanted to point out that Senate
19 Bill 206 has been put on the schedule for House Human
20 Services for this Thursday. So, we will be
21 providing -- we will be providing a resource for that
22 and also wanted to let you know that House Bill 15,
23 which is the DIR Consolidation Bill, which actually
24 puts the money in to keep us whole, has been referred
25 to Senate Finance. So, we expect action on that after

1 they kick the budget out.

2 With that, I'll be glad to answer any
3 questions.

4 CHAIR RATH: Very good. Any questions?

5 COMM. LEHMAN: I do not. Thank you.

6 COMM. CONGLETON: No questions. Thanks,
7 Jesse.

8 MR. LEWIS: Thank you.

9 CHAIR RATH: Thank you. Appreciate it.

10 AGENDA ITEM NOS. 13, 14 & 15

11 CHAIR RATH: I don't think we have
12 anything on the Appropriations or Katrina and Rita or
13 the State Data Center.

14 AGENDA ITEM NO. 16

15 CHAIR RATH: So, that brings us to staff
16 reports, Mr. Temple.

17 MR. TEMPLE: We have one. I think --
18 Nicole is going to give one on -- on how the -- the
19 boards' implementation of the waivers at the local
20 level on Child Care provider.

21 MS. VERVER: Good morning, Chair Rath,
22 Commissioners; Nicole Verver, Workforce Development.

23 This morning I wanted to provide you an
24 update on the implementation of in loco parentis for
25 Child Care applicants. As you recall, on January

1 30th, the Commission approved the definition of a
2 parent to include individuals who are in loco
3 parentis, standing in place of the parent. Staff
4 issued guidance to the boards on how to determine in
5 loco parentis and the documentation that is needed.
6 Guidance was issued through WD letter and board
7 conference calls.

8 To date, staff have provided technical
9 assistance to six boards who had questions on in loco
10 parentis. Their questions primarily were around
11 appropriation documentation to verify that the
12 individual is actually standing in place of the
13 parent.

14 Of the waivers granted, a vast majority,
15 about 90 percent, are for individuals receiving
16 At-Risk Child Care. The other 10 percent are for
17 Choices and Transitional applicants.

18 The waivers primarily involve cases
19 where the parent or the legal guardian is not present,
20 and the children have been left with the individual.
21 Staff will continue to monitor the use of in loco
22 parentis and will work with boards as they need
23 additional guidance.

24 At this time I'll be glad to answer any
25 questions.

1 really getting it into a well-oiled system. The
2 number of kids participating was significantly
3 increased. The last time it was about a thousand.
4 This time it was 1300 kids, about a thousand projects,
5 tremendous increase.

6 And the other thing that's very excited
7 is to see the broad level of participation. We have a
8 lot more girls participating. We have a lot of
9 minorities, not only participating, but winning.

10 You have a very good demographic mix in
11 engineering and in a lot of the -- the new categories
12 that were added this year, because the competition
13 categories were expanded. And they really expanded
14 the engineering ones from about one to about four, so
15 significantly improved in -- in that regard.

16 The level of research continues to just
17 blow me away when you see what these extremely bright
18 kids are doing. It's really exciting to see colleges
19 get up and award \$50,000 of scholarships.

20 And I have to really thank UTSA and
21 Texas Tech and UT Arlington and our Lady of the Lake,
22 who participated for the first time. So, we do have
23 college scholarships being awarded, and -- and the
24 number of special groups that give recognition and
25 special awards just grows every year. So, it -- it is

1 really heartening.

2 And I have to thank UTSA, because
3 they're very interested in continuing to sponsor it,
4 which is a very good location for the kids and the
5 family and the teachers to attend. And -- and what's
6 very exciting -- and I want to see if Workforce can
7 see if there's any additional way we can assist them,
8 they're talking about next year taking advantage of
9 Thursday and -- and maybe just Friday, but when the
10 judges are judging the projects to really have
11 additional opportunities for both the kids and the
12 parents and the science teachers that are there. So,
13 UTSA is talking about perhaps putting on financial aid
14 seminars because, you know, you have a lot of middle
15 school parents and high school parents starting
16 freshman year to start educating them on the process
17 and what's available to help gear their thinking that
18 way for both the kids and the parents, particular the
19 parents.

20 And then taking advantage of having so
21 many science teachers there of, perhaps, doing some AP
22 instruction or some additional instruction and
23 workshops for the teachers, which I think is a
24 phenomenal idea. And so if we can look at if there's
25 any way we can assist that endeavor.

1 And perhaps -- and I didn't think about
2 it until over the weekend, it might be some
3 opportunities with the Science Fair to get some of the
4 appropriate cluster groups involved, both with
5 information, occupational information, perhaps
6 providing workshops for the students on potential
7 careers to expand their career awareness. I think the
8 industry groups would be a wonderful resource for
9 that, and I have not mentioned that to UTSA but --
10 because if you're -- if -- the only thing you do is
11 wait for the judges to come by your project and,
12 otherwise, you just have time to kill. So, I think
13 really -- these bright kids raising their awareness of
14 what is available out there could be very helpful.

15 So, I think it's -- it's just very
16 exciting. And I -- I hope everyone can come next year
17 and participate and see it, because it's I think one
18 of the least appreciated, least recognized, and
19 probably most significant things we do as a body is to
20 have rescued that from not happening and then to see
21 the level to which it's growing.

22 And the other thing I'm going to ask is
23 if -- at one of the quarterly forums, if perhaps we
24 could really focus on how a Science Fair might fit
25 into the Youth Services Strategy and maybe have the --

1 some of the Science Fair folks come lead that, or
2 maybe not. But it is heartbreaking to think that we
3 have individuals that we might very well be serving or
4 should be serving that don't participate because of
5 the financial barriers, because it is expensive, both
6 just to buy the supplies for the -- the research, to
7 buy the -- I mean, it's \$60 just for that presentation
8 board, to do the transportation, to do the entry fee,
9 to do the hotel. So, there are expenses involved.

10 And I want to make sure that any kids
11 that we, perhaps, might be serving or should be
12 serving can take advantage of this, because it would
13 be a really good year-round activity. So, it's
14 exciting.

15 And I want to thank everyone that works
16 on that from the agency, too. And that's all I have.

17 COMM. LEHMAN: Well, let me hitchhike on
18 that on -- on the lines of science and invention and
19 innovation. Just a brief reminder in May, the 17th
20 and 18th, is the World's Best Technology Conference in
21 Arlington. It is actually sponsored by -- it's --
22 it's hosted by the Arlington Chamber, but it's
23 sponsored by the Governor's Office. And the Governor
24 himself makes an appearance.

25 This is where 80 to 100 of the most

1 promising inventions or early C stage -- C-stage
2 capital companies come together in the presence of the
3 structured three days with 80 to 100 of the world's
4 largest venture capital firms and out of that spawn
5 partnerships, further investments, and ultimately
6 companies. I look back, the last years have resulted
7 in -- well, don't know the exact number, but nearing a
8 hundred companies that have formed and moved up to the
9 next level in their venture capital growth stages.
10 And some \$300 million have been invested as a result
11 of the product of that.

12 So, for those of you who would like more
13 information about it or to help spread the word, I'd
14 appreciate it. I can supply it, or I can arrange for
15 you to get more information. But I did want you to
16 know about it.

17 And your thoughts about science
18 triggered me. We actually experimented last year
19 taping some of the presentations in the hopes -- and
20 thanks to Larry's staff -- in the hopes of sharing
21 that with young people that might be interested in
22 learning more about science -- the future horizons of
23 science. However -- but because of problems with
24 releases and lighting and so on, we actually didn't
25 get as much footage as we had hoped. And so we've got

1 to rethink that whole strategy, so we'll do that some
2 other time.

3 CHAIR RATH: But that might be an
4 opportunity, if you're able to get the quality so that
5 you can use it, to just have it running at a Science
6 Fair or something --

7 COMM. LEHMAN: Yeah, exactly. That --
8 that was kind of the thought. But what we ran into
9 is, because there's multiple presenters --

10 CHAIR RATH: Right.

11 COMM. LEHMAN: -- and some of those
12 presenters are bringing ideas from other people --

13 CHAIR RATH: Ah.

14 COMM. LEHMAN: -- it gets to be a
15 problem with releases, you know, giving permission.
16 And that got to be kind of a headache, so --

17 Emmett's nodding like, yes, he went
18 through it. (Laughter)

19 COMM. LEHMAN: But, anyway, we -- we
20 made a valiant effort. We may try again.

21 MR. TEMPLE: We tried.

22 COMM. LEHMAN: That's right.

23 CHAIR RATH: Very good.

24 COMM. LEHMAN: But remember the date,
25 World's Best Technology Conference.

1 CHAIR RATH: Very good.

2 Commissioner, do you have anything?

3 COMM. CONGLETON: I have nothing. Thank
4 you.

5 CHAIR RATH: Very good.

6 AGENDA ITEM NO. 19

7 CHAIR RATH: Then, if there's nothing to
8 come before us, we will stand adjourned.

9 (Meeting adjourned: 9:50 a.m.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

