Tom Moran:

Audio. Okay. Got it. All right. Let's see. We have a quorum. So, Mike Ambrosio, Mike Sprayberry, Kelly McKinney, Bud Mertz, Ira Tannenbaum, Carlos Torres, Chris Geldart, Jim Sheehan, and Tom Hyatt. Hang on one second here. Okay. All right. I think we're ready to get going. John Molnar will be joining us shortly. So, I have provided several documents. I have the agenda up on the screen, provided minutes from the March 23 meeting, we've got several finance documents. Great report coming on that, actually. Then we have a mitigation strategy that Mike Sprayberry and several other board members went in on it. So, Chris, if you, with your permission, I'll just run through the agenda. First up is a termination of a quorum, and we have a quorum.

Ira Tannenbaum:

Thank you, Tom.

Tom Moran:

Okay, next up is discussion on the March 2023 board meeting minutes.

Ira Tannenbaum:

Tom, I got a motion. I read through them last night, and I didn't see any issues. So, I'll put a motion up to accept them.

Carlos Torres:

Another, Carlos Torres, I'll second it.

Tom Moran:

Okay. All those in favor?

Ira Tannenbaum:

Aye.

Tom Hyatt:

Aye.

Carlos Torres:

Aye.

Tom Moran:

Opposed?

Carlos Torres:

Aye.

Tom Moran:

That last one. Was that in opposed or in favor?

Mike Sprayberry:

That was in favor.

Tom Moran:

Okay. Sorry. Okay, next up is our financial report update. John Molnar, provide that. Go ahead, John.

John Molnar:

Yeah. You don't have any issue if I share my screen? Okay, Tom?

Tom Moran:

No. Stand by, John. Let me turn it off. Okay.

John Molnar:

Still says you're sharing, Tom.

Tom Moran:

You want me just to pull it up?

John Molnar:

If you could pull up either one, yeah.

Tom Moran:

Yeah. Stand by one second here. Can you see...?

John Molnar:

[inaudible 00:14:51] either one?

Tom Moran:

All right. Stand by one second here. Which one do you want to start with first?

John Molnar:

We'll go through the actual income statement first.

Tom Moran:

All right.

John Molnar:

Just to go down the list, I'm not going to go through all of these. There's some things I marked here in yellow. This is the funding that we receive on a quarterly basis. Go down... Stop going down, Tom... That has the grants. This is the funding. All of the money for $637,000 is the amount of grants that have been paid out to the contractors. We get a 9% fee for that funding. That's a $61,094. That's all I was trying to show on that. Down below, tom. Just going down. I've marked out pretty much some of the key areas that we spend in the AHC's expense areas. Really, the two big accounts are really Tom's Executive Director services. That's Tom's salary. Then that's my salary, for the PMO director services.

So, you'll see the $69,000, and the $61,000. The overhead consulting that was above there is mainly for several of the people that we worked on, to help out on the BRIC grants, as well as Laura Johnson doing some of the work in regards to the meeting planning activities. The item that we had down below, the marketing communications is really the IT department that we have, a lot of the marketing that goes into that. That's why we call it that. That is able, Macy's, ours, and I have to be honest guys, that probably, at this point in time would've been close to $50,000 on last year's spend rate. Tom has cut back quite a bit, in regards to that type of funding, and dealing with the expenditures on that account. So, you can see that that is running at about $16,000 a quarter versus, so $60,000 basically versus close to double, if not almost two and a half times that amount.

The difference that the only thing that you'll see down below is that, I don't know. The only thing I wanted to show here is it shows a negative balance there. The reason for that is that we do not have the funds in the income area that haven't been received yet. Tom can talk to that later on in regards to the issues that we had at the HSEMA level. But the expenses that are being shown here are $558 above, is several of the dollars that are below that amount at this point. So, the total expense is close to $600,000. We're a hundred thousand above that, at this point. That that is funding that needs to be coming into the AHC at this point. So, we're in the black, in regards to this. So, I hate this chart because it's a snapshot in time, and we have a difficult time in showing this thing because of the distribution of the funds that are related.

The next slide, go over to the other report. I developed something different in regards to, given a snapshot of what it looks like, what our picture looks like, in regards to the activity till December of the end of 2023. What I'm trying to show here is that the first section, the ready for payment, the amounts to be approved, yet to be entered for HSEMA. This is the funding that is coming to us, in regards to HSEMA that they haven't paid us yet. It's in the queue there to get funds received in that account. So, you'll see, and it's a snapshot. You'll see the funds go up and down depending upon where it is, in regards to the payment mechanism. So, at this point in time, it's $293,000 that we're dealing with. The next section are the grants that really have not been expended yet, from now until the end of December.

That's about $2.7 million that we have, that contractors will be paid for. We'll get our 9% within that arena. That breakdown shows about $206,000 that we have that is coming into the AHC from now to the end of December. Then the project work that we have in play at this point, and mainly that's in Virginia. We have the Endeavor Virginia project that has not been invoiced, or at least paid off at this point. That's $25,000. Then the BRIC total that the AHC receives is about $320,000. So, we have $345,000 in projects coming into play. So, there's three buckets that we're getting money from. The HSEMA bucket, $293,000. Future grants, that's coming from HSEMA, $206,000. Then project work. These projects happen to be in Virginia right now, $345,000. So, our incoming till the end of December is about $844,000.

There's activity. Again, I didn't put all of the dollar amount here, guys. I just tried to give you an idea of what we're dealing with here. So, the outstanding payments, the big time payments that are in queue right now is $353,000. Really the big nut is John and Tom's salary, that will occur from now through December. So, what we plan to have on the books is close to half a million dollars, which is extremely positive at this point in time. I thought that snapshot would be a little bit better. I will give that to you each and every quarter, and explain if it got better, or got worse, or remained the same, and the expectations remained the same. But I think this is almost a better way of showing whether we're green or red, within that space at this point in time, and whether there's a reason to celebrate, or reason to cry.

Tom Moran:

Thank you, John.

John Molnar:

So, this is...

Carlos Torres:

It's Carlos. I do have one question. I understand the top stuff, but the John's loan, John and Tom, and John's interest, what can you explain, give me background on it? 'Cause I have no idea what that is.

John Molnar:

Yeah, I think that's common part of the discussion, Carlos.

Carlos Torres:

Okay.

John Molnar:

So, that was a precursor of what we're talking about in the board meeting today. So, I apologize for that, but that's...

Carlos Torres:

No problem. Okay.

Tom Moran:

Yeah. For those that were not aware of Kelly, myself, Chris, Tom Hyatt, we had good news, bad news. We had a real financial shortfall due to a number of factors that caused...

Michael Ambrosio:

Cashflow.

Tom Moran:

That was a big cashflow issue. We corrected what we could correct. It's correcting itself now, and the outlook is very positive, right? Thank you to everybody's efforts. The big thing is we'll talk about... I put a financial background information document together that tells you the story of maybe the last 12 months. The good news is, liked we had the District of Columbia dealing with us. The only challenge was they changed the grant process, where we had to expend the money and then get reimbursed, which means the consortium was floating the District of Columbia. Then they were late paying us three months. In one case, almost four months. Well, that drained our $300,000 cash.

We keep about $300,000 cash on hand as a float. Well, that put us in arrears. So, John and I didn't take salaries. John actually offered to provide a float. Then we had a meeting with HSEMA. They didn't realize the problem. They corrected the problem. Now they send us the task order. John can invoice, and then they're paying now in two weeks. So, we're digging out of the hole like rapid. We should be totally clear by end of June, maybe July. By the end of the year, extremely positive. They gave us more work under those new guidelines. So, it's explained in the documentation, but we wanted the board, everybody to have eyes and ears on where are we, and more importantly, where are we going here by the end of December?

Michael Ambrosio:

Carlos, just to put a little bit more clarity on probably your major questions on. John and Tom stopped taking their draw, stopped taking their salary, so that we could pay the contractors that we had working for HSEMA. Then John actually used some of his own funding, and as John started to report out on that, after he'd done some of that, we tried to put a fix in place to go to a local bank and get a small business loan. They don't really like working with 501(c)(3)'s 'cause they're nonprofits. It's not the climate right now for that, or at the time, when we were going out. So, we didn't have much success on that. So, John was able to, and some of us talking with HSEMA, get the process fixed.

So, we're not continuing to do that. Now, it's reimbursing John and Tom for the funding that they put in to pay for our folks that are working at HSEMA. So, we made payroll every month for our people. We just didn't have the income coming in. So, you had a cashflow influx there.

Carlos Torres:

Okay.

Michael Ambrosio:

So, now what we're looking at, what we're need to talk to today on the call is how do we appropriately reimburse John and Tom for the funding that they put in for keeping our folks working, so they continue to make the money.

Carlos Torres:

Right. Right. Okay, good. No, no, thank you for the explanation. I appreciate it. Because yeah, it looked like the wording was different. Now it's the loan to John, so I took it.

John Molnar:

Yeah. It's really the line of credit, Carlos, that had been paid off. The money, I'll just be upfront as hell. It was close to $300,000. That has all been paid down up to the point of $100,000. We are almost there, within the next couple weeks of getting the entire $100,000 off the books here. That'll cover the $300,000 that you saw up above in the income of HSEMA to us. That should be paid off here in the next two weeks. That line of credit will no longer apply.

Carlos Torres:

Wow. That's great.

John Molnar:

I apologize for all that. I forgot that we were first on the list, versus third on the list there.

Carlos Torres:

No problem, I appreciate it.

Mike Sprayberry:

We refer to this in the parlance as a goat rope.

Tom Moran:

Mike, I was talking to Kelly about this. This is small business growing pains. The reality is the business with HSEMA is going to double, easy, I think. They love doing business with us. We charge 9% overhead. John is super fast at getting these people, and when they corrected this problem, they handed them another million dollars, an opportunity. So, we still need a line of credit because we can't grow fast enough. Maybe with the new policy we can John, but, yeah, no....

Mike Sprayberry:

You got to admit though, it's a pretty significant hiccup. Now what if you'd really needed the money to live, and glad that it worked out, and is working out.

Tom Moran:

Definitely.

John Molnar:

Yeah. But Mike, on the positive side of that, I think when we started this years ago, I don't know what, 10 years ago, and then Chris was involved in adding two. We started with about a million dollars in grants that we had, and it was really just one grant. We probably have, I don't know, seven grants that HSEMA has incorporated us into, at this point. That $1 million has gone to... We probably hit $5 million this year in grants on the HSEMA bucket. So, if you're dealing with the AHC trade, that root system of $400-450,000 of income is a nice base that we never had to begin with at the beginning of the AHC, Mike.

Tom Moran:

John. The majority of that is staff.

John Molnar:

That's staff. That is really what staff covers. That's correct.

Tom Moran:

Are they not also going to engage us in their $30 million BRIC project once that gets underway?

John Molnar:

That's right. Hopefully we won't spend every penny of that. That's what I was trying to show, that if everything goes as planned, we have at the end of December, we have a nice little bucket of funding to have in tow of about half a million dollars.

Mike Sprayberry:

Okay.

Kelly McKinney:

Hey John, it's Kelly. Can you go back to that first page that you showed? Yeah. So, it's a -$81,000. You're saying that there's $100,000 in accounts receivable that turns the red into black essentially.

John Molnar:

Correct, yes.

Kelly McKinney:

But if you go up, this issue of floating is everything. The point is, we can't loan HSEMA money to pay its staff, which sounds like what we were doing.

John Molnar:

That's what we were doing. They've changed that since we've talked through that, Kelly. That's correct.

Kelly McKinney:

But that's the point, is that the business model actually doesn't work if you're doing the former, rather than the latter. For the other thing, the cost of doing business, if we are talking about... 'Cause one of the things we're going to talk about is making you whole on that loan. So, the cost of that is essentially a cost of doing business, as well. In other words, you got to take that interest off of our revenue, as well, because that's doing business, as well. But going forward, there is no flow, right? You're going to bill them, even before they get the staff, we're going to have the money in hand, essentially, right?

John Molnar:

[inaudible 00:31:42] yes. If we do not have the money and we do hit a hiccup like that, HSEMA will cover that now.

Kelly McKinney:

Okay. So, that's good. So, [inaudible 00:31:54]

John Molnar:

Yeah. They don't need to have the proof of payment. Basically, they will do our reimbursement without the proof of payment. As soon as we provide that proof of payment, we have to give that back to them, and make sure that they have that filled out at the end, that they get their proof of payment, that we didn't just didn't keep the money.

Kelly McKinney:

Right.

John Molnar:

Which is a totally different environment, Kelly, than what we were doing six months ago when we were having heart attacks.

Kelly McKinney:

Well, it's the growing pains that Tom talked about. If we'd have talked about it upfront, we'd have been like, "Wait a second."

Mike Sprayberry:

Right. Kelly, not only that, I mean running a business, right? What that tells me is 9% is not enough for us to be charging.

Kelly McKinney:

Exactly. Exactly right.

Mike Sprayberry:

Going forward in the future, if we were going to be in that same system, where we've got to pay for the first 90 days of people, and that just wouldn't work. You have to do a higher percentage rate, so we have more in the bank.

Kelly McKinney:

Exactly.

Mike Sprayberry:

Which was actually what was stated to HSEMA, maybe not by John, but by somebody else, of either you figure out how to make this right, or the percentage has to go up exponentially so we can be covered.

Kelly McKinney:

Right.

John Molnar:

Yeah. I don't know what magic words were said, Kelly. I don't know if my discussion that happened to get it, but something happened behind the scenes there, and I wasn't asking any questions.

Kelly McKinney:

Yeah. I don't know. I've worked in government, so you don't often see that good result, so easily [inaudible 00:33:37]

John Molnar:

Yes, I will thank Chris.

Kelly McKinney:

Okay.

John Molnar:

Somehow or another.

Kelly McKinney:

That makes sense. That makes sense.

Mike Sprayberry:

Yeah. Well, I mean seriously, Kelly, you know this, and folks that run a business know this, we are not upcharging anybody on their hourly rate, right? All we're charging is 9% for the consortium itself. You go to any other university, or anything like that, there's close to 25%, and they're marking up their people at the same time. Because that's how you make profit, that's how you cover, that's how you're able to do things, and get out there ahead on projects till you get paid 90 days later. We're not doing that. We can, if that's the way that they wanted to continue to do it.

Kelly McKinney:

Absolutely.

John Molnar:

Just so everybody knows, when we first got into this business, the board met. I think Chris, you were still on the board then, and the board was comprised of state directors of Homeland Security Emergency Management, and Darryl Darnell was president of the board, and they all agreed on an overhead rate because they wanted to keep the overhead down, and push the money to the projects. That was the biggest problem. So much money was being scraped off top, and the board all voted, and they debated back and forth, I think it was at 6% originally.

Mike Sprayberry:

6%, Tom, it was six when we started.

Tom Moran:

I remember that. The states run the consortium at the time. So, we moved out with six, and we've increased it to nine. But to be truthful, there's so much that comes out of that into other projects. As things grow, we've been through turnover down there. John's done a great job taking care of that customer, and it's a hard proposition to say no to, right? To your point, Chris, they're paying 48-57% to their universities they work with, and some of their other staffing organizations.

Mike Sprayberry:

Every single consulting consulting firm has a 3.1 multiplier at a minimum, on top of every [inaudible 00:35:42]

Michael Ambrosio:

Yeah, ask them what they pay Haggerty for people ask them.

Mike Sprayberry:

Exactly. I can tell you right now, Mike, I don't know if you know this, but your company has a three point... You have very few people that are below 3.0 on a multiplier.

Tom Moran:

Yeah, no, that's pretty standard.

Michael Ambrosio:

I don't know anything about that. I'm an LLC.

John Molnar:

Stay that way, Mike. Stay that way, buddy.

Michael Ambrosio:

Mike, you're not in front of congressional committee. Okay. Okay.

Mike Sprayberry:

All I know is 50% of my salary goes to taxes.

Michael Ambrosio:

Oh yeah. Well, yeah.

Mike Sprayberry:

I want to be in your tax bracket.

Michael Ambrosio:

Well, that's right. I've got first world problems.

Mike Sprayberry:

Yeah, right.

Tom Moran:

That's right. That's right.

Michael Ambrosio:

We're all blessed.

Tom Moran:

We wanted to make sure we got everybody on the same page going forward, because I think, as the BRIC opportunities come forward over the next 24 months, having these things in play, this was actually a painful time for John and myself, but it was one of the best things that happened, right? Because we got a handle on every nickel that comes in and out of the consortium. We've turned off a bunch of things that were revenue sucking, not revenue generating. We've refocused our energies on BRIC and other opportunities. We have big sponsorship opportunities with Esri and a few other folks that could be in into the multiple hundreds of thousand dollars.

So, all in all, it was a healthy experience. We're going to end up very positive this year. So, the idea is now to get everybody on the same page. We have process in place, we can move forward as we come out of this. So, I want to thank John, personally one, professionally two, not just for doing what he did, but more importantly having that come to Jesus conversation with the district, which took some balls to do that, because they could just turn, "Nah, forget it, were going to go away." But I think at the end of the day, John, they appreciated what you said, and obviously they, they've moved Heaven and Earth to help, which is great. So...

Chris Geldart:

Hey, Tom Hyatt, do we need to have a principal's only conversation here, or board only conversation here?

Tom Hyatt:

Yeah, Chris, I think that'd be appropriate.

Tom Moran:

Okay, guys.

Chris Geldart:

I think right now we're going to ask Tom and John to drop for a minute, and then we'll bring them back after we have the next piece of the part of this conversation.

John Molnar:

Okay, guys, thank you.

Chris Geldart:

Good work, John, thank you. Okay, so I think they're off. I can't see from here, but what we do need to decide as a board, Molnar did put up the funding that he did. Tom forgo pay as he did, if we were to have received... Which most businesses would be able to get a small business loan, or a line of credit to keep from going and doing what those two did. In that, there's an interest payment that goes to it. So, the question for the board here is one; reimbursement. I think we've all decided that, for sure, to John. Then two; do we agree on a reasonable interest rate for the money that John and Tom had put out over the time when they forgave their pay, and put in additional funding? Is that right, Tom?

Tom Hyatt:

Yes. Yes, that's correct. Yeah, that's correct, Chris. An observation on that, if I may. Nonprofits are businesses too, and so we have to make appropriate payment for services and resources that we can consume. So, in effect, we had a member of the leadership team make a loan to the organization. There wasn't a formal contractor promissory note behind that. I didn't find out until after the fact. But it doesn't surprise me. Tom and John have always stepped in and put their own personal entitlements to the side to make sure that the consortium was afloat, and had appropriate cash flow. So, the fact that they went that direction didn't surprise me. But that said, it's appropriate for us, as a business to repay that loan. That's happening already. It's appropriate also, I think, Chris, to pay a reasonable rate of interest on that loan.

Certainly no bank or commercial enterprise would make an interest free loan, even to a nonprofit. So, it's appropriate to pay interest on that when you're dealing with a 501(c)(3), and particularly where the person on the other side is a member of the leadership team, or what the IRS calls an 'insider'. It's important that we have a reasonable rate of interest to ensure that we're operating as a charitable organization, and stewarding our funds appropriately. The IRS, over the years, has pretty consistently supported the position that prime plus 1-2% is a reasonable rate of interest. So, if we were to come back and approve, after the fact, approve repayment of the loan and pay interest from the beginning on that, anything up to prime plus 2% would be considered reasonable. If I'm not mistaken, I think prime is at eight and a quarter now. So, that get us up to 10 and a quarter on repayment on that.

Then last thing I'll say, Chris, the appropriate board action here would be two things, I think. One is to ratify what's happened so far. So, essentially ratified that we accepted the loan and that we're repaying the loan and then to approve payment of reasonable rate of interest from the beginning of the term, until it's fully repaid.

Carlos Torres:

So, Tom, it's Carlos. How many months has this been happening? So, just so I have a timeframe.

Tom Hyatt:

Yeah. I don't have that number off the top of my head. I just learned about this relatively recently, so I think less than 12 months, but I'm not certain. I don't have that hard number.

Carlos Torres:

Okay, It has been being paid down, that interest will be on the remaining balance going... So, we have to figure out what that number is, right? Because...

Tom Hyatt:

Yeah, so the answer to that would be, not necessarily, it's up to the board to decide where you'd like to go. You could make a reasonable business argument. So, let's make it easy for a simple number. Let's say the loan started January one, you'd start totalling interest as of January one, and threw him up for whatever that is and paid that amount going forward. If you wanted to take a lesser step, you could make it the interest effective now, in going forward, do you have anything from the beginning, and in between would be appropriate, but typically for even a non-profit business, you're going to pay interest on that from the beginning. The only thing is different here is it wasn't approved in advance by the board. That can be remedied if the board chooses to do so, simply by ratifying that action, as well as approving what we do going forward.

Chris Geldart:

Tom, is there a way to ratify the action, but still... One thing I don't want to have happen is have this happen again.

Tom Hyatt:

Yeah, right.

Chris Geldart:

I don't think anybody on the board, I know I did not know about this until we were well into it, and look great that John was able to do that, but it would've been good, because as soon as the board did find out. I know Kelly and myself when we found out it was, "Okay, normally businesses would do these things through lines of credit. Let's get out there, let's talk to the banks, do all those other actions that we could have done to avoid..." So, from my perspective, and I put this out there for the group discussion, this should come with... I would be supportive of absolutely ratifying and paying the loan back and interest from the beginning, because we would've had to do that anyway, if we had gone any other way.

Tom Hyatt:

Right.

Chris Geldart:

But I would want that to come with a, "This doesn't happen again, unless it's approved by the board in advance."

Carlos Torres:

Do we have to do anything with bylaws to make sure that doesn't happen again? Or the board [inaudible 00:44:09]

Chris Geldart:

That's a great question.

Carlos Torres:

Maybe, to avoid that from happening again, it should be part of the written record that any moves like that has to come to the board to decide first before that decision is made. They made it on their own. I know it was all good intentions, by all means in that sense, but you want to avoid that from ever happening again.

Chris Geldart:

Yeah.

Tom Hyatt:

Agreed.

Chris Geldart:

Exactly.

Tom Hyatt:

So, here's what I'd suggest. It's too granular to put in the bylaws, but what I'd suggest to get us to the same place is add that proviso in the motion from the floor, just in your own words. Then I'll write up a policy, an operations and board policy for this.

Carlos Torres:

Oh, okay.

Tom Hyatt:

That lays out a little bit more detail, this exact thing. Then, at the next meeting, we can approve that policy, but we can jumpstart it just by putting it in the motion for now.

Michael Ambrosio:

Chris, why don't you just make a motion right now? Put this in a motion.

Chris Geldart:

I will. I just want to see if anybody else had any questions. Absolutely. Just in case anybody else had any questions or points to order, to put in before we do that?

Jim Sheehan:

No, I just wanted to say that if this was New Jersey, we could go up to 49%. [inaudible 00:45:21]

Chris Geldart:

That's how much they charge on a car loan up there too, by the way.

Kelly McKinney:

That's why your taxes are so high, Jimmy,

Jim Sheehan:

It's actually in the law that it's not loan sharking if it's below 50%.

Chris Geldart:

Jesus.

Kelly McKinney:

Yeah. That's those Atlantic City politicians

Chris Geldart:

That's going to say that Kelly.

Jim Sheehan:

At 51, you lose a kneecap.

Kelly McKinney:

52, the other kneecap. Yeah. Chris, I could not agree more with what you said. To me, it was a big surprise, and cannot let this happen again. So, I think you're spot on, right?

Jim Sheehan:

Yeah, I agree.

Chris Geldart:

Anything from anybody else that we need to add to the motion?

Mike Sprayberry:

Well, not to add to the motion, and I'm looking at this like I was, not as a nonprofit, but if I was the director of an agency, which I used to be same as you, Chris. So, if something was to happen financially, I want to know yesterday. I want to know immediately.

Chris Geldart:

Exactly.

Mike Sprayberry:

So, whoever finds out first, it's their duty to let the board know ASAP. So, it may not be this type of instance, it could be something else relative to a grant, but full transparency as quickly as possible. I know nobody's trying to hide anything, but I think that if we're doing our due diligence, we need to really lead by example. So, if I were to find out something that concerned a grant on the All Hazards Consortium, first person I'd reach out to would be Tom, to let him know about it.

Tom Hyatt:

Yeah.

Mike Sprayberry:

My expectation is that everybody else would be the same way. To me, listening to this today, obviously I didn't know about it. When you put it on a piece of paper, and it says 'loan' and that stuff... Like I said, I'm looking at this as a Director of Emergency Management and a Homeland Security advisor. If I was to find out like this, I wouldn't be happy. I'm just saying, and so maybe all I'm saying is more than just a proviso, like you said, I liked it when you used that word. I'm not sure what I'm trying to say here. But I'm just saying for the good of the group that if something like this, or anything regarding dollars presents itself, then we owe it to our partners on this board that we're going to let somebody know ASAP. That's all I'll say.

Chris Geldart:

Yeah. And Mike, I think for clarity's sake for you, when it did come up to the board through Tom, which I think was relatively.. I say relatively, because it may have been a couple of months into it happening, I think as soon as Tom found out about it, he brought it to myself and to Kelly, as part of the board to say, "What do we do about this?" I know we had some discussions on some ideas. They went out to a whole bunch of different banks to look for lines of credit. So, it made it up to the board. I don't think a whole board meeting. Kelly, I can't remember if we covered this at any board meetings before Mike joined, but I know that it came up to the board pretty soon after it started. Then it was, "How do we resolve?" Now we hit the resolve.

Everybody did what they needed to do to either try to get funding from someplace else, in terms of a line of credit or a business loan. Then others of us went to work on making sure that the problem itself would be solved. So, it doesn't continue, at least from this client, if you want to call it that way.

Mike Sprayberry:

Roger that. And to be clear, I don't like the idea of Tom being surprised, for sure. Anyway, I'll be quiet.

Chris Geldart:

No, no, Mike, you're right on. Which is why I had to make a point today to say, "Yeah, I agree that they all did it in with the best intentions, but it could have been done with the best intentions while notifying everybody at the same time." So, that's why it can't happen again. That means, [inaudible 00:50:15]

Carlos Torres:

Chris, I'm sorry to cut you off, but it's really have to be open communication, as soon as there's an issue that rises to that level. That's our role as the board is our responsibility.

Chris Geldart:

Yes, sir.

Carlos Torres:

It's to support them, right?

Chris Geldart:

That's right.

Carlos Torres:

Help them make those decisions that it's going to protect them. So, I wholeheartedly agree that yeah, they should be repaid their loan, plus interest, and we got to just make sure it doesn't happen again. Then we discuss these things. Because I actually don't think... Even when I joined the board just a while ago, I'm probably the one that came right before Mike. I remember hearing about this, that's why I'm so surprised seeing it on paper when I saw the attachments and stuff. I really wanted to understand what that meant.

Chris Geldart:

Yeah.

Kelly McKinney:

The other thing to remember is, we were talking about these growing pains. John remembers the years that passed with very little income and revenue. So, this revenue thing really grew rather quickly. So, this thing arose out of that. Now we have the prospect of these BRIC grants, which could also fundamentally change the amount of revenue and the type of revenue...

Carlos Torres:

The cash flows are going to be different.

Kelly McKinney:

Yeah. It's a different business model. So, these issues are going to arise out of that. I mean, I love John Molnar, but those accounting statements that we just saw, I got to tell you that I think an accountant have a field day with them. I don't think they're reflecting the true cost of business, et cetera. So, I think there's a maturation process that we have to go through, as we evolve into these BRIC grant revenue streams. I was talking to Tom about this yesterday, and it also means you're talking about full-time staff that to do the work of it, there's a lot to be talked about to grow the business, essentially.

Carlos Torres:

Right. But they need to put together profit loss statements. Being a nonprofit, you could be showing a profit, but you're going to have to explain what are you doing with it. Because you pigeonhole dollars to a specific project, and you have a budget. If the scope changes, or whatever, they may claw back money, 'cause you're working with the government agencies so they could claw back money at times. So, to

Kelly's point, you need to have these cashflow discussions at least on a quarterly basis to understand where the money's coming from, where the money's going to, and again, life cycles of projects. Some may be short, some may be very long, and those grants are very different. Mike and Chris, you more about those from the government perspective, but it's just like in industry, we have budgets, and you have to work within your budgets and you can't go beyond the budgets unless you get approval.

Kelly McKinney:

Right, exactly.

Mike Sprayberry:

Right.

Kelly McKinney:

Yep. Simple as that.

Chris Geldart:

Okay, then I'm going to put the motion out there that we ratify the loan that was there, agree to pay that back with a prime plus two, and a statement within that, saying that there we are going to develop a policy in which notifications are made, and that this won't happen again.

Kelly McKinney:

Second.

Chris Geldart:

Okay. We do All in favor then?

Carlos Torres:

All in favor. [inaudible 00:54:16]

Kelly McKinney:

Aye.

Carlos Torres:

Aye.

Chris Geldart:

Any nays? We have a nay. All right, Tom, I think we can bring Tom and John back on and we'll look forward to... You're going to put that together, Tom Hyatt, and get it out to the board so we can look at that and vote on it in our next meeting.

Tom Hyatt:

That's correct.

Chris Geldart:

Okay. Thank you sir. Thank you everybody for sticking with that conversation.

Kelly McKinney:

Good job, Chris.

Carlos Torres:

Good job, guys.

Chris Geldart:

Kelly, how's New York brother?

Kelly McKinney:

It's just, it's a shit show, and it's just a question of how bad it gets, essentially. Aren't you glad you asked? No, it's all good. Except for the Canadian wildfire smoke, and the asylum seekers, and the e-bike store fires. Right? Did you see that in Chinatown?

Chris Geldart:

Yeah, I saw that.

Kelly McKinney:

We had four fatalities, and the two more likely, and...

Chris Geldart:

Wow.

Kelly McKinney:

Yeah, those e-bikes are a menace. Not only when they explode into fire, but when we were walking down the sidewalk, and you get run over by the...

Chris Geldart:

Get run over by them. Yeah.

Kelly McKinney:

Yeah.

Ira Tannenbaum:

Kelly, I thought you get driven to and from work by your executive driver, what do you mean 'dodging'?

Kelly McKinney:

I do, but it's called Uber, Ira, and then you...

Michael Ambrosio:

Oh, I hope it's an electric Uber, Kelly.

Chris Geldart:

Well, I say Kelly, I am now officially a California resident, so I'm out here in sunny California.

Kelly McKinney:

Yeah. Well, we have to chat. I don't know. Is that any better? I'm not sure. Chris, tell me, is it?

Chris Geldart:

Yeah, I'm with you on that.

Ira Tannenbaum:

Instead of Canadian firefighters, you have our US firefighters.

Chris Geldart:

We have our own.

Ira Tannenbaum:

Yeah, exactly.

Chris Geldart:

I'll tell you, it's a good change of pace though, Kelly, where I'm supporting the government employee, my wife, who now runs all debris removal from the state of California.

Kelly McKinney:

Get the hell out of here. Are you kidding me?

Chris Geldart:

Yeah. She's in charge of debris removal at CalRecycle.

Kelly McKinney:

You guys are the power couple, man. That's that's amazing.

Jim Sheehan:

Chris, where are you living?

Chris Geldart:

Just outside of Sacramento. About 30 minutes outside of Sacramento.

Kelly McKinney:

That's a nice...

Mike Sprayberry:

They call it the compound.

Ira Tannenbaum:

If they give you two addresses, you think you could turn those into debris? Brian Baker? Just, no, sorry.

Chris Geldart:

I call this the compound we're all living on my father-in-law's farm. Me, my wife, our kids, my brother-in-law and sister-in-law, their kids. We're on a 50 acre sheep farm out here.

Kelly McKinney:

Oh my gosh, that's a good life.

Michael Ambrosio:

It doesn't sound baaad.

Ira Tannenbaum:

Yeah, I think that's the location of the next all hazards retreat.

Chris Geldart:

Well, I did shoot a turkey from my porch, so we're doing all right.

Jim Sheehan:

I hope it was with a single action that you only put one round in.

Chris Geldart:

No, I hit him with a bow.

Kelly McKinney:

Oh, my...

Chris Geldart:

It's not gun season out here.

Jim Sheehan:

Wow. They have haven't outlawed bows yet in California.

Chris Geldart:

Tom, you're back buddy. We take the conversation back on track.

Tom Moran:

Tom Hyatt, I'll circle back with you on any action items for me. But yeah, are we good? We're good to go to the legal update?

Chris Geldart:

Yes, sir.

Tom Moran:

All right.

Tom Hyatt:

We are, although, yeah, legal update, we pretty much just had. Beyond that we are in need, and Tom, I didn't get a chance to even find with you exactly when we did it last time, but we're at the point now where we need to get our conflict of interest disclosure forms out and reviewed again. So, keep an eye out for those coming back. Same policy, same disclosure form as in the past, but keep an eye out for that coming forward.

Tom Moran:

Okay. I'm going to, Tom, while we're talking, I'm going to email all the board members those two documents. There's a guidance document and a form. Can you need help with anything?

Tom Hyatt:

Yes, correct.

Tom Moran:

Just shoot me an email. Let me go back to the agenda real quick. Any questions for Tom on legal update? Okay, next up, Mike Sprayberry and the AHC mitigation initiative. Mike, I know you, Carlos and Bud started, want you to tee that up. I did circulate a document for review and approval. So, Mike, why don't you take it from here?

Mike Sprayberry:

Right. So, did everybody get reminders about this meeting the way that I did, to make sure that you were here today? Tom, I got to say that there was no way I was going to miss this meeting. Thank you for the reminders. Anyway...

Chris Geldart:

Mike, he's used to working with me, buddy. He's going to remind you about 90 bazillion times to make sure you're there.

Mike Sprayberry:

All right.

Jim Sheehan:

Tom, it's Sheehan. I got to...

Tom Moran:

Mike, I'm laughing as you say that, because when you and I first talked, you told me you're a good marine, you need an objective, right? Time. Right?

Mike Sprayberry:

Right.

Tom Moran:

How I approach these board meetings. Sorry.

Jim Sheehan:

Hey, Tom, it's Sheehan. I'm at a conference in Philly. If I drop, will it kill the quorum?

Tom Moran:

Hang on.

Chris Geldart:

No. 1, 2, 3, 4. No.

Tom Hyatt:

No. Quorum is established at the beginning of the meeting, so we're good.

Jim Sheehan:

All right guys. I vote yes. I vote yes on whatever you guys need me to vote yes on or no.

Chris Geldart:

Thanks Jimmy.

Jim Sheehan:

I got to get back into this conference, right?

Mike Sprayberry:

Roger that. So, the consortium has a mitigation initiative, and is basically designed to link up states and critical infrastructure owners and operators. We have a lot of different objectives, you'll see in the hand. I'm going to try to catch up a little bit here because I know that we're behind time, but you'll look on the handout that Tom has been working on. I think it's volume four, Tom.

Tom Hyatt:

Yes.

Mike Sprayberry:

So, at any rate, we want to establish a collaborative planning framework, facilitate exchange of mitigation project ideas, promote the sharing of best practices and lessons learned, develop T&E initiatives, advocate for policies and programs, enhance coordination and collaboration among states and CI owners. I will say that the deliverables is for community. We want to discuss issues with our community. We want to have good projects, good partnerships, good resources and tools, and maybe develop some good cross-sector exercises.

I will say that for me, some of the things that are the most exciting is, well, one of the things that's very exciting to me is that for both the public and private sector currently, there's not a whole lot of people in the pipeline moving into hazard mitigation. There's a real shortage. So, I'm excited about the opportunity for the consortium to work with the EMI and the National Hazard Mitigation Association to update the courses for hazard mitigation, because the ones that they have currently at FEMA or grossly out of date. I know Jeff Stern at EMI, so I think we have a real good opportunity there. Also, I'm pretty connected with a lot of folks at NHMA, and I've told them that we'd like to brief them about our initiative and they're up for it.

So, we just have to get that going. We want to connect with a lot of schmos throughout the states so that we can get their support. One of whom is Tom Hughes up in Pennsylvania. He's a great guy, currently the president of NHMA. We want to make sure that, for me, exercises are really important, as well, because you train the way you fight. So, if we can get some good exercises done, and if we can influence policy like BCAs, and things like that, I think this initiative will really get some traction, and grow legs. So, anybody else have any questions, or Tom, you have something else you want to talk about here?

Tom Moran:

No, I just open it up for discussion for the board.

Carlos Torres:

Carlos, no comments. I think we took a couple of stabs at it, and I think it covers it very well and it's challenging, but I think doable.

Chris Geldart:

Mike, I just want to say, say thank you for putting all that together, and the work that you guys have done on that. When you look at what really makes a difference right now, what people are really starting to focus on and understand, is going to make a difference. Response, recovery and mitigation are the areas that are just going to continue to grow, as all these changes that are happening and all this stuff that's going on. So, this is our prime area that you guys are tapping into here, and I couldn't agree more with what you guys have in a document. I read it last night. Thank you for putting that together. Any way I can support brother, let me know.

Mike Sprayberry:

Roger that, sir, back to you, Tom.

Tom Moran:

Okay. I think what we're looking for, Chris, is discussion, vote to approve. So, we put it on the books as an approved sanctioned board initiative.

Chris Geldart:

Tom, I read through it. I'm ready to do that. I don't know if anybody has any other questions or issues. Kelly, I don't know if you got a chance to look through this, but from my perspective, it's challenging. It's a lot, but this is the stuff that needs to get done.

Kelly McKinney:

I have to admit, I didn't read it. So, I'm a little unprepared, guys. I apologize. But from everything I'm hearing, it sounds great. I think mitigation is the neglected phase of emergency management. It leaves a lot of jurisdictions, and a lot of states caught short because they don't have good projects developed in the for 404 money. So, I think anything that we can do to promote that is good. So, I fully support this.

Bud Mertz:

This is Bud Mertz, but it's very comprehensive. As Tom and I had found out, which we'll discuss a little bit later, I mean, every state has their own way of doing things. I think that the objectives alone, but the whole concept can capture that, and can be used no matter at what level government as well as at what state. I think it's very good.

Mike Sprayberry:

Thanks Bud. One thing I'd like to say, too, is I used to tell my team we can't do everything at once, but we can certainly get involved and do chip away at it. So, I think we've got a timeline here. Number six, we've identified objectives and deliverables. So, to me, that's what you chip at. So, you know, make sure that you're working on it. I think your expectation would be, the next time we meet to see some progress made on the deliverables. So, it's a challenge, and we know it's going to be a challenge, but it's like like what y'all are saying. Right now, we have more money for mitigation than we've ever had nationwide with BRIC, FMA, IJA. It's incredible. Plus all the mitigation dollars coming from the major disasters in recent years, and looks like the tropics are already heating up in June pretty early. So, I think we can count on having some more disasters pretty soon. So, anyway, appreciate y'all's support.

Chris Geldart:

All right, and I'll make that motion based on that, unless anybody else has any other discussion. Motion to adopt.

Bud Mertz:

Bud Mertz will second.

Mike Sprayberry:

All in favor? Aye.

Ira Tannenbaum:

Aye. [inaudible 01:07:57]

Speaker 10:

Opposed? Nay. The motion passes. Back to you, Tom. Good.

Ira Tannenbaum:

Tom, it's Ira. I apologize. I have to drop for a asylum seeker call, but this is fantastic, and I look forward to, like Kelly said, I have to catch up on that reading, but I'm looking forward to looking at the document.

Tom Moran:

Great. Thank you, Ira.

Carlos Torres:

Take care, Ira.

Tom Moran:

Okay, next up. Next up Bud Mertz, look we're talking about.

Carlos Torres:

Yes. Just before we move on, Carlos, I have to also drop off. I have a previous call I have to get on. I thought this was going to end before 5:30.

Tom Moran:

Yeah.

Carlos Torres:

All right. Okay. No problem. Great job by everybody. Thank you. Okay.

Chris Geldart:

Hey, Carlos. Thank you.

Bud Mertz:

See you Carlos.

Tom Moran:

Carlos. Okay, Bud. Next up is the FEMA BRIC Mitigation Initiative within Westmoreland County with Buds County. Bud?

Bud Mertz:

Yeah, thanks Tom. Yeah, this became a little bit of a challenge. Tom recognized the progress that they had in Virginia, and he had word from First Energy, which has a huge footprint in Pennsylvania, as well as West Virginia and I think Ohio, and a bunch of other states that they wanted to get in on this. I set up a conference call with the state, Tom Hughes, and Tom and myself and Tom Hughes from FEMA. We talked about the interest of the project, Pennsylvania, as a state putting in for the project, moving forward. Although Tom was impressed with the concept of the project, he said that the state does not make any applications for any mitigation money, that it's all pushed down to the local level. So, Tom and I talked after that, and seeing that again, First Energy is here in my county.

Tom Moran:

I'm sorry, hold on a minute.

Bud Mertz:

That First Energy is here in my county, and that we have several communities that meet the SSVI indicator that we would try to make the application for Westmoreland County knowing that it's bigger than that. The problem is different than the States is that I have a board of county commissioners that I have to go through for any grants that we make application to. So, after I convinced some of my senior staff member, and we did a briefing with them that, "Yeah, we're going to be in on this." I held a meeting with our county commissioners who, surprising to me, they paid attention during the meeting, and they actually loved the project. So, the first thing in the process in Pennsylvania is that you have to send a letter of intent to FEMA that you're planning on putting in for a grant for the BRIC grant or the mitigation grant. So, Tom and John had drafted a letter of intent up and I sent it back to Tom saying, "Hey, is this okay? Are we good with it?"

Basically, he accepted it, the draft form. He did make one correction though. He said that it still has to be Westmoreland County, I believe is what that email said, Tom, that it still has to be Westmoreland County, that the money's not going to go to All Hazards.

Tom Moran:

Yeah. No, we, yeah, prefer it that way. That's fine.

Bud Mertz:

Yeah. But anyhow, so we have a letter of intent out, which will be part of it. I don't know, Tom, we talked a little bit about... You understood it a little bit better than I did, as far as what money they used for the design and preparing the concept, and how that was going to work for the first phase. But the letter of intents there, and we're now anxiously awaiting the notice of funding opportunity to come out. Then I'm going to have to go through the process of getting the county commissioners to approve the actual grant application for the first phase, which would be done at a public meeting, so that then we can send it in. So, the timing has to be all right. Yes, it's just an extra step, and more or less going back to the mitigation strategy, just really an different, if the state wants to do it, they just do it.

They don't need anybody to truly sign off on it. But with me, I have a board of commissioners and we have the whole transparency thing, and everything else that it has to be done at a public meeting going forward.

Tom Moran:

Okay.

John Molnar:

Well that's fantastic. This is John Molnar. I always certainly appreciate your help, and thank you. One of the issues that you're dealing with there is that it's a $400,000 ask in regards to funding, and $100,00 of that is match, which the AHC has signed up to do, and which we'll be able to meet fairly easily within that environment. So, again, that brings that to ACH, what we can bring to the table on these types of grants, and the whole reason that a county like yourself couldn't do this, or wouldn't probably sign up to do this any other way.

Tom Moran:

But that's great news. So, the way we will approach it is First Energy will partner with us. They will provide the funding for the consortium to bring the whole team, the writers, the editors, the research, all that stuff. So, the county doesn't have to produce the document. We'll do all that, county has to review it. The first phase is really a study, to see which sites qualify. Then phase two, the following year, we'll do an implementation of a pilot. Usually 10, 15 sites or something like that. But I think what we're discovering, the war we're talking about, this is just the load, a consortium's approach, the business model takes off of government, and puts it on the utility.

Who's going to be the biggest beneficiary of the investment? It really is an interesting insight. Not only that, the utility's going to maintain the grant's three years. The utility's going to maintain it for 20+ years after the grant's over, so that's on their dime. So, the county doesn't have to pay for that. It's becomes part of the infrastructure, but they still get input into the dispatching of where they need these things. Really, it's a tremendous model.

Bud Mertz:

I think that's an important point, because going out on something like this, if this was a Westmoreland County project, that I'd have this G-Pod sitting out in my parking lot. Sustainability for something like that is huge. I think it would be even huge for a state government, having that partnership with First Energy, and having that commitment of that 19, 20 year sustainability, is probably key to the whole thing.

Tom Moran:

But we're emphasizing that a lot more because we didn't really understand. It's like anything, the more you talk about it. But anyway, that's good news. We'll, no action yet on our part, but First Energy is ready to go. So, all good. I want to pay attention to time real quick. I'll touch on the Virginia Project is moving into phase three. We're looking at the Hampton Roads area. That'll be another series of G-Pod trailers, and pre-wired locations submitted in January of 2024. We're waiting on the $20 million award, which should be out June, July timeframe from FEMA. We're we're waiting for to get word on that.

Then lastly, we started our fleet response working group. Pennsylvania adopted that charter in the model so the private secretary could organize the Endeavor work group model within Pennsylvania. Now Virginia is copying that, and Maryland and Mississippi want to copy that. What does that mean? They want to put in for a BRIC grant to get funded to start that work group model for their states. An interesting development here. So, we'll keep you guys apprised of that. But basically what that means, the consortium will go in there and help Mississippi or help Virginia stand up and Endeavor Work Group, which is really a private sector operated work group, in support of their private sector programs, which are very government centric. There's nothing wrong with that, but it doesn't compare to industry's ability to move quickly and fast to develop use case, anything like that.

We'll keep the board apprised of that. Last item is a fun discussion. Many of you have mentioned about having a face-to-face board meeting at some point. So, that's the last item on the agenda. Chris, I'll throw that out there on the table to talk about. Mike Sprayberry has mentioned it, Mike Ambrosio and has mentioned it, a lot of you had mentioned it. I think we just got to pick potential date, time, location options, and then I can follow up with that.

Chris Geldart:

Okay, Tom, from my perspective, let's see. We've done a lot of those in Maryland and in Philly, right? Has been our primary where we've done the face-to-faces before?

Tom Moran:

We had one in DC. Chris, right?

Chris Geldart:

That's right. That's right, we did.

Tom Moran:

Yeah. We did one at the clearing one year, and one in Delaware.

Chris Geldart:

So, I think we need to think about where we would like to do it, and then a timeframe that gives folks enough time to put it on the schedule. It also probably is outside of hurricane season, or anything else crazy going on. So, maybe the November, late November, before Thanksgiving or just after Thanksgiving, and the lull between the holidays. Those are some suggestions I would have, but any input from anybody that's left on the phone. I think Kelly's still here, and Mike I think is still here. I know Bud's still here. Any suggestions from the group is more than welcome.

Tom Moran:

Go around the horn, Kelly.

Kelly McKinney:

No, You're right. We need one. Tom, when you were away, we were talking about the implications of these new projects, and what they do to the business. So, I think there's a lot to talk about and much more than we can do in these virtual sessions. I think we want to do something bi-coastal now with Chris in California. So, can we find a place that's convenient, or relatively convenient for me? Not for me that convenient period, end of sentence. In my perspective, I will travel to wherever we need to. DC's easy for me. I don't object to California during the colder winter months. So, that's my thought.

Tom Moran:

Okay. Mike Ambrosio first, and then Sprayberry. Thank you.

Michael Ambrosio:

No, yeah, Tom, I've been always in favor of meeting in person. We do most of our better work when we're in person. So, I think it's been some time. I think the last one we had was in Philly, I believe.

Tom Moran:

Yes, it was.

Michael Ambrosio:

That was pre-COVID, so it's been some time. I'm with Kelly. how many acres you have out there, Chris?

Chris Geldart:

Oh, the farm itself is 75. We've got 20 acres on it.

Michael Ambrosio:

So, if we could pitch a tent out there, why not? No, I think the timeframe is great. November's a good time, and I'm all for it.

Chris Geldart:

Yeah. Tom, I'm not opposed to DC, either.

Tom Moran:

Well, if we do DC, I was going to ask Chris Isenberg if he would be interested in hosting it at EI, which is a lovely place. It's near transportation and Metro. It's right there.

Chris Isenberg:

Yeah. Yeah, I'm on the call, Tom. So, you've already asked, so no, I was going to suggest we'd be happy to, unless people are tired of visiting DC. It's obviously convenient for me, it's convenient for New York, New Jersey with the train and Tom, you live not too far, either. So, if we can't for some reason do it at our facility, we don't have the restrictions anymore for having meetings there like we did over the last three years, because of COVID. But if we don't do it there for some reason, I'm not going to speak for [inaudible 01:22:37] in Philly, but they have a great facility, as well. They're very convenient, as well. I know that Bill [inaudible 01:22:46] and his team are very engaged with All Hazards, so I would think that they would be good with it, as well. But either one of those are good for me. I go to California too much in a lot of my trips, so I'm going to pass on Sacramento.

Chris Geldart:

You don't want to come to PG&E, brother?

Chris Isenberg:

No, we're helping them from where we are. I'm good.

Mike Sprayberry:

I am a new PG&E customer.

Chris Isenberg:

Well, we love our customers.

Michael Ambrosio:

Sorry to hear that, Chris.

Tom Moran:

Mike Sprayberry?

Mike Sprayberry:

Yeah, I'm not going to spend the night out in the tent on a farm. Those days are long gone, but DC, Philly sounds good to me because first of all, sounds like y'all got a place where you can meet for free, and I always like going somewhere where you can see something historical and probably have some good eats, too, and pretty easy to get in and out of. So, but I was going to say Hawaii, but whatever the group wants. That's good. But DC, Philly sounds good.

Tom Moran:

Okay. Let's see. Did I miss anybody? Okay, what I'll do, Chris Isenberg, I'll circle back with you, if we're looking at fourth quarter, first quarter, or try to do it in fourth quarter?

Chris Isenberg:

Yeah.

Chris Geldart:

Why don't we send two out, for fourth quarter and for first quarter just to be safe, right?

Tom Moran:

Okay. Yeah, because I know sometimes Chris Isenberg, things get pretty dicey there. End of third quarter for you all.

Chris Isenberg:

Yeah, January's a pretty big travel month for me as well, so it might be that might be the [inaudible 01:24:55]

Tom Moran:

Okay, well, I'll work with you to see if we can find some dates there. I'll check with availability in Philly and we'll come up with some times. So, I do think it'd be very beneficial. But every time we do these, they will come in the night before, we'll try to meet, have dinner, and we'll spend a day together, and the consortium will cover the travel costs for the board members. If we want to have someone come in outside, we can adjust the agenda, as we see fit. It's a good time, a lot going on, a lot of growth coming. We haven't touched on the stuff that's in the pipe. We'll do that at another time. But very exciting time. In my 18 years, I don't think we've seen it like this, right? As far as the things that are ahead of us that we can do.

When I say things Mike and I, Mike's Sprayberry and I were talking about it, this is generational things, when we can have an impact on this next generation hosting many [inaudible 01:26:00]. I know we're hosting a mentorship program with women in emergency management. We've done two webinars. Laura Johnson hosts some, Chris's wife, Heather has helping part of the planning. On LinkedIn, Laura's running a mentorship program, assigning young with older, and the reaction is fantastic. They had over 200 people registered for this webinar, the last one we had. I just love mentorship of any kind. It's just such an important thing. I like Mike's vision for this mitigation. How do we train up the next generation of that? Chris, it's a lot like when we started the consortium right back in 2003 on conference calls. So, I love it. The people side is always the best part for me. Okay, well, that's the end of our agenda. Any new business? All right.

Chris Isenberg:

Oh, Tom, Chris. Chris Isenberg here again.

Tom Moran:

Yeah, go ahead Chris.

Chris Isenberg:

Our members of our mutual assistance committee, we hold a meeting with them twice a year, once in October, once in April. They're very interested in getting a All Hazards update on the G-Pods projects, and also your work you're doing with Bent Ear, and a lot of other things. So, just, I think Wally reached out to you, so...

Tom Moran:

Yes.

Chris Isenberg:

Okay.

Tom Moran:

Yeah. Plan to support it. Yep. Very good.

Chris Isenberg:

Great.

Tom Moran:

All right, Mr. Geldart, I think we're at the end of our agenda. I'll give you the last word.

Chris Geldart:

No, thank you everybody. Mike, thanks for doing all that work, buddy, that that's a great document. It's a real exciting move forward. Chris Isenberg, thanks for everything, brother, and for everybody being on. So, that's it, Tom.

Mike Sprayberry:

Thank you, Tom for helping us with that document.

Tom Moran:

My pleasure. All right. Motion to adjourn.

Chris Isenberg:

[inaudible 01:27:54]

Tom Moran:

All in favor.

Chris Isenberg:

Aye. [inaudible 01:28:01]

Tom Moran:

Have a great evening everybody.

Chris Isenberg:

You too.

Michael Ambrosio:

Bye.