

**PUBLIC SCHOOL CAPITAL OUTLAY COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
July 18, 2019
STATE CAPITOL BUILDING, ROOM 317
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO**

Members Present: Mr. Joe Guillen, NMSBA Mr. David Abbey, LFC
Ms. Rachel Gudge, LESC Mr. Antonio Ortiz, PED
Mr. David Robbins, PEC Ms. Stephanie Kean, Office of the Governor
Ms. Olivia Padilla-Jackson, DFA (arrived 8:36)

Designee: Mr. Jeff Eaton (for Mr. Raul Burciaga, LCS)
Mr. Martin Romero (for Ms. Marguerite Salazar, RLD)

1. **Call to Order** – Chair Guillen called the meeting to order at 8:33 A.M.
 - a. **Approval of Agenda** – Chair Guillen asked if there was any objection to the agenda presented; as there was none the agenda was unanimously approved.

Following approval of the agenda, Chair Guillen requested a moment of silence in memory of PED staff member Ernestine Romero.

- b. **Correspondence** – None.
2. **Public Comment** – Chair Guillen had audience members and staff introduce themselves.
3. **PSCOC Financial Plan**

Mr. Evans reviewed the changes to the financial plan since the last meeting: Awards totaling \$10.0M were allocated to the Central, Gallup and Zuni school districts for teacher housing and pending Council approval, there is a proposed \$1.6M increase in award to NMSBVI for Garrett Dormitory. The financial plan has been updated to reflect FY19 actuals and FY24 projections. SSTB revenue from the June bond sale was updated; the anticipated \$18.1M was actually \$17.8M which resulted in a \$300K change to the financial plan. FY20 Lease Assistance was increased from \$12.0M to \$15.4M. Repayments were received from the Capitan and Cloudcroft school districts of \$500K and \$250K respectively. The projected PSCOC fund balance is \$291.4M following a June draw request of \$5.5M for May expenditures.
4. **Consent Agenda**
 - a. Approval of Minutes – June 10, 2019
 - b. NMSBVI – P15-009 – Garrett Dormitory – Award Language Change & Out-Year Estimate Update
 - c. BDCP – 2018 Category 2 (Equipment) Awards - Final
 - d. BDCP – 2019 Category 1 (Fiber) Awards - Final
 - e. Broadband for Libraries

Mr. Guillen read through the items listed within the consent agenda and asked members if any item needed to be pulled for discussion; as there was none, a motion to approve was made.

MOTION: Ms. Gudgel moved for Council approval of the consent agenda. Mr. Robbins seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

5. 2019-2020 Award Cycle

a. 2019-2020 School Security Program Awards

Ms. Cano began by stating in this second year of the four year school security funding program PSFA received 214 applications from 26 school districts and three state charter schools. Of the 214 applications received, 211 are recommended for award by the PSFA. The financial plan assumes up to \$10.0M in security awards for this fiscal year. The total project cost request for all 214 applicants is \$33.3M; the staff recommendation, pending some potential reductions to awards, results in a total project cost of \$32.2M. State and local match and offsets do apply to all requests; the potential state match after reduction is \$8.5M. Staff evaluated all applications and reached out to the districts to clarify the scope and estimated costs and verified alignment with one of three justifications: through third party assessment, PSFA scoring checklist, or by written justification from the district. Ms. Cano acknowledged that the dollar amount for awards was less than the amount presented to the Subcommittee due to additional review of the applications which resulted in a reduction of the DEAP application to only the tangible goods and a savings in the state share of nearly \$45K. An error was also caught in an incorrectly calculated offset for Jefferson ES (Gallup) which resulted in a state share reduction of slightly more than \$10K. The total state share reduction from the previous recommendation to the Subcommittee is \$55K.

Of the three applications received from state chartered charter schools, two are in lease purchase arrangements and the third is in a private building. To maintain compliance with the anti-donation clause, that award has been reduced to handheld radios and cameras, which can be moved/maintained by the charter and not the owner of the building.

Ms. Cano highlighted three applications being recommended for no award: David Skeet ES (Gallup-McKinley) and Ramah HS (Gallup-McKinley) were identified as duplicate applications and both were previously funded and for Gadsden MS (Gadsden) the district submitted a systems-based request under the current funding cycle. Based on the site visit and nature of the district's request, staff is recommending no award for Gadsden MS pending the outcome of a potential future application as the district may seek a standards-based award to replace the facility.

As requested by the Awards Subcommittee, Mr. Chamblin presented a brief overview of the security program which included staff experiences, lessons learned from the first year as well as recommendations for the program. Between last year and the proposed awards up for Council consideration, 50 of the 89 school districts throughout the state have received/will receive awards for projects, equating to approximately 421 school sites having received awards through the program. Trends between the current and prior year indicate the five most requested project types are in-line with recommended best practices

and research done last year with local law enforcement and school security consultants. Mr. Chamblin reminded members the state-wide ranking did not apply and the program was open to any school facility to improve security throughout the state. Recommendations for future years are being developed and includes reducing the number of fundable project types to the most important, functional security improvement projects schools can and should do. The most requested system types for the current funding cycle are: exterior door access control system, site fencing, secure vestibule and hand-held radios. The most costly award item this cycle are secure vestibules totaling approximately \$12.5M.

Ms. Padilla-Jackson asked if there was a sense as to why some schools were not applying; Mr. Chamblin replied that some districts have invested their own money to make critical security upgrades while other districts will apply once they have their funding in place. Ms. Padilla-Jackson and Mr. Guillen suggested that an analysis be done of what might be missing at the schools and that staff reach out to the districts to see why they are not applying. Mr. Guillen thanked staff for their work on starting this program from scratch.

MOTION: Council approval of the Awards Subcommittee recommendation to make awards under the school security program to the 29 districts and 211 schools set out in the attached award spreadsheet of this item, for the purposes and in the amounts specified, including any special conditions contained in the award language for each school (see attached). Reimbursement of previous expenses are ineligible for funding under this program. Each allocation is intended to fully complete the project, phase, or specified purpose. As this was a Subcommittee recommendation a second was not needed and the motion was unanimously approved.

b. 2019-2020 Lease Assistance Program – Land Leases

Ms. Gudgel noted an inaccurate staff recommendation had been presented to, and adopted by, the Awards Subcommittee for School of Dreams Academy due to confusion with their lease and acknowledged she was making an updated recommendation that they be included in the request for consideration in the amount of \$38,902.

Information listed within the executive summary was reviewed and members were reminded that staff had been asked to bring forth a transition plan to move out of land lease assistance. Seeking clarification, Mr. Robbins asked whether a land lease covered only the land that portables sit on or if there was sufficient land for parking or other outdoor space. Ms. Eekhoff replied that three charters consisted of portable campuses while South Valley Preparatory was not and clarified that the 1:3.5 land-to-building ratio was derived from a facility-to-land ratio not a portable-to-land ratio.

Recalling prior Council and Subcommittee discussions, Mr. Abbey reiterated there were many uncertainties in how much land is needed for a project, what the right valuation is and Council history of not being involved which prompted the question as to why Council is participating in lease of land when it doesn't participate in a new school buying land. Ms. Gudgel reiterated that statute only allows funding for classroom facilities and during the 2018 awards cycle schools were put on notice that land leases would not be done in

2019; Council ended up maintaining lease assistance in the same way it had been in 2018 despite the fact that Council attempted to set a land-to-building ratio and fund a reasonable amount of land. At the plea of several charters, Council decided it would reconsider and make a transition recommendation for this year despite last year's notice that land leases wouldn't be done this year.

Mr. Guillen asked for comment from any charter school in attendance:

- Ms. Barbara Langmaid (International School at Mesa del Sol) stated the school serves 340 students from 4 counties and appealed for reconsideration of the decision to exclude land leases. The charter was given 2.9 acres but actually sits on 5 acres which is fully used as outdoor space for physical education, Pre-K, robotics, and measurement, math and inquiry based classes. The charter is actively pursuing a move to a permanent facility and has been working with the owner of the property to donate or sell land to build a permanent facility in the spring.
- Ms. Argelia Carreon (International School at Mesa del Sol) expressed support for an adjustment of the proposed land lease grant for the 2019-2020 school year. The goal of the school has always been to move into a brick and mortar building; however, past circumstances i.e.: a foreclosure at Mesa del Sol, have been an impediment to that goal. This year, the sale of Mesa del Sol has opened some possibilities for the school which is currently considering two proposals to build a school. Since the school must remain on the mesa, it must continue to lease land for at least one more year however, the proposed decrease in lease agreement grant is so large that the reduced funding will greatly impact the school and its students.
- Mr. Michael Ogas (School of Dreams Academy "SODA") stated that three years ago the charter got into a two lease situation when the Village of Los Lunas helped them move to a 20 acre site. The charter is approximately 60-90 days out from permanent funding to be able to build a brick and mortar building and move into a lease-to-purchase situation which may alleviate concerns with the two leases.

Mr. Matt Pahl, Public Charter Schools of NM, addressed the Council regarding land lease payments and noted that the decision/proposal was similar to the prior proposal for lease assistance for classroom facility space. This year, the charters feel a more thoughtful approach was put in to place that considers the different scenarios the schools are in with their unique facilities. Mr. Pahl suggested that Council delay taking action and use the time to figure out a solution that treats each school with equity across the board or to extend the draw down to 3 to 5 years so charters could renegotiate their facilities situation and determine next steps.

- Mr. Alfred Martinez (South Valley Preparatory) noted the charter resides in a permanent facility however the leased land is used strictly for physical education and community gardens. The school is trying to purchase the property in order to create ballfields.

While staff feels statute is quite clear that the lease assistance program was meant to fund classroom facilities Mr. Chamblin reiterated that part of last year's process involved a deliberate effort to provide some uniformity to the program. When staff goes out to assess charter schools only the building and classroom spaces are looked at and measured and is

what is included in the lease assistance application. Coupled with the verification of square footage and the understanding in greater detail of the facilities, staff feels the issue is quite clear and that the land lease does destabilize uniform treatment within the program. Staff supports moving away from land leases/transitional plans as the program needs to follow statute. Mr. Abbey asked Mr. Pahl what a soft landing would look like; Mr. Pahl replied that he did not have a quick solution and was the reason additional time was needed. Mr. Abbey indicated he was amenable to tabling the motion.

Referring to the lease reimbursements table included in the meeting material, Ms. Gudgel acknowledged that Council has funded land leases for some time and questioned how land was valued as the cost per acre varied significantly. Over time, the average cost was \$5,000 - \$6,000 per acre; costs have escalated significantly which potentially includes construction, utilities and site improvements on the land while statute states charter school facilities are supposed to be brought up to adequacy by the owner. Ms. Gudgel suggested Council move forward with the proposal as an award amendment could be made at a later time and added that the Subcommittee was amenable to hearing Mr. Pahl's suggestions. As first quarter payments will not be made until October there is time to consider whether the recommendation needs to be changed; Mr. Guillen agreed.

MOTION: Council approval of the Awards Subcommittee recommendation to adopt the Land Lease Transition Plan (Exhibit A) for FY20 for the following schools: International School at Mesa Del Sol, Mosaic Academy Charter School, and South Valley Preparatory Academy. No other land lease assistance applications will be accepted from schools other than those awarded at this time.

AMENDED MOTION: Ms. Gudgel moved to adopt the Land Lease Transition Plan (Exhibit A) for FY20 for the following schools: International School at Mesa Del Sol, Mosaic Academy Charter School, and South Valley Preparatory Academy. No other land lease assistance applications will be accepted from schools other than those awarded at this time. The Awards Subcommittee will continue to work with Mr. Matt Pahl through this year's awards on a potential amended awards scenario to be brought back as a recommendation to the Council and continue to work with Mr. Pahl and the four charters on a potential out-year transition plan.

Additional Discussion: Seeking clarification, Ms. Padilla-Jackson asked if the lower lease amounts were being approved now with a softer landing occurring before October. Mr. Guillen understood this would allow Council to possibly extend this for a 2-3 year period. Ms. Gudgel clarified since Mr. Pahl does not currently have a suggested solution her proposal was for Council to move forward on the rate for this year and have the Awards Subcommittee work with Mr. Pahl for an amendable solution in the next few months.

Mr. Pahl reiterated that while he did not have a specific recommendation of how to calculate what was appropriate for each school he did mention a five year phase.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Ms. Padilla-Jackson moved to table the item until the next meeting. Mr. Robbins seconded. By a vote of 7 to 2 the motion to table was passed with Ms. Gudgel and Mr. Abbey voting in the negative.

Mr. Abbey requested that Mr. Chamblin contact the Tax and Revenue Commission Property Tax Division regarding cost per acre and bring the information to the Awards Subcommittee.

c. 2019-2020 Lease Assistance Program Awards

Mr. Robbins stated he would like for Council to consider what the minimum standard is in terms of classrooms, halls, egress, etc. for charters and have them be allowed in lease assistance as their facilities are put at a disadvantage vis-à-vis district schools.

Ms. Eekhoff reminded members that Council had previously approved a 1.5% rate increase per MEM resulting in a per MEM amount of \$747.29 for this year. PSFA received 110 applications for lease assistance with 107 coming from charter schools; Gallup-McKinley has rescinded three applications for land leases of non-chartered schools and Jemez Mountain has also rescinded their application. Ms. Eekhoff stated two new charter applications were received; 8 charters were requesting lease assistance for additional sites and one charter school closed this year. PSFA awaits E-Occupancy certification on 5 schools and amounts will be adjusted according to the date the E-Occupancy is received. Ms. Gudgel sought clarification on whether the \$15.5M listed in the motion included the land leases and if it did they would need to be pulled from the spreadsheet based on the motion for land leases being tabled. Ms. Eekhoff replied in the affirmative and noted that the land leases were highlighted in the spreadsheet for ease of reference.

Mr. Guillen called for comment from the charters in attendance:

- Mr. Frank McCulloch (Amy Biehl HS) stated he was recently notified of a 44% reduction to the tune of \$88K for lease reimbursement which was on top of a \$500K cut to the small schools size adjustment and that with the lease reduction, the school was in financial risk of closing. In looking at the data, roughly half of the schools square footage was considered classroom space and thus eligible for lease reimbursement. The school is currently celebrating their 20th anniversary and 92% of the 2019 graduates are continuing on to post-secondary opportunities which is consistent with the last 16 years of graduations.
- Mr. Michael Ogas (School of Dreams Academy “SODA”) echoed Mr. McCulloch and stated that the current allocation, as listed on the spreadsheet, drops down to zero in terms of lease assistance, The charter has been working with PSFA regarding its lease purchase agreement however it will come after their permanent funding is in place and they are in a situation of not getting any assistance while trying to make over \$600K in payments for the year to keep the school open. As the situation is dire, Mr. Ogas requested that they be given some sort of allocation as entering in to a lease purchase agreement appears to be 60-90 days out. Ms. Gudgel clarified that their lease was to lease construction from the Foundation and that facilities are not being leased as the Foundation did some construction on portables purchased from APS and others loaned by PSFA; Mr. Ogas replied in the

affirmative. Ms. Gudgel then asked if the school would be lease purchasing the land or if they were entering into a lease purchase agreement to purchase the improvements. Mr. Ogas replied it would be to build a building and cover current obligations to the Village of Los Lunas and to a private lender. A bond sale is expected to wrap the obligations into one that the Foundation will take on.

- Mr. Mike Hyatt (Gallup-McKinley Schools) clarified that the applications for land leases were rescinded because the district was told public schools did not qualify for land lease assistance.

Mr. Pahl reminded members that last year charter schools had two requests: to change the strict interpretation on classroom facility and that PSFA would come to the schools and learn how the facilities were used. The latter was done in a fashion that set the table for continued work with the PSFA and PSCOC in the future. The charters felt they were heard and signed off on square footage that was instructional; though it didn't mean they agreed with the tight interpretation of instructional square footage. If the Council continues on this path, it will have facility requirements (i.e.: E-Occupancy) without providing funding for it which is a true unfunded mandate. Council was reminded that last year there was an overwhelming majority rejecting the 20% cuts to lease assistance and one comment made was that the 20% proposal was due to a reduction in available funding which is no longer the case. Mr. Pahl proposed that schools losing more than \$20,000 this year be held harmless, that tare be added to the policy and that Council support the charters in their per MEM legislation during the next session and asked that schools in their first five years of operation be able to update their MEM numbers to real numbers as they come in.

- Ms. Connie Dove Castilleja (The ASK Academy) advocated for a per-MEM calculation and elimination of the square foot calculation as it would simplify the process. Schools are also required to be in E-Occupancy space which would be taken out of the equation with a per-MEM calculation and land lease issues would be eliminated. Per MEM supports right sized buildings so schools in large facilities are encouraged to increase enrollment or downsize and growing schools can acquire additional space to accommodate student numbers.

Mr. Chamblin note for the first time in the history of the lease assistance program there is 100% certainty that the square footage numbers are accurate as last year staff walked every charter school within the state and asked school officials about the square footage and how the spaces were used. To be discussed at a future meeting is that traditional schools, submitting applications through the standards and systems-based programs, are held to very high standards in terms of documenting their existing space use/utilization rate. They have to prove they are using the classroom to at least a 75% utilization rate which means 75% of the day it is occupied; charters were not held to the same high threshold and were given more flexibility with their square footage. For that reason, every square foot of the building was measured and a letter was sent to each charter school to sign indicating they agreed with the square footage as documented; in the end, every one of the charters signed off on that letter. Mr. Chamblin felt the process was fair and that the methodology used gave each school a reasonable assignment of classroom net square footage based on how

their facility was used. Mr. Robbins added there is still the need to determine what is considered “required educational classroom space” but was happy to see statute was being followed. Mr. Ortiz asked Mr. Chamblin if the square foot calculation included tare; Mr. Chamblin replied in the negative and stated staff was not recommending a one size fits all tare increase for everyone.

MOTION: Council approval of the Awards Subcommittee recommendation to make awards in the amounts specified for lease payment assistance on the accompanying spreadsheet to make 106 awards to 92 charter schools totaling \$15,511,348. Upon acceptance of awards by charter schools and school districts, Council authorizes PSFA staff to distribute award amounts quarterly on a reimbursement basis upon receiving proof of actual lease payments. Council authorizes PSFA staff to make reductions to award amounts subject to PED certifying in writing to PSFA that a condition exists that warrants an award adjustment or suspension which may include: school closure, charter revocation, financial violation or irregularities, adjustment to certified attendance numbers (MEM counts), lease termination or amendment. Awards made to charters that do not have an E-occupancy, facility master plan or a current audit are contingent upon PSFA receiving the required documentation and the award will be prorated to the approval or issuance date of the material to PSFA.

AMENDED MOTION: Mr. Robbins proposed adding 10% tare to the original motion.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Ms. Gudgel proposed that the item be brought back to the next Awards Subcommittee meeting with a different proposal reflecting 10% - 20% tare.

FINAL MOTION: Ms. Gudgel moved to table this item, send it back to the Awards Subcommittee and continue to work with Mr. Pahl on alternates to the funding issue. Motion was unanimously approved.

d. Outside of Adequacy Program - Legislative Appropriation Update - informational

Mr. Chamblin reviewed the information listed within the executive summary. The eligible districts were surveyed regarding interest in funding through this program. The funds are intended to be used on project types that have not been eligible for PSCOC funding participation to-date. The districts were asked to prioritize the most important categories as well as provide a list of up to 5 prioritized potential projects with a description of the estimated scope and cost for each. Key highlights include:

- 20 school districts receive federal impact aid for tribal lands
- 17 of the 20 districts intend to apply for outside adequacy funding
- 3 districts do not intend to apply as they do not currently have their local match
- 8 districts have construction ready projects
- The most requested project types are athletic fields and teacher housing
- Of the 47 projects requested, 20 are estimated to have a total project cost of less than \$500K; 8 projects are between \$500K-\$1.0M; 10 projects are between \$1.0M-\$2.0M and 9 projects are more than \$2.0M

If all of the priority 1 and 2 projects for the 17 interested districts were funded, the state's obligation would be approximately \$26.6M; if priorities 1, 2 and 3 were to be funded, the state's obligation would be nearly \$35.0M.

Discussions with the districts continue; staff to bring program rules and a potential application to the October meeting for Council approval. The districts are in agreement with the potential timeline as they will not know what they can afford until they go out for bond elections in the fall.

Additional discussion took place regarding items originally outside of adequacy that are now fundable as well as the existing stock and utilization of teacherages. Representatives from the Gallup, Zuni and Central Consolidated school districts spoke to how they have shovel ready projects and could put the funds to use immediately. Mr. Abbey noted that with the passing of legislation last year, the standards have evolved and though teacherages are within the standards we don't yet have the guidelines for them. Ms. Kean expressed concern with the application being drafted in September for approval in October as a lot of schools have shovel ready projects and preferred this be worked on through August and a draft application be brought forth in September. Mr. Guillen agreed and asked that the Awards Subcommittee also work on this at a special called meeting in August to prepare for September. Ms. Gudgel asked that the draft application be emailed to the Council for review and that the Awards Subcommittee be delegated to authorize the release of the application. Ms. Gudgel proposed an open ruling process for those districts that have projects ready.

Though this was an informational item only, Mr. Abbey moved to authorize the Awards Subcommittee to approve the issuance of an application at an August meeting. Ms. Gudgel seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

e. 2019-2020 PSCOC Work Plan Timeline - *informational*

The September PSCOC meeting will be changed to September 9th and 10th and will take place in Los Lunas. Subcommittee meetings will be rescheduled and a Doodle survey will be sent to determine member availability for the week of August 26th.

A date will also be determined for a special called Awards Subcommittee meeting in mid-August to accommodate further discussion on the outside adequacy program.

6. Other Business

a. Proposed Changes to the Adequacy Standards

The adequacy standards set the minimum acceptable levels of physical condition and capacity for school buildings. They are meant to be dynamic with changes proposed as time and circumstances require. They were originally adopted in 2002, largely in response to the Zuni lawsuit and is the basis for the standards-based process including the state-wide ranking of all schools. It is the baseline document used to assess, measure and evaluate buildings for deficiencies related to the standards.

Mr. Chamblin noted that the proposed changes are technical changes (clarification of language/meaning), increases to the minimum requirements (per SB230 which called for the incorporation of Pre-K state participation funding) and reductions to the minimum requirements. It was noted if all changes were implemented to the Standards the implication on ranking would be negligible. Mr. Chamblin stated that changes for Council consideration and approval would be followed by public meeting and changes to NMAC in the fall. The follow-up effort internally would be the update to the Adequacy Planning Guide. Mr. Chamblin referred to the meeting material which included a summary of the proposed changes as well as the red-lined document which identified the changes in detail.

Mr. Guillen asked if the document would go out to the districts for comment; Mr. Chamblin replied that there was a public meeting requirement; Ms. Casias added that comments have been received from the districts and PSFA would be moving forward with the hearing requirement. Districts will be notified and invited for public comment. Ms. Gudgel acknowledged this has to be published in the Register which is published every two weeks and that there is typically a 30 day comment period. The rule will need to be submitted to the NM Register for publishing along with a reason why the rule is being changed.

MOTION: Council approval of the staff recommendation for adoption of the proposed changes to the Adequacy Standards.

REVISED MOTION: Mr. Abbey moved to approve the proposed changes to go out for public comment. Unanimous approval with Mr. Ortiz absent for the vote.

b. Proposed FY21 PSFA Appropriation Request

Ms. Padilla-Jackson noted this was above the statutory limits in terms of what it means for the operating budget. Mr. Evans clarified if we were to look at the current statutory limitation and if the FY21 appropriation was approved, it would be at approximately \$5.5M and would mean if the statute changes during the next legislative session we would be restricted to the amount of the appropriation. The appropriation request was presented for review and approval as it is due to DFA by September 1st which is before the next PSCOC meeting. The request assumes the five year average which would allow PSFA to staff up and go from 8 vacancies to 3. Ms. Padilla-Jackson expressed initial concerns with approving a budget utilizing a revenue amount not currently in statute however, following additional discussion with Mr. Evans saw that Council would be approving a valid budget. Ms. Gudgel clarified that PSFA was wanting to fill 5 vacant positions and 1 new position which made up the \$1.2M difference from this year's budget to next year's; Mr. Chamblin replied in the affirmative and added that another reason was that \$550K was being added back in to the budget for eBuilder and School Dude.

MOTION: Council approval of the staff recommendation to approve the proposed \$5,804,597 budget and organizational structure of the PSFA. Unanimous approval.

7. Informational

a. PSCOC Project Status Report

Mr. Chamblin reviewed information listed within the executive summary. It was noted that the staff workload was really heavy during the summer months related to the security projects being done and that the schools were in need staff assistance on the project management, procurement and contracting support levels. In addition, these districts, and others, are applying for major awards and are getting ready for the district presentation meetings in September.

b. Broadband Deficiencies Correction Program Status Report

The BDCP program is doing a lot of work; the program has been contacted by a number of representatives at the State level; there is also interest at the federal level in learning more about the broadband work. Mr. Chamblin noted if the libraries pilot program becomes PSFA responsibility 1 additional FTE will be needed to cover the additional workload. It was originally intended that DoIT would be the long term project manager, however the BDCP team has been asked to continue helping for another year. Mr. Abbey stated that the Cultural Affairs Department appropriated an FTE to work on broadband and felt the BDCP team should be easing out; Mr. Chamblin agreed and added confirmation has not been received that the Cultural Affairs Department has the new FTE.

8. Next PSCOC Meeting – Proposed for September 12, 2019

It was agreed the next PSCOC meeting would be held September 9th and 10th. Mr. Robbins noted that the October, November and December meetings were currently scheduled for the same day as the PEC work sessions and asked if they could be moved to Wednesday; Mr. Guillen requested that a survey be sent to determine member availability.

9. Adjourn - There being no further business to come before the Council, Mr. Abbey moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Eaton seconded and the motion was unanimously approved. Meeting adjourned at 12:04 P.M.

 _____ Chair

 _____ Date