

WORKFORCE CONNECTIONS

BOARD MEETING MINUTES

June 21, 2016

10:00 a.m.

**Rosalie Boulware Conference Room
6330 W. Charleston Blvd., Suite 150
Las Vegas, NV 89146**

Members Present

Bart Patterson	Brad Deeds (phone)	Charles Perry
Jack Martin (phone)	Janice John (phone)	Ken Evans (phone)
Louis Loupias	Marvin Gebers (phone)	Michael Gordon (phone)
Paul Brandt (phone)	Peter Guzman (phone)	Renee Olson (phone)
Rob Mallery	Tobias Hoppe (phone)	Tommy Rowe
Valerie Murzl		

Members Absent

Jerrie Merritt	Leo Bletnitsky	Liberty Leavitt
Lou DeSalvio	Mark Keller	Rebecca Henry

Staff Present

Ardell Galbreth	Suzanne Benson	Ricardo Villalobos
Jaime Cruz	Brett Miller	Kenadie Cobbin Richardson
Jeramey Pickett	Carol Polke	Shawonda Nance

Others Present

Stephanie Garabedian, Parker Nelson Associates	Michael Oh, Henderson Legal
Armand Dodsworth III	Terri Conway, Goodwill of Southern Nevada
Gina Garcia, Goodwill of Southern Nevada	Steve Chartrand, Goodwill of Southern Nevada
Coralie Peterson, DETR	Esmeralda Rojas, DETR
Bonita Fahy, SNRHA	Arcadio Bolanos, AHD
Bianca Gutierrez, Goodwill of Southern Nevada	Sean Vanater, Goodwill of Southern Nevada
Devonte Yarbrough, Goodwill of Southern Nevada	Jared Awerbach, Goodwill of Southern Nevada
Tenesha McCulloch, Goodwill of Southern Nevada	April Guinsler, Easter Seals Nevada
Trnee Stephenson, Easter Seals Nevada	Dantes Franklin, Easter Seals Nevada
Howard Ostfeld, Easter Seals Nevada	Denise Gee, HELP of Southern Nevada
T. Williams, Easter Seals Nevada	Ron Hilke, DETR
Lyn Espinosa, Easter Seals Nevada	

(It should be noted that not all attendees may be listed above)

1. Call to order, confirmation of posting, roll call, and pledge of allegiance

The meeting was called to order by Chair Valerie Murzl at 10:12 a.m. Staff confirmed the meeting had been properly noticed and posted in accordance with the Nevada Open Meeting Law; roll call was taken and a quorum was present.

2. FIRST PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION

Arcadio Bolanos, Academy of Human Development (AHD) expressed gratitude to the Board for trusting AHD with the opportunity to serve as the One-Stop Affiliate Site – East provider and provided some history regarding AHD's programs/contracts.

Howard Ostfeld commented in support of Easter Seals Nevada and requested the Board to consider funding Easter Seals and Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority. Mr. Ostfeld is a participant of Easter Seals Nevada.

Bonita Fahy, resident program coordinator, Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority (SNRHA)/Youth One-Stop Affiliate Site – East asked the Board to look at SNRHA's partnership with Easter Seals, Nevada Hospital Association, and Olive Crest and consider the return on investment if this partnership is allowed to combine its resources, best practices to benefit the community. SNRHA has been serving adults under WIA since 2010 and has over 75 years of workforce development experience serving the Las Vegas community. SNRHA has the facilities and the space and is donating over half its building to becoming a one-stop. Ms. Fahy inquired if WC researched the proposal site location and stated that it does not make sense for Goodwill who is located up the street from HELP of Southern Nevada to be a one-stop site. She inquired regarding Goodwill's capacity to hold workshops and hiring events. Ms. Fahy restated that SNRHA has the capacity and space to be a complete one-stop to serve everyone that walks through its doors.

April Guinsler, director of employment solutions, Easter Seals Nevada commented that Easter Seals' program offers Assistive Technology (AT), including assistive, adaptive and rehabilitative services, products and solutions for individuals with disabilities to fulfill their core roles and become gainfully employed. As a group, collectively Easter Seals' AT program has over 30 years experience. Ms. Guinsler demonstrated the Read-It wand, a tool for individuals with learning disabilities. An Easter Seals' client used this tool to assist with her reading comprehension while attending school to be an HVAC technician; she successfully graduated with straight As and yesterday, received a job offer. Ms. Guinsler stated that no other vendor in Las Vegas has the technology that delivers AT services like Easter Seals. She further stated that over a third of Easter Seals' candidates are qualified dislocated workers who are on public assistance, unemployment and are looking to get off these services and over 25% of Easter Seals' candidates are veterans and/or spouses of veterans. Ms. Guinsler asked the Board to engage in conversation and rethink the recommendation for Goodwill as the One-Stop Affiliate Site – East provider and award the grant to SNRHA partnership with Easter Seals, Olive Crest, Urban League and FIT, with whom Easter Seals has an MOU.

Lyn Espinosa spoke in favor of Easter Seals and shared about her personal disability and the employment challenges she faces. She asked the Board to consider individuals who need assistive devices to go to work. Ms. Espinosa is a client of Easter Seals.

Steve Chartrand, president, Goodwill of Southern Nevada thanked the Board for making time to attend this special meeting and for the initial approval for Goodwill to receive the grant. Mr. Chartrand gave the following reasons why Goodwill is the best choice for the One-Stop Affiliate Site – East provider:

- Goodwill is committed to meeting the unique needs of its clients.
- While Goodwill offers a wide variety of services, individuals that Goodwill does not have the services or the technology for are actively referred by Goodwill to agencies that do. Goodwill considers this as one of the key things of an affiliate one-stop; to know the available resources in the community and to be able to allocate that.
- Goodwill has a proven record of achieving incredible outcomes and leveraging resources.

- Goodwill has been in partnership with Workforce Connections since 2009.
- In the last seven years, Goodwill has been a steward of \$7.9 million dollars in grants from Workforce Connections and raised \$4.3 million for a combined total of \$12.2 million that Goodwill was entrusted to invest into the community. Goodwill has placed 11,800 southern Nevadans into jobs generating \$209 million in wages. The ROI of the \$12.2 million is over 1,700% and continues to grow everyday those people are employed.
- If selected for this grant, Goodwill will commit \$402,000 of in-kind services and labor in order to maximize the leverage of these resources.
- Goodwill has many effective community partnerships having run two Career Connection Centers in the valley for the past ten years working with over 800 local employers who hire Goodwill's clients.
- Goodwill has a very effective relationship with the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation; since 2009 Goodwill has provided services to 2,800 youth and adults who are disabled.
- Goodwill has a stellar veterans placement program working with many veteran organizations and 800 employers; since 2013 Goodwill has placed 720 veterans into employment.
- Goodwill is partners with many community organizations, such as the Veterans Administration, Clark County School District, Catholic Charities, Nevada Partners, Easter Seals, and more.
- With good business acumen and culture, Goodwill's retail stores have grown 106% since 2009 creating 547 new sustainable jobs.

Davonte Yarbrough (using an interpreter) shared his positive experience with Goodwill's Elite program, which he has been a client of since December 2015.

Sean Vanater shared his positive experience with Goodwill's Elite program. Since joining the program in October 2015, he has had the opportunity and resources to advance his education, gain valuable work experience, and develop professional relationships. He asked the Board to consider funding Goodwill this year and beyond.

Bianca Gutierrez shared about her positive experience with Goodwill. Ms. Gutierrez has been a client of Goodwill since January 2016 and is currently receiving training in the food service industry.

Michael Walter thanked Goodwill for the employment services he received through the veterans program that assisted him to find employment with Allied Barton Security Services and a part-time job in construction, and thanked Goodwill for assisting his two children get jobs, one in Goodwill's retail store.

Dantes Franklin commented regarding his experience with Easter Seals and Goodwill and spoke highly in favor of Easter Seals for its individual service and less favorable of Goodwill's one-size fits all approach. Mr. Franklin is a U.S. Airforce veteran.

Jared Awerbach spoke about his positive experience with Goodwill's Level Up program and the WIOA services he received for housing, education and employment. Mr. Awerbach is currently employed as a security guard and actively refers people to Goodwill.

Gina Garcia, director of mission services, Goodwill of Southern Nevada noted an error in the May 24th Board minutes on page nine of the agenda packet. She clarified that the minutes should reflect that Goodwill received a score of three (not two) referring to the scorecard on page 31 of the agenda packet and noted that SNRHA received a score of two per the scorecard on page 43.

3. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: Approve the agenda with inclusions of any emergency items and deletion of any items

A motion was made by Charles Perry and seconded by Tommy Rowe to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried.

4. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: Approve the minutes of May 24, 2016

A motion was made by Charles Perry and seconded by Louis Loupias to approve the minutes of May 24, 2016 with noted correction. Motion carried.

5. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: Review the Board’s decision to award a contract to Goodwill of Southern Nevada as a One-Stop Affiliate Site – East to deliver WIOA employment and training services to Adults and Dislocated Workers in an amount not to exceed \$700,000 and WIOA Youth services in an amount not to exceed \$960,000. The total funding amount shall not exceed \$1,660,000. The contract period shall be a period of two years beginning July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2018 with annual funding based on Workforce Connections grant allocation. Provide the Southern Nevada Local Elected Officials Consortium with detailed information highlighting respondents’ service delivery initiatives with established partnerships and the following options for ratification:

1. Confirm Workforce Connections’ Board award to Goodwill of Southern Nevada in the total amount of \$1,660,000 as indicated above with the following impact:
 - Youth, Adult and Dislocated Worker employment and training services shall be delivered in the underserved eastside area as scheduled; or
2. Confirm Workforce Connections’ Board award to Goodwill of Southern Nevada with conditions as noted by the Southern Nevada Local Elected Officials Consortium with the following impact:
 - Based on conditions outlined by the Southern Nevada Local Elected Officials Consortium, program design adjustments may be needed to ensure underserved eastside residents receive timely, comprehensive employment and training services

Ricardo Villalobos, Director, Workforce Development Programs provided background. This item went before the Local Elected Officials Consortium for ratification on June 14, 2016. After much discussion and a vote resulting in a tie (3-3) the item was not ratified and the LEOs directed staff to bring the item back to this board for review.

Mr. Villalobos noted the following key points:

- Goodwill was not at the LEO meeting to provide perspective and answer questions

- Easter Seals attended the meeting and provided compelling testimony on behalf of Easter Seals and SNRHA (Easter Seals was one of the partner organizations named in SNRHA's proposal)
- Service providers should be present for each step of the approval process and attend the Programs Committee, Board and LEO meetings
- Goodwill does not have Assistive Technology (AT) and referred clients to Easter Seals, the only vendor in the community with AT. Service providers should be making referrals and collaborating with community partners while building capacity to move toward a one-stop delivery system
- The LEOs want the opportunity to review, discuss, and modify items as needed before ratifying; they do not want to rubberstamp the Board's decisions
- Moving forward agendas will be modified to include staff's recommendations with options (provide example) to allow the LEOs the opportunity to make adjustments if necessary

Executive Director Ardell Galbreth noted that any modifications or adjustments made by the LEOs must be within the parameters of the scope of services set forth in the RFP.

Chair Murzl opened the floor for discussion.

Bart Patterson requested Mr. Villalobos to recap the scope of services in the RFP. Mr. Villalobos replied that this RFP is for the One-Stop Affiliate Site – East to provide services to both youth and adults specifically in the east area in the valley. The One-Stop Affiliate Site – East provider will be required to have at least one core partner under WIOA targeting specific populations, including but not limited to veterans, adults/youth with disabilities, re-entry, foster youth, and adjudicated youth.

Mr. Patterson noted that an issue was brought up in terms of space and asked Mr. Villalobos to address it in terms of the RFP. Mr. Villalobos replied that the RFP specifies that service delivery must target a specific geographical area based on zip codes, in this case the east and the One-Stop Affiliate Site – East provider must be located within this area.

Chair Murzl clarified that the question pertains to whether or not Goodwill has the space to accommodate a one-stop, not demographic location.

Terri Conway, chief culture officer, Goodwill replied that the One-Stop Affiliate Site – East will be located on the corner of Tropicana and Pecos and has plenty of space for individuals to work on the computers, have small workshops, and to speak with career coaches. There would be approximately five people staffed at the location and one veteran career coach, who would be a veteran themselves and another individual from Olive Crest on site to assist individuals from the foster youth community. There will also be someone who has expertise serving youth and adults. The larger workshops would be held approximately four miles away if needed.

Rob Mallery asked if site visits were conducted at the potential locations. Mr. Villalobos replied that he personally has not visited the sites nor have the interview panel members. Mr. Mallery asked if the board can recommend that staff visits these locations.

Mr. Galbreth replied that staff typically visits the site as part of the process for implementing the contract. For example, staff will visit a site to verify that it is ADA compliant as well as provide technical assistance to the provider as needed.

Mr. Villalobos stated that there are no concerns regarding Goodwill's capacity to deliver WIOA services at any of their locations.

Louis Loupias stated that in the construction business, when an RFP is awarded, the other bidders cannot ask the awarding body to reconsider its decision, unless there were discrepancies in the contract and according to the LEO Consortium minutes, Easter Seals specifically asked the LEOs to reconsider the award, which is confusing because how can an entity who did not participate in the RFP process ask the board to reconsider the award?

Stefanie Garabedian, Parker Nelson Associates/Legal counsel, replied that after the RFP has been awarded, the party who did not win the contract is allowed to submit a protest pursuant to the guidelines set in the RFP. There is a technical process that has to be followed; however, Easter Seals would not be the organization allowed to do this, it would be SNRHA, the organization that submitted the RFP. Regarding the LEO minutes, the individual mentioned was providing public comment.

Mr. Loupias stated that the Board does not rush into these decisions. With this item alone, the Board has heard at least three hours of testimony and has had to make heart wrenching decisions. He stated that he relies heavily on staff's recommendations and knows that Mr. Villalobos and his staff does a lot of research so that the Board can make these decisions, but there is just not enough funding to help everyone and the only way to get more WIOA funding is through legislation.

Discussion ensued regarding the options attached to the agenda item.

Mr. Villalobos stated that staff is not recommending one option over another, but whichever option the Board recommends has to be approved by the LEOs.

Tommy Rowe stated that second option which gives the LEOs an opportunity to set conditions is probably the best option to ensure that services get out in the community the soonest.

Mr. Villalobos apologized for the confusion and clarified that the recommendation is to move forward both of the options to the LEOs, not one or the other, for the purpose of providing the LEOs an opportunity to provide conditions based on their perspective.

Jack Martin stated that he is uncomfortable putting forth a recommendation without knowing or having any idea what the conditions might be.

Mr. Galbreth stated that staff does not know specifically what conditions the LEOs will require; however, whatever they are they would have to be within the framework of the statement of work in the RFP that was published and pursuant to Workforce Connections' procurement policies as well as state laws and/or federal regulations required under WIOA. Chair Murzl asked if the LEOs have the authority to force Goodwill to partner with Easter Seals; Mr. Galbreth replied no, not at all.

Mr. Patterson made the following comments:

- In the minutes of the LEO meeting, a concern was raised about a one-stop affiliate concept. The Board went through a couple meeting cycles where it specifically talked about a new approach to provide more comprehensive services. It is very important for the LEOs to know that the Board went through this discussion in advance of issuing the RFP to signal that this is the direction the Board will go to provide more comprehensive services. If the Board decides at the end of the day in a year or two or whatever the evaluation process is, that it is not working as effectively as planned, then the Board can go in a new direction. It needs to be clear that this was a very deliberate conversation.
- It was mentioned that Goodwill was not present for the LEO meeting. The Board does not know the questions the LEOs had and so we cannot comment as to what the outcome of that would be, but obviously it would be good for Goodwill to be there at the next LEO meeting to answer whatever questions might have existed.
- There were only two real issues that have been raised in the process. The first is the issue with the Assistive Technology, which the Board already heard is a referral to Easter Seals. In the future when Workforce Connections issues an RFP, if it required specific Assistive Technologies, either in partnership or as part of a provider, that could be evaluated differently, but it is very difficult to back off of an RFP process that was not specifically evaluated. Goodwill's recognition that they need to provide that effective service is very important going forward because Easter Seals is a terrific organization that provides a terrific service. In the future, it's a learning experience for the Board that maybe we need to include that and make sure that it's scored in some way in the RFP.
- The second issue raised is regarding space. Staff is going to evaluate the space at some point and make sure it is adequate and appropriate. That could be something that potentially goes into the RFP process, where the space is actually evaluated. This is not a recommendation to hold back the process because there are additional things that could have been put in the RFP and it would not be fair to the clients or the RFP respondents to try to add additional conditions like that and so forth. Proposal scoring methodology and scorecards are provided on page 22-61 of the agenda packet.
- Going way back, the Board specifically went through external evaluators to avoid politicizing the process and to go back to those days where people negotiated or went into political postures to try and change results will not have a good outcome for this Board. It is very important to look at the external evaluators very carefully and if there is a reason that the scoring should be changed and there is a disagreement with the scoring metric that would be a reason to make a change in the decision, but there has been nothing presented yet why there should be a change in the scoring by the external evaluators, so there is no basis to change the recommendation. If the Board needs to add flexibility to the LEOs because they have some conditions they want to discuss, that is okay; however, it is not coming with a strong recommendation that the Board views those kinds of conditions imposed positively because there is a lot of concern on this Board about what are the conditions going to be. The item can go forward with this language as is but the record needs to be clear that the Board is not seeing what the conditions are going to be and therefore cannot express any opinion about what the LEOs decide to do or not do in connection with those issues.

Mr. Villalobos noted that one of the things staff has discussed internally is hosting in the fall an RFP session for decision makers, where staff will be requesting participation from Board members and Committee members and even potentially LEOs, so that everyone is informed and aware of the evaluation process from the beginning to the end.

Chair Murzl stated that she has a major problem and agrees 150% with Louis, Jack, Rob and Bart comments and the open-ended, based on conditions, no conditions defined, having to stay within the narrow window of having to stay within the RFP. In the LEO minutes, it clearly suggests to Easter Seals that they should speak with Goodwill and attempt to establish a partnership with them; as Goodwill clearly told the Board that they have partnerships with vets, Olive Crest and other community organizations. Easter Seals did not submit an RFP on their own, they partnered with the Housing Authority, who did not score as well as Goodwill so they were not awarded the contract. The Board has spent more than three hours between the Program Committee meetings and the Board meetings rehashing everything again but without clearly defined expectations of the LEOs and no real direction, but to send it back to the Board. She further stated that she is definitely opposed to putting conditions on a situation that is not defined.

Charles Perry stated that he does not like to be held hostage by the LEOs, but this item has to be moved forward one way or another and suggested a motion to send this back to the LEOs with option number one.

Mr. Villalobos stated that he did not take away an understanding or the implication that when the decision comes to the LEOs they would want to change the recommendation this way or that way, rather the spirit of it was that the LEOs wanted the opportunity to just have discussion and not just rubberstamp the Board's decision. They want the same opportunity presented to the Programs Committee and at the Board level to have discussion.

Chair Murzl agreed and stated that it is really Goodwill's fault because they failed to show up for the meeting and speak to the \$1.6 million award and they were remiss. The LEOs were up against a wall, they had nobody to talk to from Goodwill and Easter Seals was there, so the LEOs were certainly going to respect what Easter Seals was saying and without Goodwill representing themselves, it puts us back here in the boardroom. This is what happened and Goodwill needs to own it, deal with it and be there to answer the LEOs questions and address whatever concerns they have because the Board nor staff can answer on behalf of Goodwill.

Chair Murzl called for a motion.

Mr. Patterson suggested moving forward agenda item five as presented with both options, but with the record showing that the Board's recommendation is option number one. Legal counsel stated that the agenda says or, so the Board will need to select just one option. Mr. Villalobos clarified that the agenda item is to move forward both options for ratification and we can clarify with the LEOs the preference of the Board is option number one.

A motion was made by Charles Perry and seconded by Bart Patterson to award a contract to Goodwill of Southern Nevada as a One-Stop Affiliate Site – East to deliver WIOA employment and training services to Adults and Dislocated Workers in an amount not to exceed \$700,000 and WIOA Youth services in an amount not to exceed \$960,000. The total funding amount shall not exceed \$1,660,000. The contract period shall be a period of two

years beginning July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2018 with annual funding based on Workforce Connections grant allocation. Provide the Southern Nevada Local Elected Officials Consortium with detailed information highlighting respondents' service delivery initiatives with established partnerships and the following options for ratification:

- 1. Confirm Workforce Connections' Board award to Goodwill of Southern Nevada in the total amount of \$1,660,000 as indicated above with the following impact:*
 - Youth, Adult and Dislocated Worker employment and training services shall be delivered in the underserved eastside area as scheduled; or*
- 2. Confirm Workforce Connections' Board award to Goodwill of Southern Nevada with conditions as noted by the Southern Nevada Local Elected Officials Consortium with the following impact:*
 - Based on conditions outlined by the Southern Nevada Local Elected Officials Consortium, program design adjustments may be needed to ensure underserved eastside residents receive timely, comprehensive employment and training services*

For the record, the Board's preference is option number one. Motion carried.

6. INFORMATION: Board Member Comments

None

7. SECOND PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION

Steve Chartrand thanked the Board for its support and continued confidence in Goodwill. He stated that he owns that fact that Goodwill staff was not at the LEO Consortium meeting which was due to an internal communication problem, now resolved and promises to be at all future meetings.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.